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1.0 Introduction

This document is prepared primarily for the Chinese Economic Development Council Inc. (CEDC), a community development corporation based in Boston, proposing a set of land use and development objectives, from the community-development viewpoint. Upon this basis, strategies are devised to accomplish these objectives and to fulfill housing and land development goals compatible to community needs and priorities.

The recommendations for these objectives and strategies are built upon an analysis of the social and political backgrounds of the community, the community needs and priorities, the available resources, the regional development context, and the roles that CEDC should take in the course of housing and land development.

During the process of preparing this document, the author is under the employ of CEDC on half-time basis and is directly involved with the housing and land development activities. However, the recommendations made in this document only represent the personal view of the author.
2.0 Recommended Objectives

For over a century, the Chinese community has settled in Boston Chinatown. It has been the home for thousands of Chinese since then. Many lived here for many years, some moved out, but still more moved in. Since 1960, the Chinese population in Boston has increased by three fold.

Although Chinatown has been the center of our community for a long time, history tells that when faced with external pressures, our community has been disorganized and ineffective in protecting our neighborhood from being either encroached upon, sold out, sacrificed for other developments or threatened by undesirable activities.

First came the construction of the Surface Artery in the 1950's which ran through the original Chinatown, tearing down houses, shops, restaurants and even on third of the Chinese Merchants Association Building was demolished to make way for highway construction. Then the Mass Turnpike Project replayed the same incident again in the 1960's causing further loss of housing stock and developable land. As a result Chinatown (excluding South Cove) shrank from 30 acres to 20 acres, by more than 30 percent.¹

¹ Source: "Boston Chinatown", Boston Redevelopment Authority
The Tufts New England Medical Center which is located within the neighborhood also has, over the years, bought large tracts of land for its own expansion purposes, and torn down hundreds of houses despite the housing needs of our community.¹

Moreover, the City allows great concentration of adult entertainment businesses to operate just next door to our neighborhood and legitimizes the area as the Combat Zone. Other than spreading blight, spurring crime, deterring desirable growth and investments, the Combat Zone has been a great menace to our Community and Chinatown ever since it was designated.

Recently, the external pressure has not only continued but has picked up additional momentum under various urban revitalization projects such as the Lafayette Place, Tufts Pediatrics and Nutrition Centers and University expansion, the State Transportation Office Building, the General Services Administration Building, and the Theater District Revitalization Project, which are all located within or very close to the Special Impact Area of CEDC, and would cause substantial impacts on Chinatown.²

Although from the City and the institutions' point of view, the benefits brought to Boston through these developments might be substantial, yet our community would have to bear most of the costs in terms of pollutions, congestion, high land prices, displacements,

¹ Exhibits 1 and 2 on pages 15, 16
² Exhibit 3 on page 17
etc. So far little has been done by either the public or the private sector to actively involve our community into participation or to ensure the meeting of community needs. But unless our community reacts to these proposals effectively, what had happened in the past may very likely recur again soon in the future.

Internal pressure has also loomed in the recent years. Following an effort to reverse the inequitable immigration laws; the ban on Chinese immigrants was lifted in 1943. However, the real growth of Chinese population began to take place following the enactment of a new immigration law in 1965, extending the upper limit for any one country to 20,000 immigrants per year. Since then, thousands of Chinese have come to rejoin their families in the U.S.\(^1\) Due to cultural differences and language barriers, many have sought to settle in Chinatown or areas within easy reach in the proximity. Population explodes in Chinatowns first on western coast then on the eastern coast as well. The low mobility of the new immigrants has been the main reason for their tolerance of overcrowding, poor living conditions and high rents.

\(^1\) Exhibit 4 on page 18
What Chinatown means to our community hardly needs further emphasis. The social, financial and cultural values are irreplaceable, let alone a large group of new and old residents, whose daily life vitally depends on the survival and well being of the neighborhood. However, with the growth in size and complexity, our community seems to be divided into factions, which do not come to consensus across a wide spectrum of issues. Some of these discrepancies are economical, political or purely ideological, but they all create great difficulties in community goal setting and block consensus even when dealing with matters outside the community.

We, being a minority will find it difficult to influence public policies effectively even with all the coalition we can marshal from the community. Fragmentation can certainly further diversify our political power and weaken our position when dealing with city wide, state wide, not to mention nation wide interests.

Painful experiences in the past are indicative of the long term and significant impact on us as a community when we are ineffective in blocking devastating developments or encouraging needed facilities. With these major urban development projects now about to be launched in the near future, in and around Chinatown, it is absolutely vital to let the community be aware of the situation, to involve them in the process of looking at the land use and development issues as a top priority and to draw up strategies to influence public policies in order to ensure long term compatibility with community goals.
Furthermore, to cope with the increasing needs of our growing community, it is appropriate for us, as a community development corporation to take the lead and provide assistance to the community to satisfy their housing and other land development needs.

Finally, in view of the development pressure around the Chinatown core area, CEDC should in co-ordination with other community agencies devise a set of strategies both to preserve the existing neighborhood community, and to turn such pressure in favor of community economic advancement.

Based on the studies which I shall discuss in the following Chapters, the following objectives are proposed to be adopted by CEDC Board as guidelines in regard to development and land use matters in order to meet the community needs in the future:

(1) To broaden community support of CEDC, to mobilize our community in political activities and to coordinate pursuit of Community growth in order to maximize political leverage in dealing with public agencies, institutions and private developers that may affect the future of Chinatown and our community.

(2) To encourage housing developments in Chinatown South Cove, South End and other neighborhoods desirable for community growth, so as to:
(1) Increase the supply of subsidized and non-subsidized housing for both elderly people and families;

(2) To stabilize the rent and improve the housing stock occupied by Chinese households; and

(3) To promote home ownership by Chinese families

(3) "To extend the community control of land and to encourage more intensive, mixed developments in and around Chinatown core, with a view to integrating community development with the city growth pattern and to facilitate community economic advancement through the creation of more jobs and business opportunities provided that:

1) The existing viable social structure will be preserved;

2) No displacement of families outside their existing neighborhood will be necessary; and

3) The environmental quality will be maintained at a satisfactory standard."
Buildings demolished for Artery & Turnpike construction

Properties owned by Tufts as of 1975
## Exhibit 2

### Displacement Due to Institutional Expansion and Urban Expressway Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing (dwelling units)</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artery</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>approx. 10 garment &amp; leather shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,200</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td><strong>3-4</strong></td>
<td>approx. 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES:**
2. "Boston Chinatown", BRA 1972
3. BRA Chinatown/South Cove District profile 1978.
MAJOR URBAN DEVELOPMENTS AROUND CHINATOWN

1 Lafayette Place
2a G.S.A. Building
2b (alternative sites)
3 Tufts
4 State Transportation Office Building
5 Combat Zone
6 Theatre District

Exhibit 3
**Exhibit 4**

**Table Showing Chinese Immigrants Admitted, by Sex, 1960-1974**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>8,613</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8,995</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>12,311</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12,285</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>7,862</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8,572</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>10,001</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10,892</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8,586</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9,335</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>10,437</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11,293</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>9,537</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11,719</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>10,724</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11,961</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>11,179</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12,248</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Social, Economical & Political Objective

"To broaden community support of CEDC, to mobilize our community in political activities and to co-ordinate pursuit of community growth in order to maximize political leverage in dealing with public agencies, institutions and private developers that may affect the future of Chinatown and our community."

Development and land use policies are formulated generally through the political process of the local government and the planning body, i.e. the City of Boston and the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA). Therefore, CEDC's pursuit to influence public land use and development policies should follow strategies that would lead to a politically stronger and more unified community, and good working relationships with the city government, BRA and other key agencies. In the light of the above notion we shall discuss in more detail the directions with respect to achieving our social, economic and political objective in the following sections.
3.1 SPECIAL IMPACT AREA

3.1.1 Impacts on our community

The Chinese population in Boston is estimated to be close to 15,000 in 1979, which represents only about 2.0 percent of the city population. While the Chinatown population has grown a substantial 66 percent between 1960-70, Chinese population increased 608 percent in Allston-Brighton and 108 percent in Parker Hill-Fenway. The differential rates are projected to remain in this pattern in the future, though in a narrower margin of difference. The 1980 projection shows the Allston-Brighton and Parker Hill-Fenway Chinese population will catch up to 33 percent of the total, almost equivalent to the 38 percent concentration in Chinatown. With the main growth taking place in the Allston-Brighton and Parker Hill-Fenway areas, the population dispersion pattern will very likely change in the long run. Chinatown will probably represent a smaller and smaller percentage of the total Boston Chinese population in the future years to come.

---
1 Exhibit 5 on page 74
2 Exhibits 6 and 7 on pages 75, 76
However, not all the main growth areas, e.g., Allston-Brighton and Parker Hill-Fenway, are currently included in CEDC's Special Impact Area (SIA),\textsuperscript{1} which sets the geographic limits to CEDC's operational functions. Therefore, if our SIA boundary remains unadjusted, a greater and greater proportion of our community will be precluded from the catchment area of our organization. As it stands now, we are leaving out two thirds of the Chinese in Boston already.

Furthermore, due to the limitation of land and the commercializing tendency of the Chinatown core, it has become more and more difficult to pursue low income housing and other community facility developments in the Chinatown area. To include Allston-Brighton and Parker Hill-Fenway into our SIA will improve our abilities to deal with community growth needs on a wider area and population basis. We shall gain extra access to additional land resources, and to serve another 32 percent of the Boston Chinese community, who will then be more willing to participate and support us in dealing with community need issues. Therefore the SIA should include not only the downtown Chinese community but also the other two main growth areas, i.e., Allston-Brighton and Parker Hill-Fenway.

\textsuperscript{1} Exhibit 3 on page 77
3.1.2 Recommended Actions

The CEDC should seek the revision and extensions of the SIA. Further studies should be made on the main growth areas to identify:

1. The dispersion of Chinese population.
2. The geographic, physical and environmental characteristics around the Chinese communities in Allston-Brighton and Parker Hill-Fenway areas.
3. The demographic, social and economic profiles of the target population.

Based on this data, we would be able to delineate the extent of the proposed SIA expansion, so as to best cope with future community growth. Formal application for the change of SIA should then be processed, to obtain the approval from the Community Services Administration, stating the needs for such changes.
3.2 COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS AND DEVELOPMENT OF SUPPORT

3.2.1. Political Characteristics

The Little City Hall estimated in October, 1978 that over 50% of the residents in Chinatown are not eligible to vote. This neighborhood also has the lowest registered voter percentage in the whole city, probably in the region of 20%. While the number of Chinese voters in other neighborhoods are not known, it is believed to be rather small as well. The Hart Associates Inc. found out that Chinese are much less responsive to the U.S. political system than the average Americans in Boston. A city wide survey done in 1977 (between April 29 and May 27) on Boston residents, revealed that the percentage of Chinese registered voters is 35% and Chinese residents not registered for voting is 60%. In the same survey, the city averages are 64% and 35% respectively under the same categories. Thus, Chinese participation in politics is roughly one half less than the city average. This phenomenon might be accounted for a number of reasons:

1. Large number of new immigrants who are not eligible for voting.
2. Language barrier prevents most Chinese from taking an active part in mainstream-U.S. politics - Chinatown residents that aurally understand, speak, read and write English, irrespective of age, were found to be almost non-existent, according to a survey in 1975.¹

3. Old immigrants are locked in the non-voting status due to language barrier and reluctance to deal with the Immigration Services Department.

4. Unfamiliar with the U.S. political system and do not believe participation will change the situation.

5. Cultural differences - the attitude of minding one's own business within one's household or community.

6. Old mentality to return to China at old age - generally losing prevalence even among older Chinese in the recent years.

7. Long working hours, low income and family responsibilities discourage active political participation.

It is evident that as a small minority community, we are faced not only with the problem of political weakness due to the small number of voters, but also the problem of ineligibility and incapability to participate in politics by the majority mass.

¹ Exhibit 9 on page 78
3.2.2 Factions within our community

Our community is further fragmented due to great diversification of social backgrounds. Before mid 60's, socially we were more homogeneous and unified, because our community were predominantly southern Chinese coming from several counties (e.g. Toi San, Hoi Ping and San Wui) in the province of Kwang Tung. A much stronger common feeling was shared by most Chinese because they spoke similar dialects, observed similar customs, came from a common peasantry background and belonged to close-knit family structures. Differences between individuals or interest groups within the community were usually resolvable through the intervention of clan associations, family associations or the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, and the elders' opinions were generally respected throughout the community.

Since civil war broke out in China soon after World War II, many central, northern, as well as southern Chinese fled to Hong Kong and Taiwan and came to this country later, either as immigrants or refugees. With this new generation of immigrants, who were brought up in different social environments, either in cities or in the country, the characteristics of our community has become more complex and diversified than before.

In addition, several generations of American Chinese have been brought up in this country. In their minds, the old culture is somewhat blended with contemporary values and American ideals.
The traditional reliance on community elders to handle all neighborhood affairs are scrutinized in a wide scope of issues. The elders' competence and rights to represent the whole community have begun to be questioned. While the legitimacy of the old community organizations as neighborhood representatives is still recognized by some public and private institutions, many new community agencies have been set up to fill the gaps of social services unavailable before to the community.

The diversification of the social background of our community only form a back drop for further differentiation according to the socio-economic status of the individuals and their families. Those who came first, who have established or the well off belong to distinctly different social classes from those who came late, who have little education or the poor. Our community is therefore divided into multiples of fragments either along socio-economic division lines, cultural differences or political ideologies.

We are a small community which inherits the tremendous burden of great diversification originating from a vast and the most populous country in the world. However, we all know that community cohesion is necessary to develop sufficient political power in order to influence public policies in the American system. In order to resolve as much discrepancies as possible, certain sacrifices may be necessary in order to achieve compromises if not resolutions. Understanding, co-operation and unification within our community are keys to more effective dealings with outside political entities.
3.2.3 Development of community support

In the past we have maintained good relationships with many federal agencies which might be accountable for our modest success so far. However, on local level, we have suffered great political frustrations due to the small number of voters in our community and thus lack of political power. Time after time, we have been excluded from getting access to federal or state programs due to local political intervention. Examples are numerous: Tufts' success in holding on to large tracts of vacant lands in spite of the community's need for housing; exclusion of CEDC's housing project from the Urban Development Action Grant application; the voiding of City Council's order to appropriate $475,000 for CEDC housing development by the Mayor; and the prolonged delay in the construction of the China Gate although the materials have arrived for years. All these evidences indicate that we need to strengthen our political base, and we need to develop more support from the Community.

Faced with a situation of great diversification in our community whom we serve and hope to be supported by, CEDC is fortunate to have on the board as representatives from a wide spectrum of our community including many leaders from the traditional community organizations, experts in the business and technology sectors, intellectuals and professionals. But from experience, there are still two very difficult tasks for CEDC to fulfill before it can function as a community development corporation meaningfully:
(1) The generation of support and participation from the community especially the middle and basic strata. While the Chinese middle class provides instant political power and expertise resources, the basic community class participation is essential to build a firm and broad community base for meaningful community development.

(2) The coming to consensus of community priorities and to develop mutual understanding and co-operation with other community organizations and agencies which compete for funds and/or services targeted toward the same community.

Addressing these two issues, CEDC should devise strategies to strengthen the community support on two levels, i.e., on community level and on community agency level.

3.2.3.1. On Community Level

Through my involvement in the community, I have identified a hierarchy of social strata consisting of three layers:

1) A basic community of disadvantaged people and families comprising the great majority of our community;
2) A smaller community of middle class Chinese; and
3) An elite class consisting of a handful of professionals, intellectuals, and successful businessmen.
Since the behavioral characteristics are different, socially and politically among different groups of people, CEDC should address each group individually in whatever ways that are most responsive.

(A) The Basic Community

Characteristics

Although there are no statistical data to show the income of all Chinese families in Boston, it is strongly indicated by a BRA report in 1969\(^1\) that our basic community (presumably comprising the Chinatown population) are low income families. This is further reinforced by BRA's Chinatown/South Cove District's profile 1978, which shows that about half of all the families in Chinatown (38% of the Chinese population in Boston) receive less than $5,000 income a year while the city's median is $9,133.

Among other difficulties that the basic Chinese families have to face, there are at least three common major barriers blocking their way to integrating with the American society for upward mobility:

1) Language and cultural differences

It is believed that the adaptability of most new immigrants to the American society is poor, at least in the initial few years due to cultural shocks and language barrier for most of them.

\(^1\) Exhibit 10 page 79
A survey carried out in 1975\(^1\) showed that the Chinatown residents who could aurally understand, speak, read and write English were almost non-existent. The communication problem restrict their choice for work and home within the geographic boundary of Chinatown or within easy reach of this area by walking or public transportation. Although the recent acute housing shortages have caused many to settle outside Chinatown, yet Chinatown is still overwhelmingly preferred as a place to live among restaurant workers who make up to 77.3\(^2\) of the Chinese male work force. English is a great hurdle for most of them, especially among the older immigrants, to enter the mainstream of the American society. Those who cannot bridge the gap have remained as non-voting residents for their whole life.

2) **Deficiency in knowledge of the American society and indifference to politics**

Due to the drastic difference between their places of origin and America, most Chinese immigrants are unfamiliar with the social and political system of this country. Moreover, their language problem alienates them further from responding and reacting with the outside society, thus blocking their ways for entrance into the proper channel through which they could voice their needs and desires.

---

1. Exhibit 11 on page 80
2. Exhibit 12 on page 81
Besides, since they are either not eligible or do not vote, their political representation, if at all present, can only be reflected through various community agencies and community leaders.

3) **Low or mismatch of skills causing handicap on economic advancement**

A survey done in 1977\(^1\) shows that, the Chinese work force is predominantly engaged in low income operative jobs. While most men concentrate in restaurant related works, most women work as stitchers in garment factories. Since the hour rates are usually low,\(^2\) Chinese working class families make their ends meet by putting in long working hours (10-12 hours per day and six days a week). Low income, family responsibilities and long working hours drain the energy of the working class and discourage them from participating in community activities despite that their participation is essential for upward mobility. Poor families are thus locked into a self-perpetuating vicious cycle of low socio-economic status norm that they find it difficult to break through.

---
\(^1\) Lee, Man Leing, Master Thesis, Boston University, 1977
\(^2\) Exhibit 13 on page 82
Chinese families trapped in this low socio-economic stratum belong mostly to two categories, viz. recent immigrants and elder people.

(1) **Immigrants**

Chinatown is overwhelmingly inhabited by immigrants, recent and old.\(^1\) CEDC studies project that the Chinese population in Boston is increasing at the rate of about 300 per year since 1970.\(^2\) If all the Chinese in Metropolitan Boston are considered to be more representative of the local Chinese community, then the annual growth rate is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 450 to 500.\(^3\)

Since immigrants will continue to come to Boston, our political influence will also grow with the size of the community relative to the growth rate of the city (community growth rate at about 2.0% compared to a city-wide decline tendency), provided that the immigrants will eventually be naturalized to become citizens and they exercise their political rights. Recently, there are signs of encouraging changes in the characteristics of the recent immigrants:

---

\(^1\) Source: Chinatown Little City Hall, 1978  
\(^2\) Exhibit 5 on page 74  
\(^3\) CEDC and CACA estimation, 1979
First, America is no longer considered only as a transitional home, but as a place for permanent settlement. Therefore, most immigrants are making more serious efforts in adapting to and understanding the country to which they have migrated.

Second, the great majority of immigrants are teenagers and adults between 20 and 40 years of age. Therefore, there is a high possibility that they would adapt themselves to the new environment, social and political systems, given time and the appropriate guidance and assistance.

(2) Elderly

The Chinese elderly make up the remaining portion of non-voting residents in Chinatown. The majority of them have been in this country for many years. They either have no family or choose to live alone in Chinatown rather than with their families in the suburbs. Lack of English has prevented many of them from entering the mainstream of American society. Besides, ignorance of the system and reluctance to deal with the Immigration Services often keep them as non-voting residents for their whole life. It is estimated that 90% of the Chinese elders belong to this category.

1 Exhibit 14 on page 83
Being unable to communicate with the outside world, they are tied to the neighborhood. Chinatown is the only place they feel comfortable and can move relatively freely, and where the social and cultural environments are familiar to them. They rely vitally on the neighborhood both for psychological support, and the availability of various community services specially staffed and equipped to serve the Chinese elderly.

**Actions recommended**

With a view to developing a long term, firm and broadly based community support from the basic layer, CEDC should take the following actions:

(1) Step up on public relation programs to make CEDC, its functions and programs widely known among the Chinese and Boston communities and promote CEDC's image through the following media:

- Periodic publication of CEDC activities in Sam Pan, the bilingual community newspaper
- Frequent broadcasting in Chinese and English on TV and radio, especially on the Chinese wired broadcast which reaches many Chinese speaking families, restaurants and shops.
- Regular newsletter (at least monthly) mailed to all known Chinese establishments, families, student centers, colleges
and universities in Metropolitan Boston.

- Press release on important events, occasions and programs, such as CEDC open house, joint ventures, development projects, etc. at appropriate times.

- At least two times a year preferably during Chinese New Year and August Moon Festival, when Chinatown is most frequented by the Chinese community, to join the celebration programs, CEDC should issue an open house invitation for all community members, legislators, government officials, and private enterprise leaders.

(2) In coordination with other existing programs run by other community agencies, CEDC should strengthen social services programs along the lines of:

- Language capability training programs
- Skill improvement and economic advancement programs

- In the course of the above programs, convey the basic knowledge of the American society and political system, emphasizing the need to respond to register and vote and provide assistance for eligible residents to process natualization and registration.

(3) At all stages, CEDC should involve participants of social, occupational and language training programs to act also in the various CEDC sub-committees, standing committees and the board as a means to obtain community inputs and feed backs for future policy formulations and adjustments.
Through the various social services and job training programs, CEDC should maintain constant contacts with a broad base of the lower level of our community. It is hoped that, in the long run, once the beneficiaries of our programs become independent and established, they would continue to be interested and take part in community affairs. CEDC would then be able to build up a broad and active community basis, upon which our political position will become strengthened.

(4) As an immediate measure to reinforce the representation of our basic community on our board and various subcommittees, CEDC should consider the possibility of open or selected invitation, advertisement or other appropriate means to have the current vacancy filled.

(B) The Middle Class

The middle layer is made of a smaller number of middle class Chinese families. They are either American born Chinese or have been in this country sufficiently long to have gone through the process of adjustment and adaptation to the American society. Since they are more acculturated, language does not create a substantial communication problem for most of them.
In a study done by the Boston Chinese Community Health Services Inc. in 1974-75, 21.4% of the male and 22.8% of the female residents in Chinatown were found working in fields other than restaurant and garment factory works (the two principal occupations for the basic stratum).

While these female workers mostly engage in clerical work, male workers include professionals, technicians, small businessmen, clerical workers as well as craftsmen. This group make up the middle class layer in our community, however the exact percentage of the middle class Chinese in our community is not ascertainable.

Economically, they have stable incomes generally, and are ready for upward mobility. In fact most of them have, following the path of other ethnic races, moved out of the central city neighborhoods. They disperse widely in other Boston areas and the suburbs, most notably in Allston-Brighton and Brookline.

---

1 Exhibit 12 on page 81
Politically, (with the exception of a small number of young active members) they do not seem to be active in community affairs. However, most of the middle class Chinese maintain continuous ties with Chinatown and the community through:

1) Social relation with friends and relatives;

2) Making use of the retail facilities, supermarkets and restaurants in Chinatown, where they obtain their supply of Chinese food, groceries and other provisions.

3) Joining cultural activities, such as special occasions during the Chinese New Year and August Moon festival, and some of them sending their children to Chinese language classes in the Quong Kow School operated by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association.

They are generally conscious of both their and their children's cultural inheritance and identify themselves as part of the Chinese community no matter where they live.
Since most of them are citizens, they are the unaccounted and under-utilized political resources in our community that CEDC should draw upon. Besides, for those who have migrated to this country years ago and have established their footholds after going through the long process of adjustment, their experience will be most valuable to the new immigrants who are now undergoing a similar process. CEDC, therefore, should reach out to the middle class Chinese and promote their participation in community affairs as much as possible.

**Actions**

(1) The stepping up of public relation programs mentioned in the previous section is equally applicable to the middle class Chinese

(2) CEDC should introduce social services programs targetted towards the middle class or the potential middle class so as to encourage their taking part:

   a) Homeownership program for the first homebuyers
   b) Small business assistance programs, e.g., shop front improvement, SBA loan application technical assistance, home improvement program etc.
   c) Law enforcement and security programs
   d) 'Start a business', 'Tax exemption' or other seminars or dicussions which would interest middle class people.
(3) Strengthen cultural activities:

(a) Promote the establishment of a Chinese cultural center, a library of Chinese books, etc.

(b) Foster an image of Chinatown as a community by initiating and taking part in projects that would promote the cultural and social value, such as China Gate construction, banners along streets, social functions such as August Moon Festival, Chinese New Year, etc.

(c) Reach out to the young generations in Chinatown by organizing workshops, slide shows or film shows in elementary, and junior high schools especially in the neighborhoods where there is a concentration of Chinese residents.

(4) CEDC should also publicize its need for more community participation and openly extend invitation to all eligible members of our community to take part in our functions.

(C) The Elite

An elite class, consisting of a small number of well-to-do businessmen, professionals, and intellectuals tops the pyramid of social structure in our community. They are active in community affairs and many sit on the boards of various community agencies including CEDC. They are the status-quo community leaders in our community.
Qualitatively, they represent two distinctly different generations of American Chinese community leaders. The traditional leaders usually head the local clans association, family associations and the Chinese Merchants Association. They are mostly business leaders in restaurants, food, groceries and other traditionally Chinese businesses. Despite the fact that some of them may still have language problems and that their political activities are restricted mostly within our community, they have been in this country and probably in Boston as well for a very long time. And, through their long involvements in local and community affairs, they have become familiar with the local politicians and officials. On another front, traditional leaders usually maintain good relationships with the Nationalist Government of China in Taiwan. Although they are still thought to be the official spokesmen of the mainstream in our community and that their leadership recognized by the American society at large, their popularity among the Chinese is gradually being superseded by a new generation of well-educated and Americanized professionals, intellectuals and businessmen who have established firmly in the American society, mostly outside the community.

This new group of elite class, unlike their older counterparts, are well integrated into the American society and are active both politically and socially. Being more educated and sensitive to the outside world, their outlook is broader and untraditional, which sometimes would lead to opinion differences in a wide scope of issues from broad ideological aspects to community goals and priorities.
These differences would certainly involve a more pluralistic approach, however, occasionally there also exists obstacles in deriving community consensus, in which case, it does not seem to be in the interest of the general good of our community.

Actions

(1) Public relation programs is very important in making CEDC known and promoting the image of CEDC among the community, irrespective of social classes. This is the first essential step to generate community participation.

(2) Direct invitation should be made to established members of our community for their participation in CEDC's functions.

(3) The availability of time is the greatest handicap against active participation especially among the elite class people. Therefore, flexible and time-affective means of participation needs to be explored. Less time consuming participations, such as honorary advisers in certain fields of expertise, guest speakers on infrequent seminars, free consulting services on specified after-work hours, etc. may be plausible first steps to involving the established members of our community in more community activities.
3.2.3.2. **On Community Agency Level**

In a culturally and linguistically isolated ethnic community such as the Chinese community in Boston, the community organizations and agencies operating in the neighborhood play an unusually important role in delivering services, reflecting community needs and bridging the gap between the community and the various public authorities and institutions.

There are over twenty community associations, organizations and agencies in Chinatown, established for various purposes and engaged in different types of activities. Even among the major services to delivery agencies, the types of services, goals, priorities and development plans are all individually set. However, CEDC is one of the leading Chinese community agencies with a housing and land development component. Therefore, it seems appropriate for CEDC to take the principal role in co-ordinating the development plans of other community agencies operating in our neighborhood and to develop in conjunction with them a long term community development plan with a set of land use policies to the best interest of our community.

Generally speaking, there are three major types of community institutions in Chinatown:
(1) Traditional organizations such as family or clan associations;
(2) Religious organizations; and
(3) Social, health and community services agencies established to deliver certain specific services to the community.

(A) Traditional community organizations

Due to social and economic changes, improvements in service delivery systems and change in the demographic composition of our community, most family and clan associations which once served as quasijudicial and social services organizations, have lost their popularity. Their social service functions, on the other hand, have largely been taken over by banks, governmental institutions and other community service agencies established in the last 10 years. Although the umbrella head of all family and clan associations, the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (CCBA), is still recognized as the community spokesman by the outside world, their influence within the community has diminished significantly. The once powerful Chinese Merchants Association (CMA), which represents the business sector of our community has also declined in influence and power, following the social and economic changes on the passage of time. The traditional scope of CMA's functions has receded considerably except for a Chinese language class at the Association's Quong Kow School; even this program has been facing deep financial difficulties in recent years.
Nevertheless, the traditional organizations still represent the more conservative and established sector of our community. The CCBA through past involvements with the public authorities, was the bona-fide leading organization to speak for the community on development and land use issues:

(1) Under a 'Terms of Agreement' signed in 1963\(^1\) between BRA and CCBA, the latter's consent is necessary for any proposed developments on the southern part of the South Cove.

(2) CCBA has been named the developer of the old Quincy School to become a community building;\(^2\)

(3) CCBA is also the co-developer of the China Gate project\(^3\) on Beach Street with the city by supplying the building materials which came as a gift from the Chinese Nationalist Government in Taiwan.

As a community housing provider, CMA used to own over 20 buildings in and around Chinatown. After liquidating a greater part of its assets to ease the financial difficulty in the past few years, the Association still owns six properties in Chinatown.\(^4\) These are low rise, old brick houses mostly rented to Chinese families and businesses. Considering the current housing needs and development pressures, these old structures are not making the best use of the land they occupy to satisfy the market demands and community needs.

\(^{1}\) Appendix 1
\(^{2}\) & \(^{3}\) Exhibit 15 on page 84
With these assets still in hand, the support of its Chinese merchant members, and considerable credibility in the past, CMA has good potential to resume a leading position in community developments.

**Actions**

In the past, CEDC has maintained good relationships and has the support from both CMA and CCBA. The former is also a current member of the CEDC Board. This relationship should not only be maintained in the future, but CEDC should initiate and explore further opportunities to join venture with CMA in housing and land developments, pooling together the credibility and assets of CMA and the professional and technical expertise of CEDC Board, staff and consultants.

(B) **Religious organizations**

According to CEDC studies, the three traditional Chinese religions, viz. Taoism, Buddhism and Confusianism have declined in the United States, while Christianity is becoming more pronounced. It is estimated that less than 20% of Chinese living in CEDC's Special Impact Area are Protestants, while about 30% are Catholics. The decline of the traditional Chinese religions might be attributed to the lack of organization and places for worship. Immigrants who brought their Chinese religions to this country have to follow the traditional religious rituals only at home. On the other hand due to the various missionaries in China and this country, Protestantism and Catholicism are becoming more and more popular among Chinese communities.
A large proportion of Chinese church members are members of the young generation, predominantly students and professionals. Churches and other Christian organizations usually receive substantial support from the community and other outside sources. Those with a large number of Chinese participants include:

- Chinese Christian Church of New England
- Chinese Evangelical Church
- Chinese Bible Church of Greater Boston
- Holy Trinity Church
- St. James Church

Besides religious activities, there are also many social activities organized by these religious organizations for the community, e.g. language class, bazaar, Christmas parties for children, etc. To satisfy the community's religious and social needs, some religious organizations seek to expand their services in Chinatown. The Chinese Evangelical Church has just completed their new church, on Harrison Avenue, and half a block of old building in the South Cove area are earmarked by BRA for housing development by the Chinese Christian Church of New England.

---

1 Exhibit 15 on page 84
Actions

CEDC has seldom communicated with any religious organization in the neighborhood, therefore information regarding their needs and future plans are far from clear. Although it is not appropriate to utilize public funds for religious activities or developments, yet religious activities are an important part of community activities, and religious organization expansion has to be integrated with community growth. Therefore, the expansion efforts of all neighborhood religious organizations should be taken into consideration, so that community development could be more comprehensively and coordinately planned. CEDC should initiate and maintain communication with all these community religious bodies in our neighborhood by inviting them to be represented in our community activity sub-committees.

(C) Municipal, social, health and other community services agencies

Contrary to the decline of traditional community organizations, many community services agencies and organizations were established in Chinatown particularly in the 70s', delivering a wide range of social, health, employment, education and other services. The most active ones are:

Municipal services

Chinatown Little City Hall
Health and social services

South Cove Community Health Services, Inc.
Chinese American Civic Association
Quincy School Community Center
Greater South Cove Golden Age Center
South Cove YMCA

Business, employment, economic, manpower housing services

Chinese Economic Development Council
Chinese American Civic Association/Action for Boston Community Development Neighborhood Employment Center

The Chinatown Little City Hall

The Chinatown Little City Hall is an extension of the Office of Public Services, the City of Boston. The Manager of the Little City Hall is the Mayor's representative in the neighborhood and a key liaison person between the city government and the community. Although major decisions are usually made at higher levels, the manager has great influence in the decision making due to his familiarity with the community. Besides providing normal municipal services to Chinese residents, the Little City Hall also intervenes into community affairs and advocates for city policies. Support from the Little City Hall would generally indicate support from the city, and would facilitate bureaucratic proceedings on the local level.
Action

The Little City Hall manager is an advisory member on the CEDC board, and through his participation, CEDC has maintained close connections with the Little City Hall in the past on many major community issues. Although this existing relation should be maintained in future, CEDC should hold onto its own goals as a community developer whose interests are those of the community we claim to represent, which may not be in full accord with the city's interest under certain circumstances.

Health and Social Services

South Cove Health Center Inc.

The health center is the only community based primary care health services provided in the neighborhood offering the whole series of medical, dental, social, mental and health education services. It is also affiliated with the Tufts New England Medical Center through a 1974 agreement that Tufts will provide secondary and tertiary health care to the patients referred by the Health Center.

Since the Health Center is staffed to service Chinese-speaking patients, the catchment area extends well beyond Boston to distant suburbs. Nevertheless, the majority of the patients live in Chinatown, South Cove, Allston-Brighton and other Boston neighborhoods.
Although the facilities were planned to serve only about 25,000 visits per year, currently the center is taking care of over 40,000 visits annually, resulting in overworked staff and insufficient space (at present the total useable space is about 5,000 sq. ft.) and equipment. In view of the new concentration of the Chinese population in Allston-Brighton, the Health Center will plan any further expansions for health services in these neighborhoods rather than in Chinatown.¹

The center is controlled by a general board of 30 members (over 50% are consumers) and an executive committee of 11 members with over half of them residents in Chinatown and South Cove. The executive committee oversees the day to day operation and it is mainly represented by professionals, students, businessmen and working class people.

The main funding source have been the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Additional financial supports are also available from the State Department of Public Health and the Health and Hospital Department of the City of Boston. Evidently, there is no conflict with CEDC's usual source of funding for housing and land development.

¹ SOURCE: The Executive Director, South Cove Health Center; 1979.
In the past the Health Center has been concerned about a lack of community participation in major developments in our neighborhood. In their opinions, Tufts' expansion should be contained and our community should have a master plan for land use and development. However, the Health Center is also aware that they do not have the expertise in housing and land development. Their immediate concern seems to be CEDC's social services programs as they fear these programs might cause a certain degree of duplication of their programs and those run by other social service agencies, thereby jeopardizing future funding and expansion plans due to competitions within the community by CEDC.

The Chinese American Civic Association

The Association targets its services to the Chinese community especially non-English speaking residents. It is controlled by a board of 75 members, the majority are middle class and working class Chinese. About a third of the board members are Chinatown residents while the rest live in the suburbs.
The Association has a multi-service center, a neighborhood employment center, a publication section for the "SAMPAN" community newspaper, and a youth service section. It provides comprehensive social services and assistance to the community in interpretation, employment, immigration, housing, social security, welfare, and other essential matters. CACA is funded mainly by the State Department of Education and private foundations.

CACA is basically a social service agency. Other than their future spatial needs, there is no competition with CEDC in community housing and land developments. However, much concern has been expressed by CACA on our social service programs.¹

The Quincy Community School

This is a non-profit organization governed by a council of community residents who determine program policies and directions. The community school runs social, educational and recreational programs for both young and old community residents.

The community school is at the moment suffering from space shortages and fund limitation. Although they have access to many facilities in the new Quincy Community School Complex, e.g. swimming pool, gymnasium, classrooms, etc., no further space nor funds are available for future expansion of programs. As of now, it is estimated that the community school still needs an additional 6,000 sq. ft. to generate programs planned for the future.

¹ Source: Executive Director of CACA, 1979.
Other than social services programs, the Quincy Community School Council and staff are also active in promoting community participation in the decision making process of development and land use policies in our neighborhood. A Housing and Land Development Task Force has been recently organized mainly by QSCC group and the Chinese People's Progressive Association (a community organization which approves the policies of the People's Republic of China), acting as an ad hoc committee to promote a privately developed elderly housing project in the South Cove area and to oppose further expansion by Tufts New England Medical Center and University.

Represented mainly by younger generations of American Chinese, the QSCC has held an independent attitude in community matters, sometimes in open defiance to the conservative traditional community leaders. On social service programs issues, they are also concerned about CEDC's social service program. However, the Task Force welcome CEDC's participation in their endeavor to stop Tufts' expansion, and to promote the elderly housing project. While our Board and Housing and Land Development Sub-Committee are well represented by professionals, businessmen and the more conservative sector of our community, CEDC would certainly be strengthened politically by recognizing but not necessarily approving the views of the younger and emerging generations.
Golden Age Center

This agency provides elderly services in our community and is quickly gaining popularity especially among the old people. At present, it has about 800 elderly members (90% are Chinese) living in Chinatown and South Cove (30%), South End (30%), Allston-Brighton (30%) and other areas (10%).

Its services include an elderly drop-in center, hot lunch services, transportation, home maker, home health care and other social services for the old people.

It is a non-profit agency, run by a board of 15 members with over half of them elderly people. More than 50% of the board members live within the Chinatown and South Cove areas and the remaining members come from other parts of Boston and the suburban neighborhoods.

The agency is funded principally by Title XX State fund channelled through the Department of Elderly Affairs. CDBG is also used as local funds to match the Title XX money. Supplemental financing is obtainable from Title III federal Old Americans funds, CETA program and HUD.
The center is now at an advanced state of processing an application for 27 units congregate housing for the elderly in Chinatown, under Section 202 HUD housing program, which is distributed by the City of Boston. An old building has been purchased and earmarked for the project. At the moment the center estimates, about 30 more Chinese elders are coming to Boston annually and most of them need elderly services. Besides, the center is also planning to reach out further to the remaining Chinese elderly population (estimated at 1,600 in Boston) that might need help. With the additional facilities provided through this proposed elderly housing project, it is hoped to match the increasing demand in the near future.¹

The South Cove YMCA

The South Cove YMCA is affiliated with the Greater Boston YMCA. Financially, it is self-sufficient by running a parking lot and 20-unit transit housing for men at its temporary premises occupying one Urban Renewal parcel allocated by BRA. Financial aid is also available from the Greater Boston YMCA.

The South Cove YMCA offers spaces for limited indoor recreational activities under an inflated structure erected on their temporary site. Current programs are mainly educational and recreational organized mainly for the younger community members who maintain a close tie with this YMCA even after they move out from the neighborhood.

¹ Source: The Executive Director of Golden Age Center, 1979.
Spurred by the growing needs for recreational facilities by the Chinese and other Boston communities, YMCA is planning to expand its recreational and educational facilities in South Cove to a substantial scale (estimated expansion 60,000 sq.ft.) involving an investment of over $3 million in the near future. This proposal has the financial support from the Greater Boston YMCA and preliminary plans have been submitted to BRA proposing to use either the Urban Renewal R1 site or preferably, the combination of R3 and R3a sites. The development of this scale and the kinds of facilities proposed are aimed not only to serve the Chinatown and South Cove neighborhood but also to provide recreational and educational facilities to the other communities in Boston such as the working community in the office and retail areas. However, space will also be provided for the various human services agencies operated in Chinatown and South Cove. ¹

¹ Source: The Executive Director, South Cove YMCA, Feb., 1979.
There have been considerable concerns on CEDC's social services program expressed by other health, social and human service agencies in Chinatown. In order to make available to our community those services not currently provided by other agencies, CEDC is well justified to organize and deliver such services as soon as possible. However, in the long run since all community agencies including CEDC are serving the same community, it is only sensible, and in the interest of the community to have the services delivery system studied and programs co-ordinated so as to avoid duplication in some areas and yet deficient in others. Similarly, funding sources should also be co-ordinated and diversified in order to utilize all sources efficiently, and to tap the greatest amount available for our neighborhood by avoiding inter-agency competitions in any particular source. In this organized and rational way of settling differences, competing community agencies will hopefully become partners rather than rivals in community service delivery.

Furthermore, this harmonious relationship would be mutually advantageous to all agencies concerned and the community at large, because agencies will then be in a position willing to support other agencies. And, being more cohesive and unified, our community will stand a better chance to compete for public programs and funds with other communities.
CEDC has invited the South Cove Health Center, the Chinese American Civic Association and the Golden Age Center to send representatives to CEDC Board, and has started communication with the staffs of the Quincy School Community Council and the Chinatown Youth Essential Services, with a view to co-ordinate future social service program. Although there is still a long way ahead to achieve harmonious working relationships among all social and human services agencies operating in our neighborhood, yet these are meaningful moves to make towards the community.

Recommended Actions

(1) CEDC should continue its efforts in co-ordinating with other agencies in regard to the long term services delivery to Chinese communities, taking into account also the growth tendency in Chinatown, South Cove and other Boston neighborhoods. The long term perspective of creating a Chinatown/South Cove Social Services Cleaning Housing composed of the board and stiff members of major social and human services agencies in this area should also be explored as a major step towards community coalitions.

(2) CEDC should, if the needs were justified, support other agencies in their efforts to expand their community services (such as the recent proposal of a nursing home for the elderly by the Health Center group) and also seek their support in our endeavor in housing and land developments and other social programs.
(3) Since the spatial needs of community facilities for health and social services should be planned co-ordinately with housing and land developments so as to facilitate the use of such facilities by our community, CEDC should take into consideration the expansion plans and spatial needs of other agencies as an integral part of the overall community development plan.

(4) The Chinatown Housing and Land Development Task Force represents a younger sector of our community interested in the development and land use aspects of the neighborhood. As far as community development goals are concerned, the Task Force's immediate efforts to contain Tufts's expansion and promote more community housing are compatible with our own goals. As a community development corporation, it seems appropriate for CEDC to have their views represented in the Housing and Land Development Subcommittee, despite other ideological differences. To have the Task Force members working with CEDC and supported by our staff, they would be able to react more rationally and contribute more effectively towards future developments in our community. Furthermore, the existence of the Task Force is being recognized by the City, the City Council and BRA. To have them join forces with CEDC will enhance the political cohesiveness within the community and increase the bargaining power of our organization whenever political leverage has to be resorted to. Therefore, CEDC should invite the Task Force to our Housing and Land Development Subcommittee. And, CEDC should also take part in the Task Force's activities wherever compatible with our own goals.
(5) CEDC should take up the major role in co-ordinating and developing a community land use and development plan based on which community consensus could be formulated as future guidelines for developments in and around Chinatown.

3.3 Intervening Public Institutions

Development and Land Use Policies

The formulation of local development and land use policies are largely the responsibilities of three local public institutions, i.e. the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the City of Boston and the Zoning Board. In the existing system, the former two institutions take a much greater role than the Zoning Board which only reacts on the recommendations of the other two agencies.

The Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) designs, plans and make recommendations to the City of Boston and the Zoning Board on development and land use policies, the Mayor's Office and other city departments remain to be the executive body to implement such policies after they are adopted by the City council. Development projects, in particular public developments and large private projects, often have to go through a series of public hearings held by the City Council before each important decision is made. During the hearings the community would be given opportunity to voice their opinions regarding the proposed developments or land use changes. The City Council will then discuss and vote to reach a decision.
Development and land use policies are mostly formulated through this political process. To cause an effective impact on the policies, CEDC should gain access to the various key nodes along the decision making channel, either to intervene or to assist the relevant public institutions during the early stages of the policy formulation process. We shall discuss about these public institutions in the following sections.

3.3.1 The Boston Redevelopment Authority

The Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) is the local planning authority. It is also the agency empowered to administer the Urban Renewal program within the jurisdiction of the City of Boston. While the full structure and functions of BRA are beyond our concern, we need to be familiar with the part where BRA and its key personnel fit into the development and land use policy making system, the characteristics of BRA to function as a public institution so as to device appropriate strategies for CEDC, as a community development corporation, to intervene into the system.

The Boston Redevelopment Authority has earned a great reputation in the past as a professional entity advising the city on development and land use issues, and yet insulated from the political complications by establishing a separate BRA Board to control its various functions. However, the appointment system to the BRA Board (4 members appointed by the Mayor and 1 member by the Governor) lends the whole agency to very strong influence by the Mayor.
The last several BRA Directors, e.g. Robert Kenny, Robert Walsh were recommended by the Mayor and appointed by the BRA Board, then dismissed by the Board under strong pressures from the Mayor's Office, over disagreements on various development policies. Although BRA has lost some of its credibility as an independent professional entity lately, its support on community development is absolutely essential for any projects developed or planned by community agencies like CEDC.

The BRA Director

The Director is the head of the agency. Currently, this position is held by Robert Ryan, who has joined BRA only recently in September, 1978. Personally, the Director is responsible to the BRA Board, but professionally, he also acts as advisor to the Mayor on development and land use issues.

Traditionally, BRA Director's decision has been strongly based on the recommendations of his professional staff. Confrontations with the Mayor has happened not infrequently in the past, leading to a rather high turn over rate of the Directorship. However, the style of the current Director has yet remained to be recognized.
CEDC has been communicating with the past BRA Directors, to inform him of our positions on various community issues. On several occasions, we also had his support and commitments for assistance on community housing developments. Understanding and good relationship have been developed in the past. This tradition should be continued and extended to the new Director as early as possible. On all major development related policies or events, CEDC should directly seek the opinions and supports of the Director. Finally, his cognization and approval of our long term community development plan will be one of the best guarantees for future realization.

The Deputy Director of Community Development

The Deputy Director, Dick Garver has broad control on city wide community developments and other major development projects causing impacts on neighborhoods. Based on community needs, he recommends for individual community development proposals and coordinate public programs to facilitate such developments. He also assumes the general responsibility to administer the Urban Renewal Program in Boston. Through the UR Program, lands publicly acquired will be redistributed to developers at subsidized prices for various developments compatible with the intended land use in the neighborhood.
The South Cove Urban Renewal area has been the area where sharp conflict of interests exist between our community, trying to develop more housing, and Tuft NEMC, planning to expand medical and educational facilities. Being aware of the situation, a BRA team headed by Dick Garver has tried to mitigate and reconcile both parties with no apparent success so far, probably due to the lack of land resources in this neighborhood.

Taking this opportunity, CEDC should on one hand oppose to Tuft's further expansion, (the Chinatown Housing and Land Development Task Force has been involved for the same purpose since September, 1978) and on the other hand press BRA to recognize and alleviate the housing shortage problem of our community, if necessary by expanding into new turfs such as South End, Allston-Brighton or Parker Hill-Fenway. In this effort, the Deputy Director's support will be crucial to our success in pursuing community developments either in Chinatown/South Cove or in other neighborhoods desirable for community growth.
The Project Director administer the UR program in the South Cove area. He coordinates developments on UR sites and has been instrumental in selecting and designating developers on various UR parcels, e.g., the South Cove YMCA recreation site, Don Bosco Technical School expansion, Tai Tung resting area, etc. However, most of the UR parcels in South Cove have been earmarked for specific uses and in most cases developers have been designated. At the moment, only a few small parcels still remain unclaimed. Nevertheless, the dismanteling of the elevated Orange Line, expected in five years' time, will provide an extra 15,000 sq. ft. of usable land for community development, and certain designated developers e.g. Don Bosco Technical School, do not seem to have immediate plans to proceed with this development in the near future. In view of the urgent need for housing and the limitation of developable lands in South Cove, CEDC should keep a close surveillance of both the vacant UR parcels and their designated developers. Opportunities to join ventures may still exist and with the help of the Project Director, the original conditions to develop on UR parcels might be revised to accommodate a more intensive or mixed land use which has not been conceived previously.

1. Exhibit 16 on page 85
The Director of Downtown Development

The Director of Downtown Development, Joseph Ballandi coordinates the Lafayette Place Project in downtown Boston. Due to the immense size and proximity of this development to Chinatown, CEDC has been deeply concerned with the outcome of the Lafayette Place and its impacts on our neighborhood. On many occasions, we have expressed concerns, to federal, state and city agencies, on the environmental, traffic, community development and minority employment opportunity issues in connection with this project. Joseph Ballandi will be the liaison person between our community and the various public or private interest involved in this project.

The Community Planner

Alice Boelter has been the community planner of the Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood for several years. She is the key connection between our neighborhood and BRA. Apart from planning and preparation of all groundworks for higher decision, she also goes beyond the realm of BRA occasionally, acting as liaison person to channel community needs and desires to the relevant city, state or federal agencies. Being familiar with our neighborhood, she usually plays a significant role in the formulation of various policies concerning the developments in Chinatown and South Cove. Alice Boelter has been one of CEDC's main sources of information, resources and a medium to reflect community needs and opinions to the planning authority.
CEDC has maintained a close working relation with BRA, particularly with Alice Boelter in the past few years. Since our attention has been almost entirely focused on the Chinatown core, South Cove and the Leather District, with the South End very much neglected in the past, we have not had the opportunity to extend our association with other community planners. Recognizing the need to address community needs on a wider area, it is appropriate for CEDC to maintain the existing working relationship with Alice Boelter on one hand, but also to extend similar relationships with the community planners of other neighborhoods that we contemplate to expand our operation, such as South End, Allston-Brighton and Parker Hill-Fenway.

Development Planning and Zoning Planner

Mace Wenninger deals with land use planning, and recommends for approval or denial of land use variance by Zoning Board. Since the Zoning Board does not have planners on staff, BRA's recommendation has become rather decisive in the final rulings. Chinatown's core is currently zoned for light manufacturing, therefore other developments such as residential or commercial have to clear zoning restrictions. However, the need to apply for zoning variance is not expected to cause unsurmountable problems because BRA also recognizes the severe housing shortage in Chinatown and South Cove.
**Actions**

1. CEDC should immediately approach the new BRA Director to familiarize him with our organization, goals, and functions, and seek his support to our community development efforts.

2. CEDC should urge the Deputy Director of Community Development to provide whatever assistance to alleviate the housing and land shortage in the Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood and convince him on our needs to expand to other neighborhoods in order to cope with future community growth.

3. CEDC should keep in close touch with the South Cove Urban Renewal Project Director in regard to the possibilities of packaging UR lands in South Cove, to join venture with either private owners or designated developers of UR parcels, and seek his support for such endeavors.

4. CEDC should continue to maintain the ongoing working relation with Alice Boelter, the Chinatown/South Cove planner, and to extend further association with planners of other neighborhoods that we intend to move in, which include South and Parker Hill-Fenway (Bill Marrota) and Allston-Brighton (David Triech).
5. CEDC should frequently contact Joseph Ballandi to keep him informed of the latest developments of the Lafayette Place project, so as to plan for community commercial development in Chinatown's core. At appropriate times, CEDC should also follow up and press BRA and the city to live up to the commitments made in return for our support of the Lafayette Place development.

3.3.2 The Boston City Government

The Boston city government plays a very influential role in land use policies. Although the full structure of the Boston City government is beyond the scope of this report, yet we shall look specifically at certain key figures within the city government dealing with development and land use matters that need to focus our attention upon.

The role of the city has been exceptionally strong in the recent years due to the long incumbence, deeply rooted and extensive power that Mayor Keven White has established over the years, in a succession of three terms. Furthermore, the appointment systems to the BRA Board and Zoning Board have intrinsically open up avenues for the Mayor to extend his power beyond the city hall to these two supposedly independent bodies. Therefore, the Mayor's own view and policy is a very influential factor in our community development prospects.
A. The Mayor

Mayor Kevin White is an exceptionally strong mayor. He has close control over the city government and influences strongly the decisions made by BRA and the Zoning Board. He has been an advocate for urban growth and development. His approach to urban growth and development has been forceful and politically sensitive. While boosting growth, he has employed federal patronage resources such as OEO, Model Cities and job programs to sustain minority support and allowed to a certain extent, 'community control' over these federal resources.

Handicapped by our small number of voters, CEDC has been counting on credibility, cooperation and good working relationship, rather than political leverage when dealing with the city. Evidently, when our interest comes into conflict with the City's we have not been able to stand the political pressure. The way in which our original effort to oppose Lafayette Place project for its insensitivity to community needs waned in the last moment before a public hearing held by the city council on October 10, 1978, was a perfect example of our political weakness.

I. Source: "The Postwar Politics of Urban Development" by John H. Mollenkopf
With a pro-growth city policy and immense pressures pushing for developments around Chinatown, CEDC should carefully analyze the consequential impacts of every major development project and to voice objection to those undesirable ones. As far as possible, we should also utilize our support to the desirable developments as political leverage to win more support from the city government in pursuit of our community development goals.

B. Mayor's Office of Housing

This office is headed by Andrew Ohlins, the Mayor's chief advisor on housing and development policies. CEDC has mainly been dealing with him in matters related to community developments. Conforming to the Mayor's policies, he supports most major urban developments and tends to be politically sensitive when dealing with communities. Holding this office, his opinion is crucial to the distribution of City and federal funds targeted towards various communities around the city.

3.3.3 The Boston City Council

While the Mayor is the chief executive of the municipal government, the city is governed by a City Council consisting of nine elected council members. Since all major development projects and their related public expenditures have to be approved by the Council it actually has an overriding power over most developments.
On August 10, 1978, for the first time the City Council's Committee on Housing and Neighborhood Development held a public hearing in Chinatown in response to the community's concerns and gripes with respect to the lack of local involvement in the development policy decision making process. This meeting was attended by many community members and most of the community agencies in Chinatown and South Cove. Formal communication is expected to continue in the future, informal and frequent exchange of views between City Councillors and community agencies like CEDC will also be needed to keep the Councillors aware of the community situation, needs and desires.

Traditionally, some city councillors (notably Raymond Flynn, the Chairperson of the Committee on Housing and Neighborhood Development) have been more sympathetic towards our community and have shown willingness even to confront the administration, as in the case of Lafayette Place project. To a small community which cannot deliver too many votes, such an alliance is uncommon and invaluable. It will strengthen our position when dealing with the city.

However, extreme caution has to be used when getting involved in high order political interplay. CEDC should try to avoid, as much as possible, being caught in the power struggle between the Mayor and the City Council, whereby other on-going programs in Chinatown and our future working relationship with the city might be jeopardized.
Exhibit 5

**Increasing Chinese Population in Massachusetts and Boston, 1848-1977**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6,745</td>
<td>5,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>14,102</td>
<td>12,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>15,656</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>16,320*</td>
<td>14,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>15,650*</td>
<td>14,300**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>16,980*</td>
<td>14,600**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMARKS:** NA means Not Available

* Figure is projected from the 1975 population based on an annual increase of 330 Chinese approximately.

** Figure is projected from the 1970 population based on an annual increase of 300 Chinese approximately.


#### A: Chinese Residence Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allston-Brighton</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Hill-Fenway</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxbury-North Dorchester</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown (South Cove/South End (SIA))</td>
<td>2503</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>5700</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parts of the city (includes 8 neighborhoods)</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>4360</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>4480</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5266</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>14140</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B: Growth Rates of Chinese Population in Key Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allston-Brighton</td>
<td>608%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Hill-Fenway</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxbury-North Dorchester</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parts of the city (includes 8 neighborhoods)</td>
<td>250%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>128%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:**
2. Planning and Evaluation Department, ABCD, 1970
3. CEDC Venture Development Staff, January 1978
1 CHINATOWN  
2 SOUTH COVE  
3 SOUTH END  
4 FENWAY  
5 PARKER HILL  
6 ALLSTON  
7 BRIGHTON  

Population:  
CHINATOWN: 5,700 (38%)  
SOUTH COVE: 1,850 (12%)  
SOUTH END: 2,970 (20%)  
FENWAY:  
PARKER HILL:  
ALLSTON:  
BRIGHTON:  

PROJECTED 1980 CHINESE POPULATION DISPERSION IN BOSTON
High concentration of Chinese households

SPECIAL IMPACT AREA OF C.E.D.C.

Exhibit 8
### Extent of English Language Problems Among Boston Chinatown Residents by Age (1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Percent Chinatown Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 18-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurally understand, speak read and</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write English</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least fairly fluently</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit 10**

**Extent of English Language Problems**
Among Boston Chinatown Residents by Sex (1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Percent Chinatown Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurally understand, speak, read English</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least fairly fluently</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little or more</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write English at least fairly fluently</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little or more</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Health Care Accessibility for Boston's Chinese Community Final Report to the Mass. Board of Higher Education contract no. 73-147-010 and no. 74-147-006, Tufts University Department of Sociology and other Affiliates and the Boston Chinese Community Health Services, Inc., December, 1975
Exhibit 11

Chinatown and Anti-Poverty Target Areas Ranked by Proportion of Low-Income Families, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Families Earning Less Than $3,000</th>
<th>Families Earning Less Than $6,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Plain and Parker Hill-Fenway</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxbury-N. Dorchester</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINATOWN</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlestown and South Boston</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allston-Brighton</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Boston and North End</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Point</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. = data not available

SOURCE: BRA, Diagnostic Report, and adjusted data from ABCD, CAP 5 Community Information.
### Exhibit 12

#### Job Structure of Low and Moderate Income

**A: Job Structure of Low and Moderate Income Chinese in Boston (1977)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th># Employees</th>
<th>% by Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garment Industry</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Retailing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:**
1. Dun & Bradstreet Market Identifiers 9/22/77.
3. GEDC Venture Development Team estimates

**B: Job Structure of Low and Moderate Income Boston Chinatown Resident by Sex (1974)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Related Occupations(^1)</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stitcher</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Includes waiters, cooks, bartenders, restaurant cashiers, dishwasher and restaurant helpers.

**SOURCE:**
Exhibit 13

Wages of Laborers in the Three Major Chinatown Industries (1977)

Restaurant Industry:
- cashiers $400 per mo. = $1.70 per hr.
- waiters $500 per mo. = $2.10 per hr.
- busboys $400 per mo. = $1.70 per hr.
- head chef $800 per mo. = $3.30 per hr.
- dishwashers $400 per mo. = $1.70 per hr.

Restaurant-related Industry:
- shopkeepers, laborers, bakers, other semi-skilled labor $400-600 per mo. = 2.50 per hr.

Garment Industry:
- stitchers $100-200 per wk. = 4.50 per hr. (for a 45 hr. wk.)

Electronic Industry:
- assemblers $2.75-
  $120 per wk. = 3.00 per hr.

### Exhibit 14

**Age of Chinese Immigrants**

**1969 & 1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>3,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>4,334</td>
<td>7,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>2,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>20,924</td>
<td>23,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Annual Report, 1969 and 1976
SOUTH COVE URBAN RENEWAL PARCELS

Undesignated parcels:
- R1 19,335 sq.ft.
- R3 67,800 sq.ft.
- R3a 31,300 sq.ft.
- R7 13,484 sq.ft.
- C2 5,000 sq.ft.
- C4 24,000 sq.ft.

Designated parcels:
- C1 (Stanley Chen) 16,500 sq.ft.
- C8 (Stanley Chen) 28,531 sq.ft.
- P5 (Tufts) 9,000 sq.ft.
- P7 (Tufts) 27,700 sq.ft.
- P4a (Don Bosco) 4,630 sq.ft.
- P12 (Don Bosco) 66,400 sq.ft.
4.0 Housing Development Objective

"To encourage housing developments in Chinatown South Cove, South End and other neighborhoods desirable for community growth, so as to:

(1) increase the supply of subsidized and non-subsidized housing for both elderly people and families;

(2) to stabilize the rent and improve the housing stock occupied by Chinese households; and

(3) to promote home ownership by Chinese families."

With a rapidly increasing Chinese population, the successive shrinking of Chinatown and the commercializing tendency of the core area around Beach Street, the housing problem of our community has become phenomenal in recent years. Today, vacancy rate in Chinatown is almost non-existent, and one will be considered extremely lucky to be able to rent a room for $250.00 per month in this area.

To satisfy the housing needs of our community is certainly one of the top priority objectives of CEDC. In the following sections, we shall first examine the needs and the resources for housing development. Then, we shall further discuss the strategies to meet the needs with the resources.
4.1 POPULATION

The rapid increase in demand for housing stems from the rapid growth of Chinese population in Boston. In 1960, the total number of Chinese living in Boston was just over 5,500, but projection shows that the 1980 figure will almost reach 15,000.\(^1\) This represents an increase of 173% over a 20 years period of time. Possible sources of such an increase could be:

(1) Natural increase;
(2) Migration from other parts of the U.S.; and
(3) Immigrants (legal and illegal)

Of these, the third seems to be the major factor.

4.1.1 Natural Increase

According to Vital Statistics 1960-66\(^2\) there has been no natural increase in the Chinatown population. In fact, if there were no increase from other sources, the population should have decreased during this period due to a much higher death rate (36.4 per 1,000) than birth rate (17.4 per 1,000). The unusually high death rate in Chinatown is probably due to the high concentration of elderly residents in the community.

---

\(^1\) Exhibit 6 on page 75

\(^2\) Exhibit 17 on page 183
In recent years, it is estimated that the birth rate might have gone up slightly, resulting from the change in immigration laws which favor the forming of more Chinese families. However, the pattern of natural decrease rather than increase still prevails. Furthermore, the net difference is too small to be significant when compared to the other categories.

4.1.2 In-Migration from other parts of the U.S.

The number of in-migrating Chinese from other parts of the U.S. to Boston is very difficult to estimate. However, our community has experienced considerable influx of Chinese from other regions in recent years. Among the new comers about whom we are most concerned are those who belong to the basic community and generally have problems of integrating with American society. They generally fall into two groups.

The first group is the overspill population from the saturated Chinatowns in other parts of this country. They are not much different from the basic Chinese community in Boston, but their migration to this area has inflated the local Chinese population and increased the local demand for housing.
The second group consists mostly of recent immigrants who are sponsored by their relatives in the outlying regions around Boston and other parts of the Commonwealth. In recent years, the number of Chinese immigrants destined to Massachusetts has risen rather sharply. This might be partly due to the moving out from the city of more established Chinese families who sponsor their relatives to come to this country. Nevertheless, despite their initial settlement outside Boston, many immigrants will eventually have to look for jobs and new homes. For those who have language and cultural barriers, they will naturally be attracted to major Chinese settlements such as Chinatown, South Cove, South End or Allston-Brighton and ultimately be settled within the city.

Although there is no official statistical data to show the number of Chinese in-migrants from other parts of this country to Boston, both CACA and CEDC have come to a similar estimation of 150 to 200 people annually.

4.1.3 Immigrants from Overseas

Oversea immigrants, by far, are the biggest source of population growth in our community. The U.S. Immigration Services statistical data on Chinese immigrants to Boston are, unfortunately rather

---

1 Exhibit 19 on page 185
fragmented and incomplete for our purpose. According to official record, the annual number of immigrants destined to Boston from China and Taiwan has been staying slightly above 200 in the past several years. However, the figure of immigrants from Hong Kong has not been listed until 1976, when 115 more Chinese came from Hong Kong to Massachusetts including 75 to Boston.  

In the last few years, there has been a third source of Chinese immigrants who came to this country as refugees of the Vietnam war. Many of them were middle class businessmen who had long been settled in South-East Asia, some even for generations. As South Vietnam fell into the hands of the communist regime in 1975, they escaped from their country to the U.S. together with other Vietnamese refugees. The number who came to Boston, however, cannot be identified.

Finally, the Boston Port opens possibilities for Chinese crewmen to desert their ships. Illegal immigrants usually take refuge inside our community. While it is difficult to estimate how many came to Boston illegally, the official record has shown a significant decrease nation wide in recent years due to more stringent port control.

---

1 Exhibit 18 on page 184
2 Exhibit 19 on page 185
According to CEDC study, it is estimated that the annual number of Chinese immigrants (to Boston) is about 300. In the absence of other more authoritative figures, this estimation is being used as the base for our study of housing needs.

4.1.4 Out-migration

The BRA study on South Cove Urban Renewal Project in 1967 showed the transient nature of Chinatown. The majority of the residents tend to stay for less than 10 years.\(^1\) With comparatively larger family sizes and the adult children usually living at home, (74% of Chinese families have children compared to 37% in white families),\(^2\) after they have established a foothold in the society, for several years. Chinese families can usually build up sufficient savings in time to move out to a better neighborhood. Some of the more desirable neighborhoods for outward settlement include South End, Allston-Brighton, Brookline and other outlying suburban areas. CEDC study estimates that in 1977, about 150 Chinese resettled outside Boston.

Summing up, there has been a constant increase in the Chinese population in Boston, mostly due to immigration from overseas. This trend will continue in the near future provided there will be no drastic change in the immigration laws. After accounting

\(^1\) Exhibit 20 on page 186

\(^2\) Exhibit 21 on page 187
for the emigration of about 150 people from the city annually, the net growth of the Chinese community in Boston is at about 300 to 350 per year.
4.2 OVERCROWDING

Overcrowding is a typical symptom of a housing shortage. In the Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood, overcrowding has become one of the most serious problems. BRA estimated in 1978\(^1\) that 78 percent of the housing units within Chinatown are overcrowded compared to a city wide figure of only 8 percent. These statistical figures indicated that there has been little improvements since 1970.\(^2\) Located within the same neighborhood, South Cove would be in a similar situation. Assuming that there is no overcrowding in all public assisted housing projects in Chinatown and South Cove, there are still 260 overcrowded privately owned housing units existing in the neighborhood.\(^3\)

To find out the situation in the South End, CEDC staff carried out a housing survey in March, 1979 of 65 Chinese households living in that area. 80 percent overcrowding was detected among the respondents. With about 404 Chinese occupied housing units in the South End, the number of overcrowding households would be 323. This will bring to a total of 583 overcrowded Chinese occupied housing units within our Special Impact area.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Source: Chinatown/South Cove District Profile, 1978, BRA

\(^2\) Exhibit 22 on page 188

\(^3\) Exhibit 23 on page 189
From the result of the above housing survey, we also found that in order to bring the housing condition of Chinese occupied households to standard (i.e. 1 person per room) we shall need an extra 950 rooms to rehouse the same number of people in new or rehabilitated housing units.

On the city wide level, however, the 1970 Census reported an average size of Chinese occupied unit to be 3.7 rooms, while the average number of persons per household (Chinese) is only 3.4. Therefore, the overcrowding phenomenon does not seem to spread outside the Chinatown/South Cove and South End neighborhoods. This is probably due to the higher concentration of elderly and single residents who overcrowd the housing units by renting the space on room basis.
4.3 **HOUSEHOLD SIZES**

Both a BRA study in 1967\(^1\) and the 1970\(^2\) Census have shown that there are many more Chinese households with four and more members but less households with one to two persons than the city average. Nevertheless, the highest concentration seems to be found in households with one to two persons, three to five persons and six or more persons, decending in this order and roughly distributed in the ratio of 40%, 40% and 20%.

A joint study conducted in 1974-75 by the Boston Chinese Community Health Services, Inc. and Tufts University's Department of Sociology concurred with this pattern of distribution. In addition, it was found that while the proportion of one person households has remained unchanged at 29%, large households with six or more persons have decreased substantially to 12%. This indicates that the traditionally large family concept among Chinese people has somewhat changed. Furthermore, the strongest growth was found to take place among the medium (four to five persons) and smaller households (two to three persons), which represented 40% and 19% of all the Chinese households in Boston. The average

---

1\(^\) Exhibit 24 on page 190
2\(^\) Exhibit 25 on page 191
size of Chinese households is 3.4 persons, compared to 3.0 persons for the city as a whole. Thus, Chinese residents have begun to live a conventionally smaller family life in the American society, although the average size is still slightly bigger than the city average.
Traditionally, Chinese people live in certain specific areas in Boston. The earliest settlement took place around 1870. By 1880, the area around Oxford Street has become a well defined although small Chinese community. Since then our community has continued to survive and grow. Despite a succession of external encroachments, suppressions and displacements, Chinese people still remain in most parts of Chinatown and South Cove.

The spinning off to other areas was not the intention of most Chinese residents. However, the construction of the Southeast Expressway (in the 1950's) and the Massachusetts Turnpike (in the 1960's) displaced many Chinese families who found their new homes mostly in the South End which, although separated by the highways, is still close to their original neighborhood. In 1965, the South Cove Urban Renewal Project was initiated with an intention to accommodate the expansion needs of Tufts New England Medical Center and to replace the dilapidated tenement houses in the South Cove. As a result, mass demolition and displacement of Chinese families took place. With few relocation opportunities in Chinatown/South Cove, many of those displaced, reluctantly moved to South End, Mission Hill, Fenway, Allston-Brighton and other neighborhoods.
The private housing stock in Chinatown and South Cove was handed down to us after a succession of immigrant occupations. The neighborhood began to be developed in 1830 primarily for middle class American residents. However, the development of railroads, leather and garment industries and later the elevated subway line in the later part of the 19th century caused rapid decline to the neighborhood which was then taken over by successive waves of immigrants - Irish, Italian, Jewish, Syrian and finally Chinese. Prolonged intensive use of the buildings with inadequate maintenance and disinvestment caused extensively deteriorated conditions. In 1969, BRA estimated 72% of the houses are deteriorated or dilapidated, compared to the city wide figure of 14%. During the past 10 years, there has been no major rehabilitation efforts in these areas except about 15 Chinese Merchant Association housing units on Oxford Street.

There have been no official statistical data to show the conditions of Chinese occupied housing in South Cove, South End, Allston-Brighton or other Boston neighborhoods. However, it was estimated by CEDC in 1977 that the condition of the Chinese occupied housing in South Cove and South End areas are similar to those in Chinatown. Therefore, other than the 664 housing units provided by the four public assisted housing projects, the great majority (620 out of 736) of the privately owned housing units in Chinatown, South Cove and the Chinese
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1  Exhibit 22 on page 188
2  Exhibit 23 on page 189
occupied housing in South End would need some improvements in order to meet the standard.
4.5 HOUSING NEEDS

That our community has a great need for housing is indisputable. Yet, housing development has to be planned and accomplished in ways sensitive to community needs in terms of location, quantity, sizes, and finance. These are the criteria that our community housing development policies have to follow and relevant parameters be laid down for implementation.

4.5.1 Location

A survey was conducted by CEDC in January, 1979 on over 100 restaurant workers who either work in Chinatown or have to come to Chinatown for transportation provided by employers to go to work in the outlying suburban areas. Among the 72 respondents (almost all of whom have poor understanding of English) half are Chinatown or South Cove residents. Despite the congestion, high rents, poor environment and other negative factors, it is not surprising to find that the majority (62%) still prefer to live in Chinatown rather than any other neighborhoods, largely due to the following reasons:

(1) cultural coherence;

---

1 Exhibit 26 on page 192
(2) absence of language barrier;
(3) convenient to everyday life necessities; and
(4) transportation facilities

The preference for other neighborhoods runs in the order of Allston-Brighton, South End and other areas in Boston. With respect to living away from Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood, they were mostly concerned about the convenience and the costs of transportation to go to work, to shop, etc., since many do not possess private means of transportation. Most of them realize that Allston-Brighton is a neighborhood with better living environment; however, this would appeal only to those who have been in Boston for a longer period of time and those who have no problem in arranging for their own transportation. For housing development outside Chinatown, South Cove, transportation appears to be one of the major considerations. There is also general negative feeling among the respondents about South End due to its mixed racial characteristics and the rising crime rates around many Chinese settlements.

4.5.2 Quantity and mix of sizes

Due to dilapidation and deterioration, 620 housing units in Chinatown, South Cove and South End would need immediate physical
improvements. More new or rehabilitated housing units are also needed to rehouse the 950 people within our SIA due to overcrowding in the existing private stock. In-migration and immigrants from overseas add another 350 Chinese to the housing market in Chinese neighborhoods annually. After discounting for the small decrease in Chinese population due to natural causes, the current (1979) overall need for housing is still substantial - 1,300 people. Using the distribution of Chinese household sizes derived in Para. 4.3 as guidance, this housing need will be translated into about 450 housing units of various sizes with an additional need of 100 more annually. Demands are most poorly met in four to five room units and two to three room units. This pattern of supply and demand is also confirmed by comparing the existing number of housing units provided by the four housing projects in Chinatown and South Cove with the number of applications for the various sizes of units.

4.5.3 Housing expenses

With the median family income staying practically unchanged since
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1 Exhibit 23 on page 189
2 Exhibit 27 on page 193
3 Exhibit 28 on page 194
1969, at $5,100\textsuperscript{1} (compared to city wide median rising from $7,543 to $9,133 during the same period), the house owning capability of our community has been very poor. The Chinatown/South Cove community has perhaps the lowest owner-occupant rate among Boston neighborhoods. The Mayor's office of Housing estimated in 1978 that in Chinatown only 5\%\textsuperscript{2} of the housing units are owner-occupied.

Ironically, most of the properties in the same area are Chinese-owned, indicating that many original owner-occupants have moved out to better neighborhoods in recent years. While the owner-occupant rate is only 14\%\textsuperscript{3} among South End Chinese occupied housing, owner-occupants are almost entirely absent (1\%)\textsuperscript{3} in South Cove, probably due to the mass removal of privately owned houses by the Surface Artery, the Turnpike, the Urban Renewal Program, and the subsequent partial replacement by three public assisted housing estates in this area - Tai Tung Village, Mass Pike Tower and Quincy Tower.

(A) House renting
Renting by far, is still the most common way for the basic community to obtain housing services. The limited mobility of a

\textsuperscript{1} Exhibit 20 on page 186
\textsuperscript{2} Source: Neighborhood Strategy Area Proposal, Mayor's Office of Housing, 1978
\textsuperscript{3} Source: CEDC Housing & Land Development Staff survey, 1978 (R.L. Polk & Co. Street Directory)
rapidealy increasing population and acute housing shortage has pushed the rent level to surprisingly high levels in recent years and caused many housing units in Chinatown to be subdivided into rooms for rent to individual families. Although the general practice by most absentee owners in Chinatown to disinvest in their properties still continues, in certain cases, the current rent for one room has risen to $200\textsuperscript{1} or even higher, which is equivalent to almost half of the annual medium income of Chinatown families. Other than the Chinese Merchants Association-owned housing units, which are still low in rent ($200-250 per month per housing unit), and a small number of long time tenants, the cost of housing in Chinatown has risen sharply. The low income families adjust to this situation by either moving to a more distant neighborhood (which entails higher transportation costs) or by cutting down the rental space creating serious overcrowding problems and intensifying the wear and tear of the buildings.

Although many Chinese families are skeptical about living in the South End, the rent level there has been more reasonable. In order to accommodate the poorer families, renting out by rooms instead of whole dwelling units is also in practice. The normal charge is in the region of $50 per month per room.\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1} Source: CEDC Housing & Land Development staff, January, 1979.
According to a study by the Boston Community School in 1977\textsuperscript{1} for a family of four earning $7,000 or less, any amount spent in housing is more than they can afford. With a median family income of $5,100, our basic community is facing a grave housing problem. To ease the housing demand pressure for our basic community, large quantities of low and moderate income housing are required to supplement the private market and to subsidize the rents of such new or rehabilitated housing, which can hardly be afforded by most of our basic community households.

(B) \textit{House buying}

House buying has been a dream of every American family and it also applies to Chinese Americans. It has been estimated by CEDC that there are 150 Chinese moving out of Boston annually. Presumably a large proportion of them will buy their own homes in the suburbs. With the enormous inflation rate and utility costs recently, this dream will become more and more difficult to realize in the future, especially for the first home buyers.

Those who first qualify to buy their own homes would probably have reached or surpassed the city's median family income of $9,133 per year. If this is used as a basis of calculation,

\textsuperscript{1} Exhibit 30 on page 196
a rule of thumb will indicate that a median income family can only afford a house costing about $20,000 which can scarcely be found in a new home market where the median price has already exceeded $40,000 in 1978. Unless innovative ways to finance their own homes are discovered, moderate income Chinese families, just as their American counterparts, would have to save more money and wait a few more years.

The abundance of two and three family houses in South End, Allston-Brighton, and Fenway offer the unique opportunity for the owner to find extra financial support by renting out the extra units. For an annual income of $10,000, a family can comfortably afford a total annual housing expense (including debt services, utility, tax and maintenance) of $8,000 if two extra housing units could be rented out for $250 per month, i.e. to finance a three family house costing about $50,000 to $60,000.

To help the moderate and middle income families in our community to own their own homes, we need to gain access to or to develop our own financial resources to facilitate
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1 Source: The Nation's Housing, Joint Center of Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard University, 1975 by B. Frieden and A. Solomon

2 Exhibit 31 on page 197
home ownership schemes. Furthermore, with the aid of a community rental housing referral agency, perhaps acting also as guarantor of rental income for the mortgages, conventional thrift institutions would be more willing to finance marginal home buyers in our community.
4.6 OTHER HOUSING NEED FACTORS

As mentioned in para 4.5 there is an immediate need for about 450 housing units of various sizes to house about 1,300 people in Chinatown, South Cove and South End due to overcrowding and poor housing conditions. It is anticipated that in the foreseeable future there will be a steady inflow of Chinese into Boston area and after discounting for out-migration, the net annual increase would still stand around 350. This figure, however has not taken into account of two other factors which are more difficult to assess, but not the least unimportant:

1) The expected reduction in Chinese family sizes:

It has been shown in para 4.3 that the traditional big family concept have been slowly given up by the Chinese. Hypothetically speaking, if the average Chinese family size of 3.4 as reported by the 1970 census would be reduced to 3.0, an estimated population of 15,000 by 1980 would need another 600 housing units. More reliable data however, will not be available until the 1980 census is completed.
The loss of housing units now occupied by Chinese households:

Over 1,200 housing units have been lost in the Chinatown/South Cove Neighborhood since the 1950's. Since many of the Chinese occupied housing units are old and not well maintained, the loss rate due to redevelopment, fire, demolition will become a significant factor. Using the 1970 census Component of Housing Inventory Changes, the rate of housing loss is almost 15% in Boston city. The total number of housing units in Census Tract 701 (containing Chinatown) is 920 and 571 in Tract 702 (containing South Cove). If the rate of housing loss persists at this level for the period 1970-80, it will mean a total loss of nearly 250 housing units in these two areas, therefore leading to an additional housing need of the same amount due to replacements by 1980. Again, the real implication would remain obscured until the next census in 1980.

Since these two factors would have very significant impacts on the magnitude and pattern of our housing need, readjustment would be required once the 1980 census data are available.
4.7 **ELDERLY HOUSING VERSUS FAMILY HOUSING**

As estimated by the Executive Director of the South Cove Golden Age Center in January, 1978, there are about 1,600 Chinese elderly persons residing in the Greater Boston area which represents almost two fold growth since 1970 when the census reported about 800 elderly Chinese (over 60 years of age) in Boston (87% of the Chinese population in Massachusetts in 1970), despite a still high death rate in Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood (estimated at 30 per 1,000 in 1977).\(^1\) The probable reasons for the rapid growth of Chinese elderly could be a combination of the following:

1) About 8% of the overseas immigrants are over 60 and another 8% are between 50 and 59 years of age (based on 1975 immigration figures) who will soon become 60 and over;

2) The quickly enlarged population base produces more elderly people than before;

3) Natural longer life; and

4) Concentration of more Chinese elderly to Boston, especially Chinatown, due to the availability of elderly services in recent years.

---

\(^1\) Exhibit 17 on page 183
The increase in the number of Chinese elderly is also reflected by the pattern of housing needs indicated by the number of applications for elderly housing in Chinatown which is currently higher than all sizes of family housing.\(^1\) The demand, however, has been partly met at least, in the past five years by the completion of two housing projects mainly for the elderly (62 and over) and the handicapped people. The Chauncy House provides 22 one-room (studio type) and 66 2 room (1 bedroom, 1 living room) units, while the Quincy Tower adds another 162 2-room units to the elderly housing supply. Under the current tight housing condition, it is assumed that these housing units are fully occupied; therefore about 500 elderly persons are housed in standard housing. There are still about 600 outstanding applications on the waiting list of these two projects (Quincy Towers has 470 applications and Chauncy House has 120 as of March, 1979 representing a substantial unmet demand.

On the supply side, fortunately there are about 450 additional elderly housing units on the way to market. If eventually they could be developed, the elderly housing demand would be more or less matched, after discounting for some duplication of applications by the same applicants in the two existing projects. First, there are 225 Section 8 subsidized elderly

\(^1\) Exhibit 28 on page 194
housing units proposed by a Chinese developer, Mr. Stanley Chen, on two separate Urban Renewal sites (C-1 and C-8) in South Cove. This development is supported by BRA and has been approved by HUD. Second, another 200 housing units for elderly or handicapped people under Section 202 has also been allocated to the Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood. At this stage however, no building sites have yet been found for the latter project. Third, the Golden Age Center is in an advanced state towards securing permanent financing for the development of 27 units congregate housing under Section 202 for the elderly in Chinatown. With the completion of these three projects in the next few years, it is expected that the elderly housing shortage would be substantially eased.

However, the situation of family housing supply has not been as bright. Although the completion of more elderly housing projects might somewhat alleviate the severe overcrowding problems of family housing, yet there is still no basic solution for any radical improvement of the family housing shortage problem, especially among our basic community. Furthermore, as indicated by the housing need trend, the demand for family housing will continue to grow as our community will be composed of more and more families. But other than the 83 family units that CEDC is now actively planning in Chinatown, which mainly consists of small units, there has been no other sizable developments of subsidized family housing planned within our SIA. There is an immediate need for about 450
housing units, and 100 units more per year due to population growth. The demand for small units will be satisfied partly by elderly housing development and partly by our own effort in Chinatown in the next few years, but the accumulated strong demand for medium to large family housing units in the preferred neighborhood of Chinatown and South Cove remains to be unresolved. In the future years to come, with more Chinese families set up and the growing in size of the existing ones, the family housing shortage will conceivably become the most serious problem and would therefore warrant a top priority treatment.
4.8 RESOURCES AND TOOLS FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Housing developments have been pursued by both public and private sectors. In resolving housing problems and encouraging housing developments, the private sector i.e., the community, private lending agencies, developers and so forth makes available certain funds and utilizes public resources. The public sector, including all forms of governments and other public entities also uses housing programs and regulatory measures to encourage certain developments but to intervene and regulate undesirable market outcomes. It is important for CEDC as a community development corporation to be familiar with these current resources and tools so as to best utilize them, or in case that their applicability is incompatible with our community needs, to propose new innovative programs. We shall examine the nature and applicability of the various private and public tools and resources in the light of the following three basic objectives:

1) To increase the supply of subsidized and non-subsidized housing for both elderly people and families;

2) To stabilize the recent and improve the housing stock occupied by Chinese households;

3) To promote home ownership by Chinese families.
Public sector involvements either take the form of housing assistance programs or regulatory measures while private sector involvements usually couple with one or more public program and measures.

4.8.1 Housing Assistance Programs

Housing assistance programs are operated on all three levels of governments, but predominantly by the federal government and to a lesser extent, by the state and city governments. Housing assistance programs wherever applicable to our community should be utilized to the fullest extent. Generally, assistance could either come in the form of direct cash transfer or in-kind benefits.

4.8.1.1 Direct cash transfer programs

(A) Loans

Section 312 Loans

The federal government loans to property owners or business tenants rehabilitation loans at low interest rates (3%). Although the 312 loans are applicable to areas affected by federal programs such as CDBG, Urban Homesteading, Code Enforcement and Urban Renewal, yet in Boston this program is mainly targeted towards Urban Renewal areas.
312 loans were available through the South Cove and South End Urban Renewal programs. However, there were only two successful loans in South Cove so far. In the 1978 to 1980 Neighborhood Profile Report, BRA attributes the low response by the community to the size of the structures, the expense of work, and inherent suspicion of government programs and a lack of financial capability. The first two reasons do not seem to apply to 312 loans for there is no maximum limit to the size of the structures, and the ceiling set at $27,000 per dwelling unit seems to be able to cover most of the rehabilitation cost. However, it does not seem at all strange for the not very sophisticated communities like ours to distrust any government programs after the massive removal of houses in South Cove through Urban Renewal. Furthermore, although owner-occupancy is not a prerequisite for 312 loans, the low owner-occupant rate (1% in South Cove) and the small number of privately owned housing (about 170 remain in South Cove) might be the main reason for the low community participation in this program in South Cove. The situation is quite different in South End, where $2 million 312 loans have been given out in 1977 alone, and another $800,000 proposed by BRA for the period between 1978-1980. Nevertheless, how many Chinese families would benefit through this program is difficult to estimate since both owners and tenants are beneficiaries. However, judging from the
general poor and overcrowded housing conditions for Chinese families living in South End as indicated by our 1979 survey, probably the beneficiary rate is rather low for Chinese households.

The 312 loan program has recently been discontinued at least temporarily in both South Cove and South End areas, due to cutting back of federal funds, and the probability of their resuming in the near future is not very optimistic.

Section 202

This federal program provides both short term construction loans and long term financing for the development of rental and cooperative housing facilities for elderly or handicapped persons, at interest rates hooked onto the average rates paid on federal obligations, usually below market rates. Loans are made only to private, non-profit corporations. Participation in Section 8 rental housing program is required for a minimum of 20 percent of the 202 section units. Rental subsidy funds are set aside for each 202 loan. Thus, rents would be stabilized for low income elderly and handicapped people.

202 section loans have not been utilized in South Cove and Chinatown before. However, the situation might change in the near future, with the establishment of more sophisticated community agencies. For example, the Golden Age Center has
recently secured the city's support for developing 27 units of congregate housing for the elderly in Chinatown under the 202 loan program. Furthermore, CEDC has been approached by the city regarding our interest to take over the 200 housing units under section 202 originally allocated to Tufts who has problem in securing a site for development. If both of these two projects could finally be built, the elderly housing shortage problem of our community could very substantially be alleviated. The idea of cooperative housing seems to be not widely acceptable in Massachusetts let alone cooperative housing for the elderly and handicapped only, as Section 202 loan program mandates. Exploration, however, should be made to develop cooperation with family type housing to extend home ownership among the low income families.

Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency (MHFA)

Through MHFA, the state provides low interest loans to non-profit or limited dividend organizations for the construction of mixed income multi-dwelling housing either in the form of short term construction loan or long term (40 years) financing. The most recent housing project financed through MHFA is the Quincy Tower which is developed by a limited dividend organization and consists of 162 housing units for the elderly.
Since MHFA encourages mixed income housing developments and usually couples rent subsidy programs such as Section 8, to approved developments with rent subsidies to cover all or part of the housing units, the income of the developer is to a certain degree assured. Interest rates charged is 1/2% higher than MHFA bonds floated to finance long term mortgages, but this is usually lower than the market rate. By reducing the finance cost of the development, more housing developments would be encouraged and since rent subsidies are usually available at least partially to the MHFA financial housing project, rents would be stabilized at reasonable levels for low income families.

The MHFA is one of the leading state-run housing finance agencies in this country and the type of loans and programs it manages are compatible with our community needs. Despite that it is a quasai-government bank therefore less subject to government guidelines but highly subject to political implications, MHFA still remains as one of the major source of subsidized housing development funds and rent subsidies for low income families. Private developers and community developed corporations such as CEDC should strive to utilize more of MHFA development funds in future.
The federal government also supplies long term financing to non-profit organizations to develop mixed income housing through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Operated on similar terms as the MHFA, FHA loans should also be pursued for housing development in our community. However, short term loans are usually not available, therefore, it is necessary to obtain construction financing from private institutions, probably coupled with a federal housing development insurance program.

B. Grants

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

This non-categorical federal grant is used primarily to replace the Urban Renewal program giving local governments higher autonomy on the usage of federal funds. Through the CDBG program, the city government becomes the recipient and distributor of federal funds for the general purpose of community development.

The city traditionally has the direct authority over the fund allocation although it is necessary to involve citizen participation. The city can award CDBG funds to existing community organizations or programs and it can set up new projects or programs. Theoretically, CDBG funds could be used for almost any kind of housing assistance programs. However, practically in
Chinatown and South Cove, CDBG has been largely used for public facility improvements ($216,410 out of $267,920 in 1977). Only limited amounts have been allocated for housing related purposes, including $25,000 (year III, 1977) for conducting a feasibility study on CEDC's proposed housing development on Edinboro Street and $50,000 (year IV, 1978) for CEDC to secure development options on properties intended for housing development in Chinatown. In addition, CDBG money is also used to fund a number of human services programs in Chinatown and South Cove.

CDBG is the largest source of grant money available. In other Boston neighborhoods, CDBG has been used in the area of housing, specifically through the Home Improvement Program (HIP), demolition of abandoned buildings and restoration of vacant land. The HIP program, through which the city reimburses 40 percent (50% to elderly) of the rehabilitation expenses (maximum $16,000 per unit) to the owner-occupant, is found to be incompatible with the Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood due to the following three factors:

(A) The maximum number of housing units within an eligible building is limited to six;

(B) Only owner-occupants are eligible; and

(C) Considerable financial capability of the applicant is required since the program is operated on reimbursement basis.
Before the program was discontinued in 1976, there were only four applications, and only one completed.

The HIP in South End has been more successful. In 1977, the City targeted $100,000 for this program. Other City programs in South End where CDBG funds were utilized includes vacant lots restoration ($30,000), public facility improvements ($523,000) and human services programs ($298,000). The City reported that over 80% of CDBG used in the South End was allocated by the City for community-requested projects. However only 13.7% was allocated for housing-related purposes and furthermore, the proportion of benefits to Chinese families is not possible to estimate.

More innovative ways to utilize CDBG have to be designed and employed so as to more effectively assist the housing development and home ownership efforts of CEDC due to the unique characteristics of our community. Some of these actions have already been put into practice in other parts of the country while others are still in experimental stage:

1) to set up community revolving loan fund or credit unions so as to give direct loans or to guarantee conventional mortgages pursued by community members in home purchasing;
2) to direct loans for the development of new or rehabilitated low and moderate income housing by private developers and non-profit organizations;

3) to operate loan rebate, interest reduction subsidies and mortgage insurance for low income housing developments and low income home owners, and;

4) to provide non-profit organizations with grants in the acquisition of properties for rehabilitation.

The allocation of CDBG funds in Boston has been subject to very strong political influence, and citizen participation has not been effective enough in allocation decisions. Furthermore intracommunity competition also weakens the position of the Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood against outside competitions from other communities. In order to attract more CDBG money to our community, it is absolutely essential to develop a high degree of community consensus and be persistent in convincing the City of our needs.
Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG)

This is a federal grant program providing non-categorized funding to cities in order to finance projects which assist in the revitalization of severely distressed economies and deteriorated neighborhoods. Application for funds through this program is evaluated on its impact on the low income communities and its leverage for private financing (normally expecting $4 private investment for every $1 public grant), and local and state involvements. Boston is declared eligible for UDAG funding. Local UDAG proposals have to be submitted by the city, therefore the process also lends itself to local politics. In the first year of UDAG, the majority of the UDAG fund has been targeted towards downtown commercial revitalization and to a lesser extent community projects. This tendency is hoped to change in the favor of neighborhood development in the future.

CEDC has been trying to obtain access to UDAG funds in the past year by dovetailing community housing needs to the now funded Lafayette Place Project. This effort has been opposed strongly by the City. Since the UDAG program is still active, it should be approached with a more comprehensive plan for neighborhood revitalization especially around the blighted Combat Zone, which the Chinese community has been
encouraged to move into by BRA. Utilizing UDAG money for mixed commercial/residential development in Combat Zone will bring our commercial activities into the mainstream of city activities along Washington Street and at the same time substantially increase the housing development opportunities utilizing the buildings and lands in that area. Further discussions will be made in later Chapters about this proposal.

C. Rent subsidies

Direct cash transfer can also take the form of rent subsidies. Rents are paid to the landlord at established market level of which the tenant will only be responsible for a portion, equivalent to 25% of his income. The two major sources of rent subsidies come from the federal and state governments.

Section 8 subsidies

There are two ways to apply for this federal program:

1) Tied to a tenant who apply individually to have his rent subsidized in any qualified and participating housing that the tenant might chose to live.
2) **Tied to a unit** which is developed either independently or jointly with public housing agency by non-profit or profit-making developers, to which Section 8 rent subsidies have been secured from HUD either or not through MHFA for the whole or part of the units in the development. Rent subsidy contracts with HUD usually vary from 20 to 40 years.

Rent subsidy is eligible for low-income households with less than 80% of the area median income. In Boston, in 1977, Section 8 subsidized about 1,000 housing units tied to a unit and 3,000 housing units tied to a tenant. Section 8 subsidies attached to leased housing is administered by the Boston Housing Authority and the Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs. While state agencies either MHFA or Department of Community Affairs (DCA) are usually responsible for the distribution of Section 8 housing projects to developers.

Federal government also directly distributes Section 8 housing subsidies directly through various federal programs, e.g. through Neighborhood Strategy Areas Program, 150 housing units under Section 8 Rent Subsidy Program are distributed to Chinatown and the Leather District. Another 225 housing units
under Section 8 new construction program have been allocated to a private developer in South Cove, Mr. Stanley Chen, for elderly housing development.

Section 8 rent subsidy program is the key part of most programs aimed at maintaining the quality of housing for the low and moderate income families, and encouraging more new and rehabilitated low income housing developments whose income is ensured by a large market of low income families. Section 8 rent subsidy program is the single most important program of its nature.

Chapter 707

Under Chapter 707, rent subsidies are provided to low income families who qualify for state public housing but cannot be accommodated in existing projects. The program allows local housing authorities to place low income families in private dwelling units of moderate rental and subsidize the difference between the rent charged by the landlord and the rent of public housing.

Chapter 707 rent subsidy program is renewable in 5-year period and funded in rounds. Although this program has been proposed
by BRA to be utilized in Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood in their 1978-80 Neighborhood Profile Report, there seems to be a strong feeling that new round will not be increased, therefore no new subsidies will be available in the near future.

4.8.1.2 In-kind benefit programs

A. Mortgage insurance

Long and short term loans for acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of cooperative housing projects of five or more units and resale of individual memberships, available to housing cooperatives mainly. Since only a small investment is required in order to become a homeowner, cooperative housing is especially appealing to low and moderate income families. Although cooperative housing is still yet to be accepted widely in Massachusetts, CEDC should explore the market among our community.

Section 221 (d) 4 (for multi-family rental housing for low and moderated income families)

Under this program, federal government loans are available for
construction and substantial rehabilitation of cooperative or rental housing of five units or more for moderate income or displaced families. Its eligibility extends to individuals, private profit-making or non-profit organizations.

This is the only remaining active federal program of its nature for new multi-family, low or moderate income housing development and has been most widely used since federal government insurance is often required to obtain long and short term financing either from state agencies like MHFA or private finance institutions. Basically, it helps to lower the financing cost of housing development, the benefit of which pass onto both the developers and the future residents in the form of more stabilized rents. It also helps to stabilize the supply of low to moderate income housing units in the market and encourages land developments of this nature.

Section 234 (for condominium)

Federal government insures loans to mortgages and non-profit developers for the purchase of condominium units or construction or rehab of projects intended to be sold as condominiums. With the abundance of old structures in the South End, there are plenty of opportunities to utilize this program in improving
existing housing stocks and extending home ownership of our community. CEDC should package some of these properties and rehabilitate them into condominium units and then sell them at no or low profits to community members in order to promote home ownership, especially among the low to moderate income families who find it very difficult to finance a whole building. Thus the equity accumulated by most Chinese families over years of saving can be more effectively contribute towards owning their own homes and stabilize housing expenses.

Section 223(e) (for housing in declining neighborhoods)

Federal government insurance is available to loans used to finance the purchase, rehabilitation or construction of housing in declining but still viable urban neighborhoods where normal requirements for mortgage insurance is difficult to meet. The program is opened to homeowners and project owners eligible for FHA mortgage insurance.

Declining neighborhoods within our Special Impact Area includes the Combat Zone, certain deteriorated pockets in Chinatown, South End and South Cove. Probably this program is also applicable to certain parts of Allston-Brighton, and Parker Hill-Fenway.
B. Tax benefits

Another form of in-kind benefits comes as tax benefits which might go to individuals as well as organizations.

**Income tax deductability**

The mortgage interest payments for homeowners are tax deductable. Therefore the extension of homeownership is doubly beneficial to our community.

**Property tax abatements**

In Boston, statutory abatements apply to categorically defined owners such as elderly or disabled. Discretionary abatements are granted on an ad hoc basis by the city government. Tax abatement would be useful to help alleviating the heavy housing expenses of both the tenant and the landlord who charges low rents. Therefore, there is a need for CEDC to look into the property tax situation of our community with a veiw to provide technical assistance to seek tax abatements in appropriate cases. Furthermore, it should also be brought to the City's attention regarding the regranting of tax abatements to those properties which constitute obstacles for community development. These would include properties for sale at unreasonably high prices, blighted buildings
and properties exerting negative impacts on the neighborhood. Many buildings in Combat Zone and South End would fall into this category. The withdrawal of tax abatements would persuade their owners to take more active steps either to redevelop this properties, to remove the blighting origin, or to sell their property for other desirable developments.

Chapter 121-A (State tax concession)

Under Chapter 121-A of the Massachusetts law, private developers and non-profit developers through the setting up of limited dividends housing developments can secure exemption from conventional property taxation. Under this program, the housing project will only be taxed 12 percent of the operational income in lieu of the normal property tax based on the assessed value. The developer would be relieved from considerable tax burden and substantially reduce the risk of investment. Through this program, more housing development would be encouraged and the benefit derived through low risk investment will be shared at least partially by the tenants as long as the duration of the exemption, which normally lasts for a period varying from 15 to 40 years.
Tax benefits through historical designation

Designation of a building or neighborhood for their historical value would qualify the owner of the property or the developer of the rehabilitation project for certain additional tax benefits including the allowance to amortize their debt and the eligibility to use an accelerated depreciation formula.

C. Counseling programs

Counseling or advisory programs are another type of in-kind housing benefits available through various federal, state or city agencies. Examples include the advisory mechanisms attached to Home Improvement Program (city), Section 225 mortgage insurance program (federal). CEDC should actively consider the setting up of similar counseling services for the community including the following:

1) Rental housing referral services to public and private housing;

2) Advisory services for home buying, home improvements, or housing developments for entrepreneurs; and

3) Liaison services for community members and various public or private financing agencies.
D. **Public Housing**

The direct provision of housing services to the community is the final type of in-kind housing services available. The federal government made available public housing development programs for local participation. The Boston Housing Authority was set up to implement these programs. The commonwealth is also running similar state programs providing state run public housing projects.

Chapter 667

The Massachusetts state runs this program to finance low-income housing projects for the elderly.

Chapter 705

Under this state program, buildings on scattered sites are acquired and rehabilitated to become low-income housing. It is operated in conjunction with the Chapter 707 rent subsidy program.

Boston Housing Authority

This is the local housing authority in Boston which is set up to administer all public housing programs funded by federal
government. Its functions include the development, and management of various public housing projects. Among the various modes that public housing has developed, the Turnkey program allows private sector to participate. Private developers or non-profit organizations may develop housing projects, and on completion turn them over to the local housing authority for operation. Developers will be compensated in the form of fees and bonus if the cost of the development would be kept under established levels.

4.8.2 Market Regulatory Measures

In contrast to the active housing assistance programs, passive measures in the form of regulatory services are also possible in encouraging housing developments and stabilizing housing markets.

4.8.2.1 Speculation Taxes

Speculation taxes impose high tax on capital gains secured after a short period of property ownership, while longer period of ownership exempts owners from such taxes. This measure might be suitable to discourage the speculative housing development in South End pursued by developers that expect a windfall from neighborhood revitalization, and cause rapid appreciation of
properties old and new, jeopardizing the opportunities of low and moderate income families to own their homes and probably also displace them from the market and the neighborhood altogether.

4.8.2.2 **Rent control**

Rent control measures help to stabilize the rent, therefore theoretically speaking this program is beneficial to low and moderate income families. However, it also discourages maintenance and improvement of existing housing stock. In Boston, rent control is gradually phasing out with more and more exempted once the current tenant moves out or after $10,000 worth of renovation work is done to the housing unit. With the rapid raise in the rent level and the over crowdedness of the Chinatown and South Cove housing, the re-introduction of both this program and the enforcement program should be closely reviewed by CEDC and appropriate recommendations to be made to the City.

4.8.2.3 **Options and Covenants**

Although not presently operated in Boston, except through the Urban Renewal Programs, other cities have introduced this regulatory measure which systematically use options (to grant the first right of purchase a property) and covenant (to set the conditions of sale for a property) in order to control property transactions in neighborhoods undergoing revitalizations.
4.8.2.4 Zoning

Zoning change, up-zoning and down-zoning are all possible tools the City could use to regulate the different types and densities of developments in any neighborhood. The granting or denying of zoning variances to individuals or organizations pursuing development in areas zoned for a different use or density could also be used as a flexible way to handle and guide neighborhood change by allowing certain desirable developments to take place other than what is currently allowed, but prohibit the undesirable changes.

Chinatown which is currently zoned for light manufacturing (M1),\(^1\) has become heavily residential and commercial over the years, and this trend is expected to accelerate in the near future with more industrial and warehouse spaces taken over by residential and commercial use. However, it is not advisable to pursue overall zone change at this moment, for residential and commercial zoning would require a much higher car parking facility standard. As long as BRA recognizes the housing shortage in Chinatown and is willing to support zoning variance for individual residential/commercial projects, a lower intensity zoning such as M1 would be less stringent and facilitate community development.

---

\(^1\) Exhibit 31 on page 197
4.8.2.5 Regulating the loaning practice by private financing agencies

The public sector could affect private market by making private loans more available to neighborhoods by discouraging discrimination or red-lining of any particular community or neighborhood. Savings are high among Chinese residents and businesses. With virtually no defaults, the credit-worthiness of Chinese is also high. Home mortgages are usually first mortgage used for the purchase of multi-family houses. The amounts of these mortgages are anywhere between $25,000 to $65,000. Due to the annual report of low income of home owners, mortgages usually require 1/3 to 1/2 downpayment. Therefore, the loan investment rate is usually low, considerably reducing the risk factor.¹ With an ever increasing value of properties in Chinatown and South Cove, no red-lining has so far been detected among thrift institutions. However, the situation for Chinese looking for home financing in South End, Allston-Brighton or Parker Hill-Fenway is less clear at this moment.

4.9 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT POTENTIALS

4.9.1 Chinatown

Chinatown refers to about ten small blocks of predominantly commercial and residential blocks in the core area along Beach Street occupying a little less than 20 acres of land. The main building stock other than housing, dates back to the late 19th century construction in brick and timber or steel and reinforced concrete structures, in varied states of repair.

This area has a high concentration of Chinese restaurants, groceries, gift shops and other retail facilities. Influenced by major developments around Chinatown, and coupled with an extremely tight housing market, building and land owners recently found it opportune to raise rents and land values to unprecedented levels. To speculate on the future growth of business volume, the core area has a tendency to become increasingly commercialized in the near future. Furthermore, building and land owners are generally expecting a higher return thereby creating almost insurmountable obstacles for community housing developments or redevelopment in the core area.

Chinatown has a high concentration of family associations, clan associations and other community organizations. However, most of them have ceased to operate actively as community services provider in recent years. The exceptions are the Chinese Quong Kow School on Oxford Street and the Chinese American Civic Association on Washington Street.
Community facilities, especially those essential for families with children, such as open spaces, recreation grounds, health care, schools are extremely deficient in Chinatown. However, these facilities are available in South Cove which is accessible only by crossing Kneeland Street, a main vehicular thoroughfare separating the two areas.

The commercialization of Chinatown, the deficiency of essential services and facilities, high land and property values, and mixed land use will propel the core area towards a more intensive use of land and higher density developments where large scale subsidized family housing (basically in a low rise form as mandated by federal and state subsidized housing policies) will no longer be feasible. Furthermore, with the growing urban developments, heavier traffic volume and more congested environment, whether any subsidized housing proposal in Chinatown will be able to meet the environmental standards imposed by the federal and state governments is still rather doubtful. Subsidized elderly housing or condominium/apartment type market value housing for small families without children would be more compatible with high density developments, yet they still have to meet the environmental standards.
Provided that the traffic pattern could be rearranged and the environmental quality could be maintained in Chinatown, the current strong market can practically absorb any supply of housing, whatever size, subsidized or non-subsidized. However, our long term goal in housing development, if at all possible in Chinatown should provide small families without children rather than with children, family housing rather than elderly housing and subsidized rather non-subsidized to cater for the most needy and immobile families. If one project could succeed, it might well begin a development relocation cycle for existing families in Chinatown so that other potential buildings could be vacated for redevelopment making the fuller use of the site possible to satisfy the long term market in housing as well as commercial spaces.

The 1977 MIT Total Studio Report noted that land or buildings available for new or rehabilitated housing construction within this area is extremely limited. There is also considerable reservations regarding the possibility of packaging considerable numbers of small properties of diversified ownerships within a reasonably short time for housing redevelopment. The core area is surrounded on the eastern and northern sides by a band of old mercantile and industrial buildings along Washington Street in the Combat Zone and Essex Street. The conditions of these buildings vary from fairly good, in which case they are rather fully occupied by existing businesses, to deteriorated where they are mostly vacant or used for unidentified purposes on the upper floors and rented to adult entertainment on the first floors. The MIT report identified three prospective site areas for re-development, i.e. Edinboro Street site, Harrison-Tyler Street site, and the Ping On Street site.
POTENTIAL PROPERTIES IN CHINATOWN

- Edinboro Street Project (48,000 sq.ft.)
- Harrison-Tyler St. site (29,000 sq.ft.)
- Ping On Street site (36,000 sq.ft.)
- 31 Beach Street (7,200 sq.ft.)
- N.E. Tele. Co. Bldg. site (5,200 sq.ft.)
- "Superblock" (97,000 sq.ft.)
- Eastern Market (4,000 sq.ft.)
- CMA owned properties (5,700 sq.ft.)
Other potential parcels in this area include the 31 Beach Street building, the Telephone Company Building Annex, the Superblock, the Eastern Market Building, and the CMA owned buildings. This group of buildings are either for sale, underutilized, or suffering negative cash flow therefore supposedly, they are under certain pressure of redevelopment.¹

(A)  **Edinboro Street Site**

As proposed in the MIT report, the Edinboro Street project includes almost 400,000 square feet of building space on 48,000 square feet of land. When all three phases are completed it would be able to accommodate several hundred (about 450) housing units, thus easing the housing shortage significantly. CEDC has been pushing the Edinboro Street Project forward as our top priority site for subsidized housing development in the past 12 months. The rationale for choosing this site are:

1) That the site is within the Neighborhood Strategy Area, a City proposed and HUD approved program through which 150 Section 8 rent-subsidized housing units were allocated to Chinatown and the Leather District in 1978;

¹ Exhibit 33 on page 199
2) That it would involve the conversion of some underutilized industrial and mercantile buildings contiguous with the existing residential and commercial core but not requiring the relocation of Chinese families; and

3) That, due to the adjacent Lafayette Place Project which is currently applying for a federal Urban Development Action Grant, it is hoped that the Edinboro Street project would also be coupled with the UDAG application for funding.

Most of these efforts have been unsuccessful. The inclusion of this project into the UDAG application is not favored by the City. Relocation requirements of some existing businesses in the proposed buildings have proved to be difficult to meet, according to government guidelines. One of the owners of Phase I building, Druker & Co., intends to sell this building only as a package with another two properties in South Cove, thus causing a further complication in packaging the acquisition deal. The asking prices speculating on the future changes brought to this area by the Lafayette Place Project has priced out any possibility for subsidized housing development.
Harrison-Tyler Street Site

The Harrison-Tyler Street site is one of the rare prime sites in Chinatown for development due to its central location. It consists of several old buildings of 70,000 square feet floor space standing on 20,000 square feet of land and 9,000 square feet of vacant lot currently used for parking. Although the MIT proposal primarily aims at the development of more commercial space, it also includes housing on the upper floors. The report proposed two alternatives:

Alternative A: includes commercial/industrial space, a garage and 60-70 small housing units

Alternative B: includes commercial/industrial space and about 100 small housing units

There are no immediate plans of development on this site. CEDC should pursue the possibility of a joint venture with the current owners so as to overcome some acquisition obstacles.

(C) The Ping On Street Site

The proposed site area consists of 11 existing residential or commercial buildings and Ping On Street which is a narrow dead end street opening to Essex Street. The total building space is about 110,000 square feet and the land area is approximately 36,000 square feet.
The MIT report proposed primarily to revitalize this deteriorating core of Chinatown, Oxford Street, and to extend prime commercial space from Beach Street to side street: such as Ping On Street, Oxford Street and Edinboro Street. Although housing is proposed on the upper floors, no indication was made on the quantity. It is estimated that, based on the proposal, 40 existing small housing units could be upgraded with little or no addition. Of all three proposals prepared by the MIT Total Studio, the Ping On Street project, as pointed out in the report, is the most complicated since many parties would be involved in assembling land including the City of Boston which owns Ping On Street. Most of the properties are not currently for sale.

(D) 31 Beach Street Building

This building is located at the fringe of the commercial core. It is in good physical condition and provides 63,000 square feet of floor space on 7,200 square feet of land. While the ground floor is leased to Shawmut Bank, most of the upper floors are occupied by garment factories employing a considerable number of Chinese workers. In March, 1979, CEDC entered into a Purchase and Sale Agreement with the owner to purchase the building for $425,000 to house our Community Support Development/Services programs and to use the property as a leverage for future acquisitions. At the moment, a funding application has been submitted to Office of Economic Development (OED) pending its approval for funds to
finance the investment. Although in the long run it is intended to convert the upper floors of the building into housing (approximately 40 units). However, this does not seem feasible in the near future due to:

1) Full occupancy entailing unsurmountable relocation cost for the existing businesses (3 current leases; other than the Shawmut Bank lease on the first floor which expires in 1981, the next longest lease expires in 1980).

2) Relocation of garment factories from this area would cost the community over a hundred jobs convenient to them.

(E) **New England Telephone Building Annex**

Located in the heart of Chinatown, the Telephone Building Annex has been vacant for a number of years. This has been caused by the rapid shrinking of equipment sizes in the age of transistors. The building serves little function for the Telephone Company but creates a heavy tax burden amounting to $60,000 per year.

The existence of this building gives CEDC an exceptionally rare opportunity for housing development right in the center of Chinatown. The building has 20,000 square feet of floor space on a 5,200 square foot site. Located within the NSA, CEDC is eligible to apply for Section 8 rent subsidy.
Using BRA as a liaison, CEDC staff began negotiation directly with the Telephone Company in early 1979 and tentatively agreed upon a sale price which makes subsidized housing development feasible. Legal procedure is to progress for a Purchase and Sale Agreement between CEDC and the Telephone Company and architectural/engineering studies will begin shortly. Furthermore, our intention to apply for Section 8 rent subsidy under NSA has also been received favorably by the City. This project is intended to couple Section 221(d)(4) FHA insurance program and Section 121A state tax concession provision. Permanent financing will be made available by MFHA, FHA and/or private banks depending on the terms offered, so will be short term construction loans. Upfront development funds would be channeled through the Venture Capital from OED. On completion, the project will be syndicated through which tax shelters are sold to investors so as to recapture the equity for further development. CEDC would remain the general partner and charge management fees from the syndication. Public and private financing resources would then be utilized to the maximum extent in a coordinated way with a view to generate and regenerate scarce development funds.

In view of the difficulty of finding another suitable site in Chinatown, preliminary study indicates that in order to maximize the site utilization, it will be advantageous to add
as many floors above the existing structure as possible. At this stage of preparing this study, an additional 5 floors are proposed, making a total of 9 (4 existing and 5 additional) floors providing a total of 83 housing units of the following sizes:

- 4 room units: 2 numbers
- 3 room units: 26 numbers
- 2 room units: 55 numbers

(F) The "Superblock"

The "Superblock" is the largest intact block of old buildings between Chinatown and the Combat Zone. The total area exceeds 97,000 sq. ft. with about 20 buildings and 3 vacant lots currently used for parking. Over 70% of the parcels are for sale, however many of the buildings are in poor condition. The owners, speculating on future growth in the area, are generally asking very unrealistic prices. Considerable difficulties in packaging the whole block is envisaged.

Two of the existing buildings are actively being considered for subsidized housing projects - a 27 unit Section 202 congregate housing for the elderly is being planned by the Golden Age Center on Essex Street, and the owner of the Liberty Tree Building also intends to convert it to Section 8 housing. The former proposal has been committed by the City, but the outcome of the latter is still pending.
The location, size, shape and intactness have offered great potentials for community developments for both residential and commercial uses. A preliminary study done by the author has shown that when fully developed, the "Superblock" can offer 140 to 870 number of housing units and 90,000 sq. ft. of commercial space depending on the scope of the development pursuit.\(^1\) Due to the size, complexity and nature of the development, very substantial investments and sophisticated expertise are required. Perceivably in view of the scarcity of housing and rent subsidies, it might be more appropriate to plan for mixed income housing, skewed rent housing, or cooperative condominiums. In the latter case, part of the funds could be recaptured from the down payments to release heavy capital involvements. However, at this stage, other than subsidized housing, there has been no sure market for other spaces, at least in the next few years before the Combat Zone fades out. The realization of this development does not seem to be feasible in the immediate future.

---

\(^1\) Source: "Superblock" a preliminary study on the development feasibility, C.W. Lui, 1978
As will be discussed in a later section a general development strategy should be designed regarding:

1) How should the "Superblock" and other strategically located buildings or lands be developed to gear the community economic and housing developments to the citywide development pattern, so as to benefit our community through a more intensified land use in Chinatown; and

2) How should public funding resources be coupled and fully utilized in order to create an effective leverage for private involvement in the development of this area.

(G) The Eastern Market Building

Owned by a group of Chinese merchants, this building has been greatly under utilized in the past few years. The current vacancy rate is about 40 percent. The building occupies only 4,000 sq. ft. of land and is 8 stories high with a total floor area of 32,000 sq. ft. It is estimated that when converted into housing, the building might provide 25 housing units and commercial space on the group floor. However, in spite of the housing shortage in Chinatown, the present owner has no plan to redevelop the building for residential use. The building is intended to be sold for $400,000 (i.e. $12.5 per sq. ft. of floor space). The asking price has priced out the possibility for any subsidized or non-subsidized housing developments.

1 Estimation based on 1,000 sq. ft. per housing unit
The Chinese Merchants Association owned buildings

The Chinese Merchants Association originally owned over 20 buildings in and around Chinatown and rented to poor families at very low rents ($36 per month per room excluding utilities) acting as low cost housing provider in our community. However, in recent years, the financial situation of the Association deteriorated considerably and the majority of its assets have been liquidated to ease the financial difficulties. At present, only 6 buildings which do not need the association's subsidies (61-67, Beach Street and 1 Hudson Street) are still remaining, providing a total of 24 small housing units (2-3 rooms). Recently raising the rent to about $250.00 per month, these buildings have begun to generate a steady income for the Association. The existing development pressure in Chinatown has been so high that these 4 to 5 story buildings, same as other low-rise buildings in Chinatown, are considered to be underdeveloped. However, CMA is short of expertise in housing development, and there is no plan to redevelop these properties for more intensive use in the near future. In order to best utilize the limited housing resources in Chinatown, it seems appropriate for CEDC to study the possibilities of joint venture with CMA, either to up-grade or to redevelop the buildings for more housing units. However, the buildings are fully occupied by Chinese families, therefore relocation, either temporary or permanent, of the existing tenants would have to be carefully planned in order to avoid excessive displacements.
Among the many family associations, clan associations and other community organizations in Chinatown, some of them have their own buildings. While occupying only one floor the remaining floors are rented out for residential use. Similar to the situation of CMA, these organizations are short of housing development expertise and staff. Therefore, these properties would represent additional opportunities for housing development through joint venture with CEDC.

4.9.2 South Cove

The majority of the private housing stocks in South Cove have been removed by the South Cove Urban Renewal Project during the late 60's. Subsequently, the lands vacated were earmarked for a variety of uses, but mainly to accommodate the expansions of Tufts New England Medical Center and University planned for the period until 1995. Over the years, large areas of Urban Renewal lands were bought by Tufts, and still earmarked for the same purpose. It is estimated that the total area of land set aside for the Tufts expansion amounts to 200,000 sq. ft. Little development has so far taken place on about two-thirds of this land.

1 Exhibit 3 on page 17
To compensate for the massive loss of housing units in this area due to Urban Renewal and the two major transportation projects in this neighborhood (i.e. the Surface Artery and Massachusetts Turnpike), three public assisted housing projects were built in the past ten years (i.e. Tai Tung Village, Mass Pike Towers and Quincy Tower), adding some 576 housing units to the low and moderate income housing market. These additions, though partly replacing the original loss of 1,200 housing units, are hardly enough to satisfy the rapidly increasing demand due to population growth in the neighborhood. At the moment, almost 900 applicants are on the waiting list of the three projects, which is equivalent to 0.83 applicants per existing housing units. The displaced Chinese families from the public development projects have become the principal tenants of these three housing projects, while non-Chinese tenants represent only about 5% of the total.

With the old tenement buildings cleared by the Urban Renewal Program, more land has also become available for community facility developments. The most recent addition is the Quincy Community School Complex, which other than providing recreational facilities to the community also houses the South Cove Health Center and the Chinatown Little City Hall providing essential health and municipal services to the community. Furthermore, the South Cove YMCA, Boys' Club, and several other religious organizations also operate social, educational and recreational programs for the neighborhood residents, from their temporarily allocated premises which were acquired through Urban Renewal and are still owned by the Boston Redevelopment Authority.
Community facilities in South Cove are considered good when compared to its population. However, since most of these facilities are being used by both Chinese and non-Chinese in Chinatown, South Cove and South End communities, many of them are actually overloaded. For example the South Cove Health Center which was originally planned for 25,000 visits per year, is currently taking care of 40,000 visits per year. The Quincy School Community Council is also experiencing insufficient room for program expansion.

With the variety of services available for the elderly, the family, the young and the old, South Cove seems to be more suitable for the family type housing. However, it is hard to be optimistic about chances for additional housing development in this area. Basically this is due to the shortage of vacant buildings for conversion into more housing, and the fact that most of the vacant lands in South Cove have been earmarked for other types of developments. A limited number of sites under the Urban Renewal Program are still undesignated for long term developments. However, the more developable sites of these are temporarily occupied for either community use or still awaiting clearance.

1 Exhibit 34 on page 200
POTENTIAL PROPERTIES IN SOUTH COVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Land area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(82,600 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>R3 &amp; R3a</td>
<td>(19,335 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19,335 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>(66,400 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(66,400 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>(17,700 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17,700 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>75 Kneeland St.</td>
<td>(17,000 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>Druker properties</td>
<td>(17,000 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(A) **Parcels R3 and R3a**

Parcels R3 and R3a are two urban Renewal sites adjacent to each other between Washington Street and Harrison Avenue. Together, they represent the largest piece of undesignated, vacant Urban Renewal land (82,616 sq. ft.) in the South Cove Urban Renewal project. The shape, the size and location are considered very suitable for family type housing development. It is estimated that about 330 new housing units could be built on both parcels. However, the two parcels are being separated by the elevated structure of the Orange Line, therefore the utilization of both sites together is restricted.

It is expected that the elevated structure of the Orange Line will not be dismantled at least for another 4 to 5 years. It is also believed that with the frequent and high level noise generated by the mass transit, it is impossible to meet even the minimum environmental standard required for housing development. Housing development, therefore does not seem feasible until the Orange Line is rerouted. In view of this, the South Cove YMCA is planning to relocate their facilities from a smaller parcel R1 to R3 and R3a where they would also expand their facilities to serve a much larger district going beyond Chinatown and South Cove to include both downtown Boston and other neighborhoods. By doing so, the smaller R1 site could be released in one or two years' time for housing development.

---

1 Estimation based on the maximum developable floor area and 1,000 sq. ft. per housing unit.
Among other considerations such as additional traffic in the neighborhood, higher land values and the possible duplication of facilities provided in the Quincy Community School complex, to use this last remaining large Urban Renewal site for recreational facilities only, seems to be overlooking the impending needs for housing by the community not only in the short but also medium and long term basis. Although housing development might not be feasible in the next five years, yet our population will continue to grow. In five years' time probably we shall need more housing than ever before. It is still very uncertain that South End would accept any more subsidized housing. With land resources running out in Chinatown and South Cove, R3 and R3a are the two most preferable locations for community housing. They are one of the very few large sites that could certainly be used for subsidized housing development, since they are both owned by BRA. From this perspective, the following alternatives should be considered by CEDC and recommendations made to the South Cove YMCA and BRA:

1) To relocate all existing South Cove YMCA facilities from R1 site to a suitable Urban Renewal site in South End such as 32c site,1 conveniently accessible to the neighborhoods that YMCA used to serve and other Boston communities, so that R3 and R3a sites in South Cove could be reserved for housing development in future in this most preferable location by the community.

---

1 Exhibit 35 on page 201
2) To relocate all existing YMCA facilities from Rl site to R3 and R3a sites thus releasing Rl for housing development, while additional YMCA facilities are developed on R3 and R3a sites jointly with other housing developments.

3) To relocate all existing YMCA facilities to R3 and R3a sites and release Rl site for a mixed development of new YMCA facilities and housing, and reserving R3 and R3a sites solely for housing development in future.

(B) Parcel Rl

Among the few undesignated Urban Renewal sites in South Cove, parcel Rl is considered to offer good potentials for housing development. It is squarish in shape encompassing 19,335 sq. ft. of land with four existing structures and about 10,000 sq. ft. floor area. The parcel is allocated for the temporary use by the South Cove YMCA accommodating their administrative office, 20 unit transit housing, activities rooms, a playground covered by an inflated structure and parking spaces. A housing project has been proposed several years ago by the First Christ Church of New England which owns a small part of the properties in the same block. However, the plan was suspended due to CCBA's objection against the Church's participation (CCBA has veto power on the proposed development in this area under a corporation agreement with the city in 1963). ¹

¹ Appendix 1
Currently, YMCA proposes to use this site for their permanent expansion if it cannot be located on parcels R3 and R3a. As explained in the previous paragraph, R1 site should also be utilized to the fullest extent either solely for housing development or for mixed development with YMCA facilities. In the first case, it is estimated that 155\(^1\) housing units can be developed on this site while only 95\(^1\) housing units can be developed in conjunction with YMCA developments estimated at about 60,000 sq. ft.\(^2\)

(C) **Parcel P 12**

Parcel P 12 which contains 66,400 sq. ft. of land has been designated to Don Bosco Technical School for its expansion. Through these years, the school has not been able to raise sufficient development funds. Furthermore, it is understood that the expansion planned on this parcel may not be able to use the maximum allowable building space.\(^3\) If the school is willing to develop this parcel jointly with the community, the extra unused allowable building space could be absorbed by housing. The site area allows a building of about 531,000 floor area. Assuming the school needs half of this space, about 250 housing units could be built.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Estimation based on maximum building area and 1,000 sq. ft. per housing unit.

\(^2\) Source: South Cove YMCA, 1979

\(^3\) Source: BRA, 1978
(D) 75 Kneeland Street

This industrial building occupies 17,685 sq. ft. of land and provides 240,000 sq. ft. of floor space. Structurally, it is sound and safe and seems to be 80% occupied at the moment. Industrial activities on the upper floors offer certain jobs for the Chinatown/South Cove communities, however, the number of Chinese employed has not been studied. Provided it is for sale at a reasonable price and there is no difficulties in keeping its financial status afloat while awaiting housing development funds, purchasing this building for future conversion to housing should be considered.

Since it is rather unrealistic to expect a large number of new rent subsidies available in the near future, this building might be more suitably considered for mixed income housing (for low, moderate and middle income families) skewed rent housing (with high rent subsidized low rent units), cooperative housing for even low cost condominiums. However, there are still certain remaining problems to be overcome before housing developments could proceed. Until a satisfactory relocation plan could be designed and accepted by the existing businesses and factories, relocation might constitute a substantial obstacle for housing redevelopment. A final consideration would be the environmental quality in terms of air pollution and noise disturbances in this area generated by the South East Expressway in the proximity.
to this building. Nevertheless, with not too many sound buildings of substantial size for housing conversion in South Cove, this property represents a good potential to provide over 200 additional housing units.

(E) The Druker Properties

Druker and Company intends to sell three buildings in South Cove and Chinatown as a package. One of them is a warehouse/industrial building located inside the Edinboro Street Project area, as discussed in para 4.9.1 before, and the other two are both commercial buildings located on Kneeland Street. These two buildings at 15-19 and 25-43 Kneeland Street, are both well maintained and occupy a total land area of 16,959 sq. ft. with 208,500 sq. ft. floor space above. At present the vacancy rate is estimated to be 40% but asking price is beyond the financing capability of housing development. Due to their proximity to Chinatown, Tufts NEMC and University, the theater district and the future extension of the main office/retail developments on lower Washington Street (assuming Combat Zone will phase out), these buildings seem to be feasible for moderate to middle income housing either for sale or for rent - catering for the more affluent Chinese and other middle class Americans who might appeal to such an environment. However, in the near future, before the Combat Zone is cleared and the image of the neighborhood
improves, only low to moderate income subsidized housing is considered feasible. It is estimated that if both buildings were converted to housing, they can accommodate about 200 housing units.

4.9.3 South End

The part of South End within our Special Impact Area (SIA) is largely covered by the South End Urban Renewal Project,\(^1\) which encompasses an area largest among all the Urban Renewal Projects in this country. South End Urban Renewal Project made the Castle Square Housing Project possible. Build in the 60s' under Section 236, Castle Square provides housing for families of various ethnic groups including Chinese, who gradually have become the largest minority group among the residents in recent years.

During the 50s' and 60s', many Chinese families were relocated to South End as a result of the construction of the Surface Artery, Massachusetts Turnpike and the South Cove Urban Renewal Project. Substantial increase due to population overspill took place only in the last ten years, after all housing units in Chinatown and South Cove has become fully occupied. Although no official statistics is available,

---

\(^1\) Exhibit 35 on page 201
both Chinatown and South End ranges from 3,500 to 9,000 by 1979. BRA officials also find that the Chinese community tends to concentrate in a 10-block area between Tremont Street and Shawmut Avenue, immediately south of Castle Square. This area at present is estimated to contain about 75% of the Chinese in South End. The conditions of the private housing occupied by our basic community are found to be not much better than those in Chinatown and South Cove. Overcrowding, poor environment and unsatisfactory conditions prevail, although housing are more readily available. The possible reason is believed to be the low income among the families of our basic community, who cannot afford more ample living spaces nor standard quality housing. High crime rates are also evident in South End (according to Chinatown Little City Hall, not unusual among Boston neighborhoods). Chinese people although too, are frequent victims, are generally known for their non-resistance, low crime reporting rate and the 'keeping out of trouble' attitude, probably due to the language barrier and cultural stigmatization in the American society. Their reluctance to deal with the public authority is further exacerbated by the legal status of some of them or their families.

Housing in South End is an intricate mixture of old and new, subsidized and non-subsidized, varying from good quality to very poor conditions. It is generally believed that over 50% of South
End residents are receiving some kinds of housing subsidy. BRA also estimated in 1977 that 38% of all the housing, i.e. 4,736 units in South End is under some sort of low or moderate subsidy program. The 1965 Urban Renewal Plan Recommendation of 3,100 units has long been surpassed. With this amount of existing subsidized housing, and strong opposition by the more affluent South End communities, the city has become reluctant to allow any more subsidized housing development in the near future.

On the other hand, the private housing market in South End has enjoyed considerable reinvestments in the past decade, caused by the return of small families and young professionals who find the remodeled Victorian row houses a bargain when compared to new houses, besides having other advantages such as proximity to downtown activities and the cultural variety of the neighborhood. Such 'gentrification' has taken place in various scales and scattered throughout South End creating small pockets intermingled with other moderate and low income housing. To encourage the process of neighborhood revitalization through private investment, the city also set aside considerable public funds mainly targetted toward owner-occupiers such as the Home Improvement Program, other than other on-going federal and state housing programs to promote home ownership.
Public housing program benefits brought to the Chinese community in South End are most noticeable through the construction of the Castle Square which is currently inhabited by many Chinese families. Home ownership among Chinese in South End is still low (14%)\(^1\) when compared to the neighborhood average (18%)\(^2\). Furthermore, judging from the poor living conditions and the overcrowdedness in most Chinese households, they have not been able to make good use of other public assistance such as the Home Improvement Program, which amounted to $100,000 in 1977 for the South End neighborhood. Although almost all community services facilities such as language training, health care, elderly care, etc. are available in South End, Chinese still prefer to depend on those similar services located in Chinatown and South Cove. Probably this is due to their language problem, familiarity with the old neighborhood (for those relocated) and still maintaining a strong and close social and financial tie with Chinatown and South Cove in their every day life.

The South End Urban Renewal Project has not been concluded yet. As of March, 1979, there are about 27.8 ac. of land and properties including 10.2 ac. within our SIA, either owned or controlled by BRA. Among the Urban Renewal land, only 20% of which

\(^1\) CEDC staff survey, March 1979.

\(^2\) BRA South End Neighborhood Profile, 1978
has old structures standing on them. The land resource of new housing development is much more abundant than both Chinatown and South Cove combined. The private housing market also offers much better opportunities for housing construction and rehabilitation, since there is still a plentiful supply of old buildings and vacant lots. New construction and remodeling are found virtually everywhere in the neighborhood. South End represents a logical and inevitable opportunity for the expansion of our community in the future years. However, in view of the city's current reluctance to accept more subsidized housing units in South End, CEDC's housing development effort should on one hand try to influence the city's housing policy while on the other hand, encourage more non-subsidized housing development such as cooperative housing, development of condominiums to be sold at cost to our community, and provide housing referral services for standard low income housing, technical assistance of the HIP, loan guarantees and low interest loans for home purchasing and improvement etc. The City and BRA should also be urged to allow the use of the remaining Urban Renewal parcels especially those close to South Cove for the development of community service facilities, such as Chinese Nursing Homes, South Cove YMCA extension, etc., so as to release the pressure for limited land resources in South Cove for more subsidized housing construction. Furthermore,
the city should also be urged to hire directly, and to support the various South End community agencies in employing more Chinese speaking staff so as to facilitate the use of such facilities by the Chinese community in South End and to relieve part of the pressure in Chinatown and South Cove.

4.9.4 The Leather District

The Leather District covers an eight block area at the fringe of downtown Boston, and lies northeast to Chinatown core separated by the Surface Artery. This area is bounded by vehicular traffic thoroughfares on all sides, i.e. the Surface Artery, Kneeland Street, Atlantic Avenue and Essex Street. In the Neighborhood Strategy Area Program 1978 proposal, the city reported that the buildings in this area are generally 4 to 6 stories in height, and built for fire proof or heavy timber construction in late 1800's. The city found that most of the buildings are in sound conditions, although the size varies - the majority of the buildings are under 8,000 sq. ft. on each floor. Mixed with other industrial buildings, there are about 40 small rowhouse buildings 20 to 30 feet wide and 60 to 70 feet deep, some with windows on both the street and alley elevations. Nevertheless, the MIT Total Studio found in 1977 that with few exceptions, the size,
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configuration and close abuttings of many of the smaller buildings makes it very difficult to convert them to residential use.

With the departure of most leather industries from this area, a few manufacturers and warehouses and some retail activities still remain. The environmental quality is poor particularly during the week days when the streets inside this area and the surrounding traffic arteries are overrun by trucks and other vehicles, generating high levels of noise, dust and exhaust air. With few residents in the Leather District except a small group of artists occupying the loft spaces of some of the buildings, the streets are practically deserted at night. The Surface Artery acts as a barrier separating the Leather District from Chinatown and South Cove where most community facilities are located. At the moment, there are few if any amenities within the district that would make it desirable for residential use by families or elders.

The Leather District is zoned to be a manufacturing area. Therefore, conventional residential use is now prohibited by the City. However, the City is willing to support zoning variances under very rigid guidelines to permit restricted residential use where only 25% of a building under 5,000 sq. ft. in area would be permitted for residential use while the other
75% would be used for commercial or manufacturing purposes. The Zoning Appeal Board has granted the artists residential use under these conditions. It is the City's intention to create an area not unlike the Soho area in New York. The City also hopes the Chinese community would make use of this relaxation and move into the Leather District.

Even with the anticipated public improvements and the availability of housing subsidies, yet, the suitability of Leather District for any major residential development is considered to be only very marginal at least in the near future. The property value and lack of suitable buildings, the sterile characteristics of the area, the deficiency in amenities, the separation from major community facilities by traffic arteries and finally, the poor environmental quality all cast serious doubts over the possibility of any feasible subsidized or non-subsidized housing developments in this area.

4.9.5 Other Areas

There are also other buildings identified either for sale or underutilized that might be used for housing development for our community:
(A) 600, Washington Street Building

The building occupies about 49,000 sq. ft. of land. There are two theaters on the first floor. All the upper floors are offices, some rented to public agencies. The merits about this building are:

1) It is located on Washington Street right in the city's main shopping and office area and yet close to Chinatown and other residential projects, such as the Chauncy House;

2) Its vast floor area estimated at over 350,000 sq. ft. will provide ample commercial space at lower floors and considerable number (about 200)\(^1\) of housing units on the upper floors; and

3) The configuration of the upper floor plan lends itself to convenient conversion into housing units.

---

\(^1\) Estimation based on 1,000 sq. ft. per housing unit
OTHER POTENTIAL PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Land area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a 600 Washington St.</td>
<td>(49,000 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Century Building</td>
<td>(15,400 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Warren Union Bank</td>
<td>(7,200 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(B) **The Century Building**

The Century Building is located in the Combat Zone. Although all the upper floors are vacant, the first floor is fully occupied to a large extent by adult entertainment businesses. The building is in good physical condition and occupies a land area of about 15,400 sq. ft. The total floor area is estimated to be a little less than 93,000 sq. ft. The Century Building has been enlisted on the Preservation List by the Boston Land Marks Commission. Current asking price exceeds $1 million. If this building could be converted to housing, it would probably provide 70 units with additional commercial space on the first floor. However, the high asking price and the relocation problems of the existing adult entertainment businesses are the main causes of reservation for housing development.
4.10 MATCH BETWEEN HOUSING DEMAND AND SUPPLY

With an immediate need of about 450 housing units to accommodate about 1,300 people in Chinatown, South Cove and South End due to overcrowding, poor housing conditions (para. 4.5) and a continuous inflow of more Chinese to Boston in future, our demand for housing will increase by 100 additional units every year. Not withstanding certain unaccountable factors of housing needs as mentioned in paragraph 4.6, which have yet to be revealed by the 1980 census, I attempt to project our future housing needs basing on the know factors only:

1) **Relatively certain projects/within 5 years (by 1985)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Housing supply in no. of h.u.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Cove</td>
<td>C1 and C8 sites - developed by private developer Stanley Chen</td>
<td>225 (elderly Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End:</td>
<td>Scattered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

335 (Total)
2) **Less certain projects/within 10 years (by 1990)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Housing supply in no. of h.u.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown</td>
<td>31 Beach St. Bldg.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison-Tyler site</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edinboro Street site</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cove</td>
<td>R1 site</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End</td>
<td>Scattered</td>
<td>760 (total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing demand in no. of h.u.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979 (immediate)</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The housing supply estimation is made in two categories according to the relative certainty of the proposals and the time required for the delivery of the housing units:

1) **Relatively certain projects/within 5 years (by 1984)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Housing supply in no. of h.u.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown:</td>
<td>Telephone Building Annex</td>
<td>83 (family units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golden Age Center</td>
<td>27 (elderly units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congregate Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **Uncertain projects/beyond 10 years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Housing supply in no. of h.u.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown:</td>
<td>Superblock</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Market Bldg.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cove:</td>
<td>R3 and R3a sits</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 Kneeland St.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Druker Properties</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End:</td>
<td>Scattered</td>
<td>(no estimates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td>Century Bldg.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 Washington St.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above figures show that even if all the housing proposals in the first category could be completed by the end of 1984, the housing shortage in Chinatown, South Cove and South End would be 600 units, much worse than the present shortage of 440 housing units. With the most optimistic expectation that all the projects under the second category are completed by 1990, we will still be short of 350 units, though the gap has been somewhat narrower compared to the present situation.

The above two projections have not included the possibilities of housing developments that might take place in other areas beyond our SIA, Allston-Brighton or Parker Hill-Fenway where Chinese families might be accommodated. However, a greater part of this relief in housing demand would be offset by the great number of Chinese families that are currently living in other neighborhoods but wish to move back to Chinatown, South Cove and the vicinity. Bearing in mind that the great majority of Chinese belong to the basic community and that their attachment to Chinatown has been proven to be very strong, the housing shortage of our community still remain to be solved in the next 10 years.

It seems that whatever we are now planning to do will not be able to cope with community housing needs. The filling of the gap between supply and demand would very much depend on our
successful expansion into other neighborhoods where land and property resources are more available and the introduction of other forms of housing developments that have yet to be explored.

Recommended Actions

1) In Chinatown, South Cove and vicinity:

In order to relieve the imminent housing needs of our community, CEDC should proceed in high gear with the housing developments already planned, and actively support the housing developments pursued by other entities in this neighborhood.

It is also apparent that there is not much vacant land available in Chinatown and South Cove. Whatever is left, therefore, should ideally be used most efficiently for housing and other purposes that conform to the priorities of our community. Therefore, housing developments on Urban Renewal parcels R1, R3 and R3a should be seriously considered. Other designated developers of South Cove Urban Renewal e.g. Tufts and Don Bosco Technical School should also be approached by CEDC regarding the possibilities of joint venture developments for more housing.
Old buildings are for sale from time to time in Chinatown, South Cove, Combat Zone and the vicinity. Although most of them are still too expensive for housing conversion, yet they would be the only resources left for future housing development after all the vacant lands are developed. Therefore, whenever the price is reasonable and the financial status of the buildings is sound while awaiting the actual developments to take place, they should be purchased and reserved for future housing development.

Due to the scacity of rent subsidies which are shared by all Boston communities, CEDC's housing development effort should therefore go beyond the realm of rent subsidized housing to explore also other forms of housing developments, such as skewed rent housing, loan guarantee, condominium or co-operative housing development, which would involve more innovative ways of utilizing public financial resources, either as leverage for private investments, as revolving loans or as self-generating development fund.

2. South End:

South End is considered to be one of the feasible alternative locations for housing developments. However, in view of the
City's reluctance to entertain any more subsidized housing in this area, CEDC should on one hand influence this policy by demonstrating our housing needs in South End, which is still increasing everyday. On the other hand, with the abundance of old residential buildings in South End, CEDC should immediately proceed to study the possibilities of developing such buildings into condominiums, cooperative housing, or setting up technical assistance and counselling services to community members who intend to buy their own homes there.

Similar services should also be offered to the existing Chinese home owners, landlords, and tenants to apply for Home Improvement Program assistance, rent subsidies under Section 8, Chapter 707, or other public assistance programs as a means to upgrade the housing conditions and to stabilize the rent in this neighborhood.

Also, CEDC should urge the city to reinforce and support the staffs of various South End community agencies in respect to their abilities to deal with Chinese clientele. It would help to reduce the dependence of Chinese residents on Chinatown, enhance their accessibility to the more conveniently located community facilities and to assist them to settle down more comfortably in a neighborhood of multi-ethnic characteristics by integrating with the rest of the neighborhood residents.
3. Allston-Brighton and Parker Hill-Fenway:

CEDC should begin to study the Chinese housing situation in all these neighborhoods with a view to help those families that wish either to move to a better living environment or those who wish to buy their own homes. Vacated housing units in Chinatown and South Cove would then serve the purpose of satisfying the more urgent needs of those families whose mobility is limited to Chinatown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth Rate</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Rate</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Boston Department of Health and Hospitals. 1977 rate based on 93 births and 145 deaths in Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood with estimated population of 4,800. (Vital Statistical figures not available for Chinatown or South Cove independently).
Chinese Immigration to Boston and Massachusetts \(^1\) (1958-1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported City Destination</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mass</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

1 Includes immigrants born in China and Taiwan only, except 1976 figures which also include immigrants born in Hong Kong.

### Immigration to Boston and Massachusetts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>China ¹</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>18,823</td>
<td>5,766</td>
<td>24,589</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>18,056</td>
<td>4,629</td>
<td>22,685</td>
<td>1,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>17,339</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>21,730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Includes Mainland China and Taiwan

**SOURCE:** Immigration Services Annual Report, 1972, 1974, 1976, Table 12A

### Exhibit 20

#### Length of Residency in South Cove compared to Boston (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency Duration</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>South Cove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9 years</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more years</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Diagnostic Report of the Residents to be Relocated, South Cove Urban Renewal Project, 1967, BRA.
### FAMILY COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>Number of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (with children)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (with children)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Families</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Families Having:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 children</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 children</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 children</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Families with Children</strong></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDIVIDUALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** BRA, Diagnostic Report of Residents to be Relocated, 1967.
### Housing Conditions in Chinatown and Boston (1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Chinatown</th>
<th>City of Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound 1</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded 2</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. = Data not available

1 The U.S. Department of Commerce defines sound housing as that which has defects that can be corrected during regular maintenance. Deteriorated housing has defects of an intermediate nature that must be corrected if a building is to provide safe and adequate shelter, and dilapidated housing is defined as inadequate and unsafe, requiring extensive repair or rebuilding.

2 More than one person per room.

SOURCE: Action for Boston Community Development Report, 1970
## Housing Conditions of Chinese Households in Chinatown, South Cove and South End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinatown</th>
<th>South Cove</th>
<th>South End</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinatown</th>
<th>South Cove</th>
<th>South End</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. of dila-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pidated or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deteriorated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.u.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. h.h. Size</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. h.u.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Overcrow-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ding</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source
1) BRA South Cove Relocation Plan, 1967
2) Interviews with Mr. Armstrong, Manager of Chauncey House, Ms. Pamela Petrie, Manager of Quincy Towers Association and Ms. Shirley Lee, Manager of Tai Tung Village and Mass Pike Towers
3) CEDC Venture Development Staff, 12/31/77
4) CEDC Housing & Land Development Staff, March, 1979

**Exhibit 23**
Chinese Household Sizes Compared to White Households (1967)

Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals living alone</th>
<th>54%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals living in joint households</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 persons</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 persons</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 persons</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 persons</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 or more persons</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chinese households (percentages based on 234 households)
White households (percentages based on 167 households)

Source: BRA, Diagnostic Report of Residents to be Relocated, 1967.
Exhibit 25

Chinese Household Sizes Compared to Boston Household Sizes (1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons/Household</th>
<th>Percent of Chinese Households</th>
<th>Percent of All Boston Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 persons</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 persons</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 persons</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 persons</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 persons or more</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median, all occupied units 4.8% 3.1%
Median owner occupiers units 4.8%
Median rental occupies units 2.8% 2.0%

Exhibit 26

Locational Preference for Housing Among Chinese Restaurant Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Neighborhoods of Current Residence</th>
<th>Preferred Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown/ South Cove</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allston-Brighton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Boston</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution of Chinese housing needs according to distribution of household sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of households</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Size of housing units</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Immediate housing needs</th>
<th>Annual increment of needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pop.</td>
<td>H.u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1-2 rooms</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 persons</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2-3 rooms</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 persons</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4-5 rooms</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more persons</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6 or more rooms</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NOTE: Sizes of housing unit determined by the standard of maximum one person per room.

**SOURCE:**
(1) CEDC staff, March, 1979.
(2) Tufts University Department of Sociology and Boston Chinese Community Health Services Inc. report 1974-1975.
Housing Needs of Various Unit Sizes in the Two Family Housing Estates in South Cove by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of h.u.</th>
<th>No. of h.u. Existing</th>
<th>No. of Applications</th>
<th>No. of Appl'n per h.u.</th>
<th>Housing Needs by Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 rooms</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 rooms</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 rooms</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 rooms</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1.12 (avg.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elderly Housing Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Housing</th>
<th>Total No. of h.u.</th>
<th>Total No. Appl'n</th>
<th>No. of Appl'n per h.u.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 rooms</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: 1) Number of rooms includes living room and bed rooms but excludes kitchens, bathrooms and store rooms.
2) Size applicants apply for by units at more than one project, the number can only be treated more accurately to show the pattern of demand rather than absolute quality of demand.

SOURCE: 1) CEDC staff, March, 1979
### Exhibit 29

#### Chinatown and Anti-Poverty Target Areas

**Ranked by Median Family Income, 1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-target areas</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roxbury-N. Dorchester</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>$7,125</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Plane and Parker Hill-Fenway</td>
<td>$6,999</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allston-Brighton</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlestown &amp; South Boston</td>
<td>$5,917</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Boston &amp; North End</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINATOWN</td>
<td>$5,170</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Boston</td>
<td>$7,543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 1969 Boston Area Survey, and Diagnostic Report of Residents to be Relocated, South Cove Urban Renewal Project, 1967. BRA figures are expressed 1969 dollars.

### Comparative Statistics

**Chinatown - South Cove**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>South Cove Beach St. District</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Families with annual income less than $5,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Chinatown-South Cove District Profile & Proposed 1978-1980 Neighborhood Improvement Program, by BRA, 1978.
Exhibit 30

Maximum Affordable Housing Costs
Four-Person Family, Boston (Fall, 1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income $ Per Year</th>
<th>Maximum Amount Available for Housing $ Per Year</th>
<th>$ Per Month</th>
<th>% of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,000 or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothetical Balance Sheet of a 3-Family House Owner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of 3-family house</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downpayment from saving</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual family income @ 10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable housing expense @ 20%, i.e.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual income from renting 2 extra h.u. @ $250 p.m.</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total affordable housing expense per year</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual debt service @ 10% constant</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual maintenance, tax and utilities</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing expenses per year</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ZONING DISTRICT MAP OF S.I.A

### RESIDENCE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Max FAR</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Two Family</th>
<th>Apartment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUSINESS DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Max FAR</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>Local Retail &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>Retail Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Max FAR</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Light Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>General Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Waterfront Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Scale in Feet:

ZONING DISTRICT BOUNDARY
Restricted Parking District Boundary
Adult Entertainment Overlay

Prepared by the Boston Zoning Commission

Exhibit 32
LOCATIONS OF POTENTIAL PROPERTIES IN CHINATOWN

Exhibit 33

- 'Superblock'
- Eastern Market Bldg.
- Tele.Bldg.Annex
- Edinboro Street Proj.
- Ping On Street Proj.
- CMA owned buildings
- Harrison-Tyler site
- 31 Beach Street
Potential Sites for Housing, Development in South Cove.

- Undesignated UR Parcels
- Designated UR Parcel P12
- Potential private properties
- Elevated Orange Line
- South Cove UR Boundary

Exhibit 34
Designated UR parcels
Undesignated UR parcels
South End UR boundary

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT PARCELS IN SOUTH END

Exhibit 35 0 1000 2000 4000 ft.
5.0 Other Land Development Objectives

"To extend the community control of land and to encourage more intensive, mixed developments in and around Chinatown core, with a view to integrate community development with the city growth pattern and to facilitate community economic advancement through the creation of more jobs and business opportunities provided that:

(1) The existing viable social structure will be preserved;

(2) No displacement of families outside their existing neighborhood will be necessary; and

(3) The environmental quality will be maintained at a satisfactory standard."
CEDC has stated that its purpose is ".....to improve the socio-economic conditions of the Chinese American community in the Greater Boston area and to preserve, share and enhance its cultural heritage." This purpose has remained to be the principal reason for the existence of our agency and should be the guideline for all the functions of CEDC, including housing and land development.

The Boston Chinatown has in the recent years subject to very strong pressure for development. Major development projects include Lafayette Place, General Services Administration Building in the north, South Station hotel/retail and office developments in the east, Tufts New England Medical Center and University expansions in the south and the State Transportation Center, Park Plaza, and the Theatre Revitalization Scheme in the east.¹

These developments have on one hand brought Chinatown to bear some unprecedented development pressure which has been adversely affecting the community housing developments in this area. However, on the other hand, external investments would also represent substantial potentials for economic advancements of many Boston communities including Chinatown if appropriate and timely actions are taken on the part of our community, public authorities and private investors.

In the following sections we shall discuss the positive and negative impacts of these major developments, the steps we should take to

¹. Exhibit 3 on page 17
enhance community economic development and the precautionary measures necessary to preserve our social structures, to avoid displacements of families and to safeguard the environmental qualities of our neighborhood. The area that the following discussion will concentrate is shown in Exhibit 36.
5.1 EXISTING LAND USE OF CHINATOWN PROPER

As our community continues to grow beyond its original settlement, Chinatown proper has become more and more an area of mixed commercial and residential developments. The prototype of Chinatown buildings consists of commercial space on the first floor and walk up apartments on upper floors. Beach Street, is the heart of the Chinese commercial district. Side streets opening onto Beach Street such as Harrison Avenue, Tyler Street, Oxford Street and Hudson Street are also lined up on both sides with various kinds of shops. The predominant businesses found in Chinatown are food retail business, restaurant and groceries. There are also a number of gift shops, book stores, pharmacy, banks, food factories and professional offices.

Chinatown proper is bounded by the Combat Zone in the west and the Surface Artery in the east while the northern and southern sides are flanked by a belt of industrial buildings and warehouses, where most garment factories are located - along Essex Street, Kneeland Street and some of the side streets. The concentration of garment factories in this area draws the supply of low wage labor from the Chinatown and South Cove community, and also takes the advantage of the low rent in these gradually outdated industrial spaces developed more than half a century ago (below $3.0/sq.ft.) Nevertheless, the garment industry in Boston is slowly declining due to keen competitions with other parts of this country such as New York, some southern states and large quantities of imported garments.
5.2 MAJOR URBAN DEVELOPMENTS AROUND CHINATOWN

The currently planned major urban developments surrounding Chinatown represents a total of over $260 million private and public investments. The nature of the projects varies greatly - commercial, entertainment, tourism, educational, institutional, and their various supportive facilities and provisions. 1

5.2.1 Lafayette Place

The Lafayette Place development represents a $71.8 million public and private investment program in the center of downtown Boston and encompasses a major retail/hotel complex, a new city garage and ancillary public investments. The project area contains approximately 6.0 acres of predominantly vacant property. Key components of the project include:

1) A 30,000 sq.ft. retail area;

2) A 450 room, high quality hotel approximately 42 stories high;

3) 1,500 parking spaces - to be provided by the City;

4) Construction of a new east-west arterial street to facilitate the movements of vehicles to and from the project;

1. Exhibit 36 on page 252
5) Project construction and improvements to streets and sidewalks in the vicinity; and

6) Construction of a pedestrian-way joining Jordan Marsh to Lafayette Place.

Acquisition of properties, and design work have already started. Construction is scheduled to begin in 1979, with the garage and new road pattern to be completed by 1980-81, and the retail-hotel complex by 1982. The Lafayette Place project is driving up the values of all the properties along the circumference of the project. CEDC's housing development effort has been most heavily dampened by the high asking prices (over $20.0/sq.ft.) along Essex Street (the Edinboro Street Project Area) and Norfolk Street.

5.2.2 The State Transportation Building and Park Plaza

The State Transportation Building, an L-shaped, mid-rise office building with approximately 600,000 sq.ft. of office space, a 60,000 sq.ft. walk-through, street level arcade, enclosed parking for 400 cars, will occupy a site fronting along the new line of Charles Street and along Stuart Street to the corner of Tremont. Construction is expected to begin in 1979, and total investment would amount to about $50 million.

The State Transportation Building only represents the first phase of the Park Plaza Project, which includes a mix of hotel, apartment,
office and retail construction covering roughly the area bounded by Arlington, Boylston, Tremont and Stuart Streets except the Pina Row Buildings along Boylston and the Park Plaza Hotel. Other than the Lex Hotel directly opposite to the Boston Common, which is now being actively considered, other proposals remain rather schematic at this stage.

5.2.3 The Theatre District Revitalization Scheme

Initiated by Mayor Kevin White, both the City and BRA are jointly engaged in an effort to get the Boston Theatre District redeveloped as a cohesive unit of legitimate theatre activities and other related entertainment businesses, such as high class restaurants, discotheques, lounges, etc. Although not as direct a development pressure as Lafayette Place or the State Transportation Building, as BRA sees it, there are a number of planned public and private improvements within the Theatre District:

1) Improvements on pedestrian amenities so as to make a positive impact on the environment e.g. new and reconstructed pedestrian paths connecting all major theatres, restaurants and parking facilities, new lighting fixtures, signage and information kiosks;

2) Multi-level, glass-enclosed atrium surrounded by retail space in the State Transportation Office Building and the Music Hall renovation;
3) Parcel C4 proposed to be a retail mall which provides ground floor uses that will complement the pedestrian activity and unique identity of the District; and

4) Rehabilitation of the Music Hall into a facility capable of accommodating the largest touring companies, such as the Metropolitan Opera - currently the host to a variety of events ranging from rock concerts to Tchaikovsky's "Nutcracker Suite". It is in line for $3.5 million renovation of its interior, a stage expansion and new dressing rooms.

5.2.4 Tufts New England Medical Center

The Tufts expansion plan had its origin in a 1966 agreement signed by Tufts and Edward Logue, BRA Director under Mayor John Collins. The agreement ceded to Tufts the development rights for land bounded Kneeland, Tremont, Oak and Tyler Streets. Expansions are planned to take place in stages until 1995. The two earliest additions beginning in the next one to two years will be the Nutrition Center ($23 million) on Stuart and Washington Streets and a new pediatric wing of hospital ($40 million) using the air rights over Washington Street joining the Tufts facilities on both sides. The total estimated construction cost for these two additions would well exceed $60 million. Other components of the the expansion plan include further expansion of the medical school, a new veterinary

---

1. Appendix 2
The spatial requirement for the new Federal Government Office Building stands at about 1 million sq.ft. with an associated garage to hold 600 cars. From fiscal year 1979 funds, the GSA has already received an appropriation of $475,198,000 for the purpose of constructing this office which is expected to realize within the next several years. Between BRA and GSA officials, the possible use of ground floor space for retail stores, similar to what is planned at the State Transportation Office Building, has been discussed although it is still prematured for any concrete proposal.

5.2.6 South Station Development Proposals

The South Station area has long been conceived as a preferable location for the extension of Boston's office and financial district. Recent additions include the Federal Reserve Bank Building, the Stone and Webster Building, Blue Cross and Blue Shield Building, and the 175, Federal Street Building.

Other proposals either privately or publicly initiated include a vast indoor stadium to replace the aging Boston Garden, a 1,200-room hotel with 50,000 sq.ft. exhibition space, an 800-car garage and other retail, restaurant, lounge spaces.

All proposals, with the exception of a major garage, are still rather remote and uncertain at this stage. However, developments proposed in the South Station area will definitely cause considerable impacts on both the Leather District and Chinatown due to their proximity.
5.2.7 Overview of external developments

In the future five to ten years, Chinatown will be most significantly impacted by a circumscribing development arc stretching from the north through the west to the south of Chinatown proper, covering the Lafayette Place, lower Washington Street area, the Theatre District and Tufts expansions, giving rise to a series of new land uses such as offices, retail, hotel, high class residential spaces, laboratories and institutions.

In a report prepared by BRA in 1978 on the basic planning and land use policy regarding the lower Washington Street area, the planners proposed two major areas of activities. One area centers on the Washington Street Freedom Mall/Lafayette Place and the other area covers most of the legitimate theatre district around Tremont and Stuart Streets junction. In between these two areas, BRA proposed a series of high class residential developments, street level malls with offices on upper stories, hotels and renovated old theatres.

New focal points of interests would be formed at important junctions such as between Tremont/Kneeland Streets, Essex/Washington Streets, Winter/Washington Streets, Charles/Boylston Streets, etc. Major public improvements would be staged along the routes connecting these focal points in co-ordination with private redevelopments with a view to bring back the vitality of this old entertainment area and to bridge a major missing link which now exists between the two
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In the future five to ten years, Chinatown will be most significantly impacted by a circumscribing development arc stretching from the north through the west to the south of Chinatown proper, covering the Lafayette Place, lower Washington Street area, the Theatre District and Tufts expansions, giving rise to a series of new land uses such as offices, retail, hotel, high class residential spaces, laboratories and institutions.

In a report prepared by BRA in 1978 on the basic planning and land use policy regarding the lower Washington Street area, the planners proposed two major areas of activities. One area centers on the Washington Street Freedom Mall/Lafayette Place and the other area covers most of the legitimate theatre district around Tremont and Stuart Streets junction. In between these two areas, BRA proposed a series of high class residential developments, street level malls with offices on upper stories, hotels and renovated old theatres.

New focal points of interests would be formed at important junctions such as between Tremont/Kneeland Streets, Essex/Washington Streets, Winter/Washington Streets, Charles/Boylston Streets, etc. Major public improvements would be staged along the routes connecting these focal points in co-ordination with private redevelopments with a view to bring back the vitality of this old entertainment area and to bridge a major missing link which now exists between the two
downtown development centers around the Financial District/City Hall and Back Bay/Insurance Center.  

Although momentarily, the Combat Zone still enjoys considerable prosperity (CEDC survey indicates that in 1978 the total business volume might have reached $50 million for the adult entertainment businesses) the combined political and economic pressure to force the exit of the adult entertainment businesses from the Combat Zone is expected to accumulate increasing momentum in future.  

In the 1978 proposal for Neighborhood Strategy Area Program, the City reported,  

"Chinatown tourists traffic is discouraged at the present time by the proximity of Chinese restaurants and gift shops to the Combat Zone, Boston's "Adult Entertainment District".  
The City has recently begun a multi-faceted program to control activities in the Combat Zone so as to minimize problems.  
Heavy police patrolling and a crackdown on liquor licensing enforcement has had a positive impact.  In addition, the BRA is now studying the area to make recommendations on its future and how to eliminate the adverse effect which the Zone has on surrounding developments.  Although the study is in a preliminary stage, it appears likely that there will be a recommendation of a combination of public and private investment in the Combat Zone over the next few years which will upgrade the overall environment both in the Zone and the surrounding areas."
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The probable emergence of a major federal government office as proposed by GSA and BRA in the Combat Zone (the location of both two final site alternatives selected for the new GSA Building are within Combat Zone's proximity) might also hasten the moving away of the undesirable businesses. The idea of a hotel development has been proposed by a Chinese developer who owns the corner block between Washington Street and Kneeland Street. The current shortage of hotel facilities in Boston could make such a proposal feasible, being readily accessible to Chinatown, the entertainment area and major office and retail centers. However, hotel development in Combat Zone was regarded by BRA as a remotely likely in view of many competing hotel sites in downtown Boston.

In April, 1979, BRA revealed that there are 25 hotel proposals awaiting study or approval of the City. 19 of these proposals (totalling 10,050 rooms) are now under review by the agency, and among these, the following proposals are within walking distance from Chinatown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reserve Hotel</td>
<td>Post Office Square</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Place</td>
<td>Downtown Washington St.</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lex Hotel</td>
<td>Park Square</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Associate</td>
<td>South Station</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA Project</td>
<td>South Station Terminal</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritz-Carlton Addition</td>
<td>Back Bay</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2500 (Total)
These hotel proposals roughly represents 25 percent of the total number of new hotel rooms and thus would probably generate 25 percent of the construction jobs (about 3,400) and 25 percent of permanent jobs (about 1,800) in connection with hotel development and operation.

More parking facilities (400 spaces at the State Transportation Office Building, 900 at Lafayette Place, 600 at Hayward Garage, 600 at GSA Building and more at Tufts expansion) would be built to support the intensified activities generated by new developments. Street widening and improvements along Stuart and Kneeland Streets, Boylston and Essex Streets, and West Street have also been planned to allow smoother traffic flow and improve the accessibility to this area by automobiles.

It is also expected that the cheap industrial space (current rents vary between $0.75 and $3.0 per sq.ft.) currently occupying some of the old industrial and mercantile buildings north and south of Chinatown would be either gradually replaced by occupancies of higher returns, or redeveloped to accommodate more housing, office and commercial spaces due to a new pattern of demand for space and land use. In the future years to come, this area would become a "hard area" for development in the jargon of BRA planners. Furthermore, the increase in the volume of street traffic both vehicular and pedestrian would render trucking materials and industrial products less tolerable to the immediate environment. Only industries of high technology and manufactories of high
capital intensity products might still be compatible and could afford to remain in this area tapping the advantage of the large pool of skillful downtown labor. Marginal or low return manufactories of low capital but high labor intensity products with large spatial requirements would be gradually displaced out from this area of upward rising values to cheaper locations. The long existence of garment industry around Chinatown would therefore subject to heavy pressure in the next five to ten years.

The Leather District seems to be a perfect location for the relocation of the latter type of industries. However, as mentioned before in para. 4.9.4, the industrial buildings in this area are apparently too small (the majority are under 8,000 sq.ft. in area) even for the garment industry which requires large horizontal spaces.

The policy of BRA with respect to the Leather District seems to be rather conservative of any major changes. On one hand, the Leather District is still being zoned for industrial use where only very low density and special types of residential use would be tolerated. On the other hand, BRA is currently pushing forward to upgrade the environment of the Leather District, including the listing of the whole area as a Land Mark, with an intention to allocate public funds for environmental improvements, technical assistance for building renovation and encouraging artists to make use of the many vacant loft spaces as their workshops.
A major computer manufacturer, Teredyne is in the process of renovating the two largest buildings in this district to house their newly expanded facilities. Being isolated by traffic arteries on all sides, development pressure in the Leather District seems to be less heavy. The long term future of this area is not clear at this point. In the next few years, it would probably remain to be a rather "soft area", awaiting the consolidation of developments in the nearby areas such as South Station and Chinatown. With the area dominated by industrial use, warehouses and the associated heavy trucking traffic, it is less likely for the Leather District to adopt itself into commercial or residential use in the near future.¹

¹. Leather District Map on page
5.3 **THE TRAFFIC, PARKING PROBLEM AND THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS ON CHINATOWN**

CEDC has on several occasions urged the city to deal with the parking facilities shortages and traffic congestion in the narrow streets in Chinatown. Although much has been planned, yet little has been accomplished so far.

Parking facilities which are vital to both commercial and industrial developments are absolutely inadequate in Chinatown proper with about only 350 public or private parking spaces mostly occupied for the whole day by workers in the nearby areas. Short to medium period parking are particularly difficult to find in day time. While other major garages in downtown and the Leather District might be underutilized at night, their locations are either too far, or the pedestrian connections to Chinatown have to go through some poorly lit, deserted streets where pedestrians would begin to worry about their safety after dark. Based on CEDC's estimation, there are 11.7 acres commercial spaces in Chinatown. If one parking space is required for every 1,200 sq.ft. of commercial space, the number of parking spaces required to serve Chinatown would be about 430, and increasing by 40 more spaces per year due to the annual growth of commercial space estimated at about 50,000 sq.ft. by CEDC in March, 1979.

Chinatown streets are narrow and clogged by traffic almost from early morning to night time. The only variation is the degree of
congestion. Streets are congested by pedestrians and all kinds of moving traffic and parked vehicles:

1. Long period parking by the workers and business owners in Chinatown;

2) Trucks and vans making deliveries;

3) Vans waiting and picking up restaurant workers two times a day at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m.;

4) Short period parking by shoppers and customers (daytime customers usually come on foot only, knowing the scarcity of parking facilities).

5) Cars waiting and circling for parking spaces; and

6) Through traffic exiting from the Expressway and approaching downtown trying to by-pass traffic lights on Kneeland Street - most serious during peak hours.

The City's current policy is not to increase the total number of parking spaces within an area which encompasses all downtown including Chinatown but rather to rely on public transportation improvement. However, in the BRA report on Lower Washington Street in 1978, there are proposals for substantial increase of parking facilities either attached to major development projects or as an independent facility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current parking facilities</th>
<th>Number of spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinatown:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers' Garage (24 hours)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurb side and parking lot</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts NEMC (24 hours)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Johnson's Sack 57 (24 hours)</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapiro Garage (7 a.m. - 6 p.m.)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Essex garage (6 a.m. - 9 p.m.)</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford-Kingston garage (7 a.m. - 10 p.m.)</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,383</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed parking facilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Office</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA Building</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Place</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haywood garage renovation</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts expansion</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood that a greater part of these new provisions would be needed just to cope with the expanded demand for parking generated by the new developments. While many of them would be

1. Exhibit 38 on page 254
reserved for the workers, a substantial proportion, according to BRA, would also be allocated for short time parking by the shoppers in downtown areas generally - including shoppers and customers who would come to Chinatown. Since there is no possible way that the parking shortage problem in Chinatown could be resolved within its small congested area, the problem should be brought to the attention of the authorities and planned in conjunction with the parking facilities of other new developments in the nearby areas.

Two most important considerations would include:

1) The provision of more short-term day-time parking spaces for shoppers; and

2) The provision or improvement of pedestrian connections from major garages to the Chinatown commercial area.

Regarding the traffic pattern in this area, BRA suggests in the Lower Washington Street Report three major east-west traffic routes along Stuart-Kneeland Streets, Boylston-Essex Streets and West Street zig-zagging through the Lafayette Place Project joining the Surface Artery.¹ North-south traffic would still move along two major arteries, i.e. Tremont Street and the Surface Artery. There is a further plan to revise the Surface Artery into an underground artery in the long run. The long delayed China Gate would eventually

¹ Exhibit 39 on page 255
be installed over Beach Street at the Surface Artery end shortly. Entrance to Beach Street would then be narrowed down to one lane only, so as to discourage through traffic.

As far as traffic flow improvement and environmental quality of Chinatown neighborhood is concerned, the depressing of the Surface Artery would have positive long lasting and most effective impacts. To a lesser extent, a narrower entrance to Beach Street would also reduce the volume of traffic moving through Beach Street at the expense of the convenience for those destined to Chinatown. While the Stuart-Kneeland and Boylston-Essex arteries are merely re-stating the existing level of usage, improvements on road surfacing, traffic light control, etc. can only improve the flow marginally. Substantial widening to either road is quite unlikely. Furthermore, no consideration has been given to the additional amount of traffic generated by the new developments such as retail, theatre, office or other additional activities. The conflict between the pedestrians and vehicular traffic would increase, due to an increase of both kinds of users, competing for the limited amount of road surface. The environmental quality would also be further aggravated due to a higher level of exhaust from automobiles.

The new major east-west traffic route proposed by BRA going between the Lafayette Place and Chinatown constitutes a substantial barrier for pedestrian movements between the two places on the street level. Its objective is more to provide convenient vehicular access to the Lafayette Place and the Washington Street Freedom Mall retail area
than to ease the east-west through traffic. Although BRA has studied the traffic and environmental implications of the Lafayette Place Project and its associated traffic requirements and found the results to be satisfactory, CEDC has raised considerable doubts about the methodology of the study, the representativeness of the data collected and the negligence of the combined effects of all other major developments in this area. These comments were sent to the State Department of the Environmental Affairs in early 1979, requesting for a more careful re-study of the situation.

Based on BRA's proposal in their Lower Washington Street report, it is rather questionable about the possibility of any improvements on the traffic flow and the environmental quality of Chinatown and South Cove, particularly when taking into account of the future increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic loads. With due concerns about the long term safety, convenience, efficiency of access to this area by both pedestrians and vehicles, a pleasant, healthy and unpolluted environment, more drastic and radical actions by the public authorities are called for. Chinatown and South Cove neighborhood must now take active steps to urge public authorities to provide more conveniently accessible parking facilities around Chinatown, to depress the Surface Artery as soon as possible, to redesign and implement the traffic pattern for this part of the city and perhaps to undertake major improvements and road widening on both sides of the Massachusetts Turnpike so as to ease the east-west traffic and to share the ever increasing loads on the older roads. Finally, the eventual conversion of the Beach Street to a pedestrian mall would greatly enhance the environmental quality and commercial developments in Chinatown.
The mainstay of Chinese commercial industry in America has been the food related businesses such as restaurants, food retails, groceries and laundry business. Industrialization and socio-economic changes have brought about the rapid decline of the conventional Chinese laundries, leaving the restaurants and food retail businesses over saturated and heatedly competitive especially in Chinatown.

The main problems of commercial development in Chinatown identified in the Overall Economic Development Proposal (OEDP)\(^1\) are:

1) Saturation of restaurants;

2) Lack of Chinese food wholesalers, food processors and food producers; and

3) The need for physical clean up of the area.

Nevertheless, the restaurant industry is still the backbone of the Chinese community as the OEDP goes on to point out. Most of the Chinese labor force is employed in this industry and restaurants occupy the greater part of the commercial space available in Chinatown. For these reasons, CEDC has selected the following as its commercial development goals:

---

1. Source: CEDC
1) To strengthen the restaurant industry; and

2) To capitalize on the Chinese knowledge of food and food service through horizontal and/or vertical developments.

The strengthening of restaurant industry and the horizontal linkages and diversification of food retail business would have to tie into the community commercial development plan and the pattern of market demand brought by various urban development projects. The vertical linkages would mean extension of Chinese food wholesaling, food processing and food production businesses which are dealt with under the industrial development section to follow.

In recent years, Chinese food has become increasingly popular among Americans, more Chinese restaurants are springing up almost everywhere in Boston and the surrounding suburbs. A Yellow Page survey on Chinese restaurants within Boston, Brookline, Cambridge and Somerville reveals that the current number of Chinese restaurants within this area is about 180 and has been increasing at a rate of 10 percent annually in the past few years. Yet the restaurant business in Chinatown has suffered long time stagnation probably due to the lack of diversity of the kinds of food, over saturation of the market and probably other economic reasons, but the location of Chinatown is certainly one of the significant causes:
1) The traffic congestion and the limited car parking facilities in this area deter many urban or suburban customers and out-of-town tourists.

2) The Combat Zone makes Chinatown rather inaccessible from the theatre, retail and office district except by passing through stigmatized areas, discouraging all but the most dedicated connoiseurs of Chinese cuisine.

3) The poor municipal services and the lack of public amenities in Chinatown render the external environment little appealing to visitors.

Furthermore, what applies to the restaurant and food retailing businesses as mentioned above is also equally applicable to a large extent of other retail and tourist related businesses such gift shops, artifact shops, or other specialty shops.

Development of the various downtown projects would in the future years generate additional demand for various kinds of services and increase the business volumes in Chinatown. Promotion of the retail business, tourism, entertainment activities and job opportunities in the neighboring areas by the public and private sectors would be compatible to and enhance our commercial development goals. The development environment around Chinatown has built up considerable potentials for furthering community commercial developments. Therefore, the commercialization tendency of Chinatown is expected to continue in the foreseeable future. However, Chinese merchants
have been so far limited to just the traditionally Chinese businesses. In order to capture more benefits of a growing market, we need to expand into other lines of business to cater for the general Boston community. Furthermore, with the expected withdrawal of the adult entertainment business from the Combat Zone, this area would become more attractive to major development interests. The Chinese community which is weak in political and financial resources would have to face strong competition in order to expand into the more desirable locations such as the lower Washington Street. In order to ensure that the future developments in this area would be compatible with community objectives, actions should now be taken to control the lands and properties at strategically favorable locations so as to anchor firmly into the city's growth areas, to expand our community into more desirable locations and within our neighborhood boundary to preserve and enhance the image of the Chinese cultural heritage. The achievement of these community development goals would depend on four factors:

1) The success of the community to control more land and properties that might provide sufficient space for commercial growth at desirable and strategically located sites;

2) The improvements of the accessibility to the Chinatown commercial areas from the main activity areas such as the retail centers, theatre district, major parking facilities, etc. by pedestrians and automobiles;

3) The improvement of external environment and amenities to convert Chinatown into a pleasant and inviting tourist and shopping area;
4) The ability for Chinese business men to diversify the nature of business beyond the comparatively narrow market of traditionally Chinese businesses.

The improvements of traffic pattern, parking facilities, external amenities and municipal services will depend on how persistent our community could be to convince the authority of our needs. In the meantime, community initiated efforts might also be introduced such as the garbage collecting program as described in the OEDP, CEDC's store front improvement program which has received support from the City, and the recent image promotion by putting up "Chinatown" banners along the main commercial streets in Chinatown. In order to achieve the best results, such efforts should be carried out in co-ordination with the developmental and promotional efforts of the public and private sectors outside Chinatown, so as to facilitate a continuation of activities extending into the Chinatown commercial area.

A group of properties have been identified in paragraph 4.9 either for sale or underutilized. Those that have potentials for commercial or mixed commercial/residential development include most of the Chinatown and downtown sites: Edinboro Street sites, Harrison-Tyler Street site, Ping On Street site, 31, Beach Street building, the 'Superblock', the Eastern Market, the Chinese Merchants Association owned buildings, 75 Kneeland Street building, 15-19 and 25-43 Kneeland Street buildings (Druker's properties), 600 Washington Street building and the Century Building.  
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CEDC's pursuit of commercial space development apparently should follow directions which would eventually lead to coupling with the main activity areas of the city or improving their accessibility to Chinatown. The extension of Chinatown westwards into the Combat Zone with an intention to replace the adult entertainment business has been encouraged by BRA and the City. Expanding westwards and northwards would hopefully bring the Chinese commercial facilities within easy and convenient reach of the theatre district, the office area, the hotels and the retail area.

Speculating on the future growth and upgrading of the area, the more marketable properties north and west of Chinatown are increasing in land values and rent rapidly. For example, the asking prices of the Boylston Building, 600 Washington Street building and the Warren Union Bank building range from $5.0 to $10.0 per sq.ft. While rehab subsidized housing development can only support an acquisition cost of about $2.0 to $4.0 per sq.ft. of floor space according to current FHA and MHFA guidelines, housing projects in these areas needs higher income such as commercial spaces on the lower floors to make developments financially more feasible. Even market value non-subsidized housing would benefit from a mixed development of this nature. Besides, the two components are mutually beneficial, for commercial establishment on the lower floors would reduce the housing cost and provide convenient access to a variety of day-to-day needs, while housing developments on the upper floors will inject live and action into the neighborhood. Co-ordinately, they make the best use of the site, intensify the use of scarce land resources and make a higher development cost less insurmountable.
In the recent Loan and Investment Committee on March 6, 1979 CEDC staff estimated that the demand for ground floor commercial space would increase by 50,000 sq.ft. per year. If this projected demand could be substantiated by market studies, it would be appropriate for CEDC to acquire properties in prime locations where commercial growth is desirable, whenever the price is right and the opportunity arises. The total ground floor area in the properties identified earlier in this paragraph amounts to over 200,000 sq.ft. Therefore, in the next few years, there seems to be ample rooms for community commercial development.
5.5 INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

In the Overall Economic Development Proposal, CEDC pointed out that,

"Chinese employment and ownership is concentrated in the two declining industries (food and garment) and in the retail industry of Chinatown. The number of Chinese who are unemployed or underemployed is very high and most Chinese entrepreneurs have not successfully made the transition from Chinese dominated industries to other more rapidly growing ones. For these reasons CEDC has chosen to pursue the following goals:

-to provide increased employment and higher wage opportunities to Chinese workers;

-to provide ownership potential to Chinese entrepreneurs;

-to provide profit sharing opportunities to Chinese workers; and

-to provide entry into the growth or leading sectors of the local economy."

To achieve the above goals, CEDC has chosen the following strategies:
1) Diversifying the industrial base of Chinatown into other more stable or growth oriented industries;

2) Expanding the share of other industries in the area such as electronic industry; and

3) Diversification away from the traditional food, garment industry mode of investment.

In the interim, CEDC, has over the last few years, initiated, involved in or been actively investigating the following potential areas of industries interested in expanding or starting up business within our SIA. Their spatial requirements were presented to the Loan and Investment Committee on March 6, 1979 as guidelines for future industrial space development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Spatial Needs (sq.ft.)</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teradyne</td>
<td>100,000-200,000</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a manufacturer of computer parts based at the Leather District)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needle Industry</td>
<td>150-200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Merchandise Mart</td>
<td>150-300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Systems Architects, Incorporated</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a manufacturer of computer parts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CEDC Ventures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Advanced Electronics</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Heat Extractor</td>
<td>25-35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Dosimeter</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Lasertron</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. A.W. China Foods</td>
<td>25-35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Banks &amp; White</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further industrial space demand comes from the need for relocation from Chinatown and the commercial areas, or further expansion or start up of garment, food processing, food manufacturing and other traditionally Chinese industries. The extent of additional industrial space needs in the next few years due to relocation would depend on the following factors:

1) The increase of commercial and office space demand which tends to displace the existing industrial use from the potential commercial areas around Chinatown west of Kneeland Street;

2) The continuous viability of the garment and other traditional industries within the SIA; and

3) The satisfactory resolution of the financial implications due to relocation.

Since the traditional industries are the major employers of the Chinese labor force, part of CEDC's effort should be devoted to save these industries from further decline and to up-grade their facilities in order to maintain the amount of available jobs for our community in the near future. This effort would have to go concurrently with the development of new industries and diversification of our industrial base so as to facilitate a smooth transition from a localized, low-skill industrial base to a growing, leading high-technology industrial base. While old traditional jobs are saved, and new jobs are created, presumably with training programs for the workers, there would be no pain in the process of transition.
Prime industrial space around Chinatown, unfortunately is not plentiful. Further commercialization of Chinatown and the area west of Kneeland Street would reduce the industrial space supply further. The Leather District, although has ample underutilized industrial space, and is conveniently accessible by our community, yet most of the available buildings are too small in size to accommodate most modernized industries. In order to make the existing buildings more adaptable to modernized industrial use, feasibility studies should be carried out regarding the development of several adjacent industrial buildings as a package, whereby larger and more marketable industrial space could be formed by joining the buildings together whenever their floor levels are compatible.

Given the size and nature of the existing buildings, the Leather District would seem to be suitable only for small to medium scale or family type industries. Therefore, the incentives for relocation of the traditionally industries now operating around Chinatown have not been very great. The available space is seldom large enough to allow significant overhauling of the old industrial mode to suit the more profitable, efficient, streamline production as required by most up-to-date modernized industries. Large horizontal space with adequate headrooms (about 18 ft.) and concrete floor to accommodate modern industrial plants and facilitate efficient production management are practically quite impossible to find within Chinatown or the Leather District areas.
In order to save the traditional industries from leaving this area and to make available more desirable space for new industries, more innovative actions have to be taken. In certain parts of South End, there are still empty lots and underutilized warehouses available for industrial space development. Further investigation should be carried out between Washington Street and Albany Street south of the Massachusetts Turnpike for suitable sites or buildings for industrial space development.

In the vast area covered by the South End Urban Renewal Project, BRA owns over 8 acres of land and properties. Pooling together public financial assistance from HUD, EDA, CSA, SBA and other state/city programs, in the form of acquisition cost write down, development loan guarantees, venture development capital grants, tax concessions, etc. development of new industrial parks might be feasible to cater for modernized industrial establishments. On one hand, new industries would be brought into old urban areas close to large pools of labor, and on the other hand more jobs could be created for the Chinatown, South Cove and South End neighborhoods right at their door steps.
The Chinatown Core is a unique situation of competing land uses. Among the commercial, industrial and residential uses of space, the latter two are more vulnerable to the adverse effects of upward rising land values, rents and persistent development pressures around Chinatown due to their less flexible adjustability to economic crunches in this particular setting. Since most of the houses in Chinatown are owned by absentee owners (owner-occupants represent only 5% of the residents) and most of the tenants are low-income families (median family income at $5,170 in Chinatown compared to city median at $9,133), resistance to economic pressures has only been weak and disorganized if any. The adverse implications against the existing largely low-income families in Chinatown have been built up tremendously in the past few years. This tendency is only expected to continue in future as Chinatown becomes more commercialized and other major urban projects continue to be develop in the vicinity.

During this transitional period, the range of rent level varies very substantially but in most cases the variation seems to go up rather than down. Rents have shot up in a most incredible manner in the recent few years. The lowest rent of $35 per room per month reported only in 1978 by the City in their Neighborhood Strategy Area program proposal no longer exists today. The highest level of rent as reported in the same document to be $450 for one housing unit of three rooms has gone up to around $600.
In a 3-room unit, for example, the rooms are rented out to three families separately for $200 per room per month, according to a recent survey by CEDC staff in January 1979. Only long time tenants, or those protected by leases would be able to enjoy more reasonable rents in this area, though it is still questionable how much longer they could still be insulated from the ill effects due to the economic uprising in this area and the increase of demand for more space and higher return developments.

If this trend is allowed to persist without check, displacements from Chinatown of all the low-income families (the great majority of Chinatown residents), largely consisting of elderly and recent immigrants would become inevitable. The social structure of Chinatown that this group of people so much depend upon for financial, psychological and social supports, some for their first few years after landed in the U.S. and some for most of their lives, would be seriously threatened.

Some forms of intervention by our community or the public authority are thus called for to regulate the invisible hand of economic power which would soon dominate the Chinatown neighborhood. Appropriate intervention would hopefully save Chinatown from drastic and devastating social changes, preserve an originally viable commercial/residential neighborhood from becoming a purely commercial area, tourist spot or homes for the rich only. Therefore, in the interest of the majority of our basic community in and around Chinatown, efforts should be focused on the preservation and the
possibility to increase the number of housing whenever developments take place in Chinatown core.

Although priority should be given to the low and moderate income families who are now living in this area, market value housing should also be considered whenever low income housing are not feasible. Mixed subsidized and non-subsidized housing development would cater for a wider spectrum of the market, foster social integration and provide housing for both the rich and poor Chinese or American families who might wish to live in this neighborhood. However, the commercialization tendency of this area will soon render the environment undesirable for families with children. Since the lower floor space in this area would have high commercial value, a mixed type development for commercial and small family residential use would seem to be financially more feasible and socially more compatible with the immediate environment and the activities around Chinatown.
5.7 PRESERVATION OF CHINATOWN/SOUTH COVE NEIGHBORHOOD

As housing development has been discussed rather extensively in the previous chapter, we shall continue to examine the possible ways to preserve the social structure, the existing housing and the environmental quality which is essential for Chinatown and South Cove to remain as a residential/commercial neighborhood.

In this unique situation where the development pressure around Chinatown has been mounting, our neighborhood is subject to an influence for upward transition into an area of multiple land use for intensive mixed developments, a place which would attract high capital investments with much more substantial return than its present form of development could deliver. The new mode of development urges for drastic changes both in the economic structure and the physical form and space to accommodate the new activities.

Although it is desirable to lure economic developments to poor neighborhoods like Chinatown to benefit the local residents with more jobs and business opportunities, yet if this process of transition occurred too rapidly most of the local community would not be able to catch up with the pace, but rather be displaced from the neighborhood, disrupting the originally sound and viable social structure. It seems, therefore, desirable to take the following measures. First, actions should be taken to stabilize and
strengthen the original social and commercial structure within Chinatown. Second, new developments would be allowed and encouraged within this area only if they are considered compatible to our community development goals. And third, meaningful community participation would be involved throughout their development and management processes in future. On this rationale it is proposed here to be recommended to the City and BRA that Chinatown/South Cove and their immediate neighborhood be considered as a Zoning Overlay District.

It has long been expressed by Mayor Kevin White that the City's policy is to preserve and promote ethnic communities within the urban areas so as to stabilize the urban communities and to enrich the character of urban life. Due to the highly unique situation of Chinatown and South Cove, where the land resources are extremely limited and the survival and growth of the local community is under almost insurmountable external pressures, the need to draw up a special set of regulations, not generally applicable to other neighborhoods nor covered by the existing regulations, is considered in order. This would be necessary to protect and preserve the character of Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood which have considerable historic value and long existence in Boston. If this district status were granted, special overlay district boundaries will be established along with the special set of new regulations. Both are made part of the city zoning ordinance. Local community would have the opportunity to participate in the process of legislation whereby the community interests would be better emphasized and protected against external elements.
In Boston, there have been precedent cases of overlay districts instituted in the form of limited programs, e.g. a special parking district downtown, the "Adult Entertainment District" and a proposed "Flood Hazard District". If an overlay district could be created for the adult entertainment business which has caused immense negative impacts on our community, there seems to have strong reasons to urge the City in taking a similar measure in order to reverse the accumulated adverse effects and prevent further undesirable encroachments. The special set of regulations of the proposed Zoning Overlay District (ZOD) however, should not conflict with the basic Zoning Regulations, and should be used as the criteria in granting special development permits by the Zoning Board. In this connection, attention should be drawn to the following issues:

1) **The geographical boundary of the (ZOD)**

The geographical boundary of the proposed ZOD should cover an area within which developments would have significant impact on our community.

2) **The intensity of development**

Due to the scarcity of land resources, all future proposed developments should attempt to maximize efficiency in the use of land and facilities but with concerns on the consequential environmental quality of the neighborhood.
3) **Accessibility**

The accessibility to such proposed developments by public transportation should be emphasized over the reliability on private means of transportation, and pedestrian accessibility should be preferred within the district bearing in mind the carrying capacity of the local street system.

4) **Maximum Use of High Accessibility Areas**

Maximum use of high accessibility areas in terms of mixed developments by one or more entities should be emphasized and encouraged so as to keep intra district traffic to a minimum.

5) **Off Street Parking**

Adequate off street parking and truck loading should be provided according to zoning requirements in order to minimize street congestion.

6) **Impact on Public Services**

Acceptability of development proposals should be based on the development potential impact on public services in the area. These services include police and fire protection, water and sewer facilities and refuse collection.
7) **Encroachment into Residential Areas**

Development proposals should avoid encroachment into residential areas which are in sound, viable condition.

8) **Replacement Housing and Relocation**

In any event, the removal, by demolition or conversion, of existing units of housing from the district's private housing supply will be unacceptable unless (a) at least an equal number of new housing units is created by the proposed development through new construction or conversion at rents comparable to those prevailing in, and in the vicinity of, the removed housing, and (b) adequate provision is made for relocation of the occupants of said removed housing either by the developer or under contract with the Boston Redevelopment Authority to the satisfaction of the displacees.

9) **Additions to Housing Stock**

Development proposals which include additions to the private housing stock - in excess of any replacement housing required - should be encouraged.
10) **Provision of Housing for Staff, Students**

Development which results in an increase in the housing needs of staff should be accompanied by a reasonable increase in housing provided for such staff. Development which permits an increase in the enrollment of full-time, non-commuting students should be accompanied by a corresponding increase in housing provided for such students. Additionally, development proposals which would eliminate, by demolition or conversion, existing student housing should include provisions for replacement housing.

11) **Conformance with the General Plan**

Proposed developments should be in conformance with the City's General Plan and with overall community objectives.

12) **Adverse Impact on Surrounding neighborhoods**

Proposed developments should not have the potential of significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

13) **Facilities beneficial to neighborhoods**

Plans which include programs and facilities having the potential of encouraging neighborhood economic advancements or directly benefiting adjoining residential communities, should be encouraged.
14) **Community participation**

Through the initiative of the developers themselves, and major development plan should be developed with the active participation of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods or their representatives.
5.8 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

(1) Community Participation

CEDC should actively get involved and participate in the planning, development and operation of all the currently planned urban development projects around Chinatown. Officially, CEDC should be represented at all citizens' advisory committees, public hearings, or community meetings in regard to these development projects. Unofficially, CEDC should keep close contact with the City, BRA the developers and their consultants, contractors or other involved entities in matters affecting the interests of our community and response effectively.

(2) Urge for public action

CEDC should urge the city and BRA to review the following issues and take appropriate actions

a) Improvement on the downtown traffic pattern in regard to ease the current traffic load and to meet the expected increased traffic load in the future;

b) Improvement of the public transportation systems as an alternate means of private transportation so as to alleviate the expected growth of traffic volume;
c) Improvement of the parking facilities in and around Chinatown and their accessibility to Chinatown commercial areas;

d) Protection of the residential community from the combined environmental implications of major development projects around Chinatown, the traffic generated and the intensified activities on Chinatown and South Cove;

e) Introduction of a Zoning Overlay District to Chinatown and the immediate periphery areas as an ethnic urban community in the face of mounting pressure for external encroachment.¹

(3) Co-ordination with community business development

Commercial and industrial space development should be planned and implemented in co-ordination with community business development so that land development would become a useful tool and part of the concerted effort "....to improve the socio-economic conditions of the Chinese American community in Greater Boston area" by providing favorably located and suitable spaces for community development activities. Therefore, the purchase of strategically located land and properties desirable for community development, whether commercial, industrial or residential should be considered whenever the opportunity arises and the price is reasonable.

¹ Exhibit 40 on page 256
(4) **Commercial space development**

Community commercial developments in Chinatown proper and surrounding areas should be planned in conjunction with housing developments. Potential properties or lands identified in paragraph 5.4 for developments should be studied in regard to possible mixed developments in order to:

a) Maximize the use of scarce land/property resources;
b) Maximize the use of public and private facilities available in downtown areas;
c) Create a more lively downtown neighborhood compatible with the city growth pattern; and
d) Make the financing of developments more feasible. Commercial space development for our community should also be planned in co-ordination with other currently planned urban projects in this area and to articulate with major activity areas in future so as to open to a much larger market outside and benefit the Chinatown commercial sector through a direct association with the other Boston communities.
(5) **Industrial space development**

Industrial space development should be oriented to meet the larger space requirements of modern industries preferably to be located in the Leather District or South End where vacant buildings and empty lands are still available at relatively low prices but not too far away from our basic community around Chinatown, South Cove and South End neighborhoods. Efforts should also be made to relocate the traditional industries to suitable sites which are accessible by our communities in order that jobs could be saved in our neighborhood when these industries will be displaced from the more commercial areas around Chinatown. Research for the type and quantity of industrial space that would be required by the traditional and potential new industries should begin as soon as possible. Traditional industries should also be approached to study the possible ways to facilitate their relocation.

(6) **Residential space development**

Our major objective is to preserve the social structure, to discourage displacements and if possible to add more housing to this area so as to satisfy the needs of those families who need to be in day-to-day contact with Chinatown. Since most of the residents in Chinatown belong to our basic community, their interest should become our priority of concern. Therefore the following actions should be considered:
a) To develop more low to moderate income housing in and around Chinatown proper to cater for the elderly small families preferably without children (the further commercialized environment of Chinatown is considered less compatible to family housing as cited in previous sections);
b) To develop more low to moderate income housing in the immediate neighborhood of Chinatown for families with children (preferable locations include South Cove and South End);
c) Take positive steps to check developments in and around Chinatown which would reduce the number of housing units in this area; and
d) To explore the possibility of developing market value housing to cater for higher income small families in Chinatown so as to add more life into the neighborhood and enhance social integration between all classes of people.
State Transp. Bldg. ($50m)
Lex Hotel
Theatre Dist. Revitalization
Tufts Paediatrics Wing ($40m)
Tufts Nutrition Center ($23m)
G.S.A. Bldg. (alt. site 1)
G.S.A. Bldg. (slt. site 2) ($75m)
Lafayette Place ($72m)
Leather District
South Station Development
Tufts University Expansion

Exhibit 36
Coorer

Combat Zone

Chinatown Boundary (existing)

Chinatown Boundary (BRA proposed extension)

Street improvement along major pedestrian routes

BRA proposed focal points

RELATION OF CHINATOWN WITH MAJOR ACTIVITY AREAS

Exhibit 37
LOCATIONS OF MAJOR PARKING FACILITIES AROUND CHINATOWN

Existing:

a. Howard Johnson (800)
b. Tufts garage (900)
c. Shoppers' Garage (300)
d. Shapiro's garage (300)
e. Bedford/Kingston garage (735)
f. Lincoln/Essex garage (298)

Proposed:

g. State Transp. Bldg. (400)
h. G.S.A. Bldg. (600)
i. Hayward gar. renovation (600)
j. Lafayette Place (900)
k. Tufts
TRAFFIC PATTERN AROUND CHINATOWN

Major Pedestrian routes

Major vehicular thoroughfares proposed by BRA

Exhibit 39
Potential properties:

a. Warren Union Bank Bldg.
b. Century Building
c. 600 Washington Street
d. 'Superblock'
e. 31 Beach Street
f. 15-19 Kneeland Street
g. 25-43 Kneeland Street
h. Harrison-Tyler site
i. Parcel R1
j. CMA owned buildings
k. Ping On Street Proj.
l. Edinboro Street Proj.
m. Eastern Market Building
n. Parcel R3 & R3a

---

Chinatown boundary
(existing)

Chinatown boundary
(BRA proposed extension)

Proposed Zoning Overlaid
District
6.0 A Summary Of Recommended Actions

Based on the analysis and proposals made in the foregoing chapters with respect to the three land use and development objectives stated in paragraph 2.0, we shall now look into the priority of actions recommended, bearing in mind the constraints of time and manpower of our organization. Actions recommended for short term accomplishments should be undertaken immediately. While some of them could be accomplished within a comparatively short framework of time, others may require constant efforts as an on-going process. Actions recommended for long-term accomplishments generally need more extensive preparatory ground work over longer time span and persistent efforts. Both categories, however, would involve not only our organization, but also the inputs from our community, other community agencies, various public authorities and other involved private entities.
6.1 SHORT TERM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

6.1.1 Actions by Housing & Land Development staff

(1) Housing development priorities

CEDC's effort on housing development should be prioritized according to the need of our community. Subsidized housing development in Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood should rank top priority. Given the constraints of time and manpower and the urgent needs for housing, vacant buildings, empty lots and properties of simple ownership would deserve prior attention than more complicated projects. Consequently, the following three sites are singled out to be proceeded with high priority:

New England Telephone Company Building Annex (vacant building owned by N.E. Tel.Co.)

-the property is under CEDC control temporarily

-to secure Section 8 rent subsidy under NSA

-to arrange for permanent financing

-to carry out detail feasibility study
-to apply for zoning variance

-to organize development team, i.e. architect, consulting engineers, contractor, etc.

-to arrange for construction loan

-to secure FHA insurance

**Harrison-Tyler Street site** (largely vacant, one owner)

-to begin negotiation with owner

-to secure rent subsidies

**Parcel R1** (owned by BRA)

-to begin discussion with South Cove YMCA regarding relocation

-to approach BRA regarding developer designation

-to secure rent subsidies

-to approach CCBA for support of housing development.
(2) **Housing Potential Investigation**

Since the demand for housing by our community greatly exceeds the potentials of the above three housing proposals, CEDC should continue to explore for more potential housing developments to satisfy the community's housing needs.

- to follow up on the identified potential sites and properties for housing development

- to keep close contact with the real estate market and BRA so as to obtain first hand information regarding the availability of new sites or properties for housing development

- to explore possibilities on parcels R3 and R3a and other joint ventures with other designated Urban Renewal developers

- to urge the City to review its subsidized housing policy in South End

- to approach South End communities so as to obtain their support for housing development in that area.
(3) **Housing needs up-dating**

Our Housing and Land Development Division and the Research and Planning Division should constantly up-date the housing needs of our community so that CEDC's housing development effort could best serve the needs of our community. The following information is crucial in shaping housing development policies:

- the quantity and size of housing units

- the locational preference

- the housing type, e.g. elderly, family, high rise, low rise, etc.

- the mode of obtaining housing, e.g. house buying or renting, cooperatives or condominiums, etc.

(4) **Safeguarding the impacts on Chinatown**

In the foreseeable future, Chinatown would be significantly impacted by substantial urban growth and the associated economic and environmental implications. In response to this, it is appropriate for CEDC to take the following actions:

- to organize and mobilize the community around a general goal to preserve and enhance the Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood amongst the mounting pressures from outside;
to urge the City and BRA to review the currently planned downtown developments, and their combined economic and environmental impacts on Chinatown and South Cove as residential neighborhoods.

to propose to the planning authority the following actions:

(a) to study in detail the environmental quality of Chinatown/South Cove neighborhood as a basis for monitoring the environmental impact of future developments around this area;

(b) to plan and improve the road systems, parking facilities and public transportation so as to ease the traffic congestion with a view to coping with the increasing loads and improving the accessibility to the Chinatown commercial area.

(c) to allow community participation in the planning, development and operation of currently planned urban development projects;

(d) to introduce an overlay district covering Chinatown, South Cove and the immediate neighborhood so as to deal with the unique situation more effectively.
5) Commercial/industrial space development

The development of commercial and industrial space is essential to facilitate community business development by providing space of suitable quantities and qualities at desirable locations for promoting economical activities.

- to plan and develop commercial and industrial spaces in co-ordination with CEDC's business development;

- to carry out feasibility studies on potential properties and lands identified for industrial, commercial or mixed developments;

- to begin negotiation with the owners for the purchase of strategically located and desirable properties and lands;

- to monitor closely the major projects planned in this area and their schedules of completion so as to co-ordinate community development accordingly in accord with the new market demand for commercial or industrial spaces;

- to actively researach and seek public assistance in developing suitable industrial space for relocating the traditional industries and development of new industries in locations easily accessible by our community; and

- to carry out a marketing study of industrial space
(6) **Spatial requirements of human service agencies and programs**

To provide sufficient spaces for the expansion of human services programs in Chinatown/South Cove and other desirable neighborhoods with a growing Chinese population and to facilitate the use of such facilities by the residents, it is appropriate to plan for their spatial requirements in co-ordination with community housing developments.

-to approach the various human services agencies in our neighbor and identify their spatial requirements, expansion plans.

-to plan and develop spaces for their use jointly making use of the commercial or communal spaces on first floor which normally are not suitable for residential use.

6.1.2. **Actions by CEDC Board and Staff**

1) **Strengthening the CEDC community base**

In order to carry out meaningful housing and land development for our community, the most urgent action would be the strengthening of our organization on the Board and Subcommittee levels. While we are strong in having many professionals, intellectuals and businessmen on Board and Subcommittee, our basic community is underrepresented. Immediate actions should be taken to overcome this weakness in our organization such as:
-to step up various public relation programs (to be further
described in later)

-to involve the participants of existing social services
programs in taking active parts in CEDC's policy decision
process;

-to openly invite community members especially those from the
basic social sector to join CEDC on the board and subcommittee
levels through various community mass media, such as
newsletter, Chinese broadcast, "Sam Pan" community newsletter
and so forth;

-extending invitation to the Chinatown Housing and Land
Development Task Force to join our effort in housing and land
development.

2) **Expansion of our SIA**

Since only about 1/3 of the Boston Chinese are now covered by
our current SIA, the following actions are deemed necessary:

-to begin the studies regarding the revision and expansion of
our SIA;

-to collect and analyse the required background data information
(mentioned in paragraph 3.1.2) so as to establish and document
the needs for the proposed expansion;
-to approach BRA officials and planners in charge of the potential neighborhoods for possible assistance and support;

-based on the findings, to decide on the expanded boundaries; and

-to seek CSA's approval on the SIA boundary revision.

3) **Stepping up public relation programs**

CEDC should immediately make plans to step up the public relation program to promote our image and publicize our goals, objectives and current functions. The following immediate actions are recommended:

-to make good use of the various community mass communication media in reaching the various social strata of our community such as newsletter, Chinese broadcast, "Sam Pan", the community newspaper, etc.

-to publicize through press release, television or radio programs and other mass media special events and occasions of CEDC or Chinatown;

-to stage open house at least two times a year (preferably during Chinese New Year and August Moon Festival) for the community members, general public, other Boston communities, the public and private sectors that might influence the future of our community.
4) **Promoting relation with other community services**

In order to enhance community coalition, to efficiently use public funding and to diversify types of social services available to our community, the following actions are considered in order:

- to maintain the good relation with the traditional community organizations and to explore ways regarding joint venture with them;

- to take into consideration the spatial requirements of other religious, social, health and human services and organizations in Chinatown and South Cove when planning for community land use and development;

- to continue the on-going communication with other agencies with a view to coordinate and diversify the social and human services programs in this neighborhood as an important step to achieve community coalition.

5) **Maintaining good working relation with key public institutions**

To more effectively influence public policy on land use and development policies, it is necessary to maintain good working relations and close contact with various key public institutions in order to fulfill the following functions:
to reflect the needs and desires of our community to the key public institutions including the City, BRA, and various state and federal agencies and elected officials;

to seek assistance, support to CEDC's community development efforts

to respond effectively to the public bodies on behalf of the community's interest, in regard to various urban development projects that might impact our community.
6.2 **LONG TERM ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

1) **Reinforcing the community support of CEDC**

In order to develop a long term, firm and broadly based community support, the following actions should be taken:

- to reinforce the public relation program as an on-going process

- to assist the basic community adapting to their new environment and making socio-economic advancements by strengthening the social services delivery system in Chinatown/South Cove coordinately by CEDC and other community agencies with emphasis on:

a) language capability training

b) economic advancement programs, such as skill improvement, on-job-training, job referral services, etc.

c) educative programs on the political and social structure of U.S.

- to develop support and generate participation among the middle class Chinese and the elite through introducing social, economic, and cultural programs such as:
a) homeowning promotion  
b) business techniques and assistance programs  
c) law enforcement programs  
d) cultural programs and activities

-to expand the SIA boundary further to cover the more established Chinese communities in Allston-Brighton, Fenway, etc.

2) Coalition among community agencies

In order to develop a united front against external competition, it is proposed that CEDC take a leading role in the following action:

-to create a Chinatown/South Cove Social Services Clearing House composing of the board and staff members of the major human and social services agencies operating in this neighborhood with an aim to coordinate and diversify the social services programs, funding resources, and development of mutual supports among different agencies;

-to have the major community agencies and organization represented at CEDC's various policy making bodies as a further step towards community coalition;
to develop a consensus regarding the land use plan and development policy of Chinatown/South Cove and other neighborhoods with Chinese communities amongst all leading community agencies and organizations so as to deal with the external pressure as a unified community.

3) **Building up CEDC's credentials**

CEDC's eventual emergence as an economically strong and politically influential community body would depend on the success of the following achievements:

- to build up substantial support from a broad base community across different social strata;

- to achieve a promising track record of housing and land development and other community development ventures

- to build up considerable assets in order to back community economic activities.

4) **Expand and diversify housing development activities**

In order to satisfy the ever increasing housing needs of our community, housing development should be intensified in the area of subsidized housing for our basic community, and diversified to deal with the housing needs of the moderate-income and middle class Chinese families.
-to step up on the searching for suitable sites and properties and carry out feasibility studies on the potential projects.

-to continue development efforts in new and rehab subsidized housing.

-to diversify housing development activities into:

a) non-subsidized housing developments for the middle class Chinese for sale and for rent.

b) various forms of home ownership promotion for moderate income families, such as cooperative housing, condominiums etc.

c) technical assistance for house improvement, house buying or housing referral services.

d) to generate income by charging the middle class reasonable fees for housing assistance services so as to help support the housing development staff and housing development for our basic community.

e) to extend developments efforts to South End, Allston Brighton, Fenway and other desirable neighborhoods.

5) **Preserve Chinatown as a commercial/residential neighborhood**

With an aim to preserve Chinatown as a culturally unique residential neighborhood and to convert it into a commercially attractive area, CEDC should continue:
-to urge the city in up-grading the public facilities and amenities in Chinatown

-to persist on appropriate measures in maintaining satisfactory health and environmental quality throughout the neighborhood;

-to continue pressing the city for basic solution of the traffic and parking problems around Chinatown including the eventual closing of Beach Street to vehicular traffic by converting it into a mall with pedestrian links to other downtown activity centers.

-to initiate and mobilize community support for zoning Chinatown as an overlay district with an aim to preserve and enhance our culturally unique neighborhood as an urban community.

-to encourage or take an active part in redeveloping Chinatown properties into more intensive use mixed developments to the extent that sufficient housing stock affordable by the existing residents will be maintained at all times;

-to provide technical assistance and facilitate financing availability from either public or private sources to assist Chinese businesses in uplifting the facade all along the Streets in the Chinatown commercial area.
Facilitate industrial development

Industrial development is important for community economic advancement. The criteria for developing industrial space would depend on the outcome of the marketing study, its suitability for modernized production management, convenience of transportation, accessibility by our community. CEDC's long term objective should be:

-to create sufficient modernized industrial space in the vicinity of our community, such as the Leather District or South End;

-to utilize the currently underutilized industrial structures by converting them to suit the modern mode of production;

-to develop new industrial space on adjacent vacant land so as to provide room for new industries and to diversify the neighborhood industrial base and to create more high-skill jobs;

-to organize the traditional industries around Chinatown in conjunction with our Business Development Division so as to upgrade their facilities, to accommodate them in more suitable spaces and to relocate them to industrial areas.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

This memorandum of understanding executed this 4th day of May, 1963, by and between the MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BOSTON, a municipal corporation established and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, hereinafter referred to as the "Mayor", THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, a public authority organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, hereinafter called the "Authority", and the CHINESE CONSOLIDATED BENVOLENT ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, a non-profit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, hereinafter referred to as the "Chinese Association".

WITNESSETH, WHEREAS, the Chinese residential community located in the South Cove area and Central Business District of Boston has suffered severe dislocation and reduction in its land area through highway construction by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works and the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority and is further endangered by intrusions of commercial and other uses not related to the Chinese community; and

WHEREAS, the Chinese community needs the construction of new low-cost housing units and space for the provision of community facilities; and
WHEREAS, the Chinese community desires protection against future demolitions and intrusions of different land uses into the Chinese community; and

WHEREAS, the Authority desires to protect and preserve the Chinese community as an important and integral part of the City; and

WHEREAS, the Authority will make every effort to provide for increases in the land area available for the Chinese community consistent with the other interests in the South Cove area; and

WHEREAS, the Authority will endeavor or aim to integrate the interests of the Chinese community in the South Cove area with its interests in the Central Business District; and

WHEREAS, the Chinese community has expressed the desire to have specific assurances concerning the South Cove urban renewal project; and

WHEREAS, the Chinese community has expressed its willingness to cooperate in the preparation of a sound urban renewal plan for its portion of the South Cove area.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained the parties hereto do hereby agree as follows:

1. Survey and Planning Application

The Authority will file with the Federal Government (as soon as required consents and approvals are obtained) an application for survey and planning funds for the South Cove area.
2. There will be no boundary amendments to the South Cove project that will in any way adversely affect the Chinese community. The present boundary of Kneeland Street on the north and the Massachusetts Turnpike on the east will not be changed. This agreement relates to the area bounded as follows:

North by Kneeland Street
East by Massachusetts Turnpike
South by the same and by Broadway, and
West by Harrison Avenue.

It is recognized that with reference to the sub-area bounded North by Kneeland Street, East by Tyler Street, South by Oak Street and West by Harrison Avenue, some portions are now owned and used by units of the Tufts New England Medical Center, including Posner Hall and the Tufts Medical and Dental Schools, and adjacent parking areas, which portions are to continue in Medical Center use. Other portions of such sub-area, which are owned by other parties, and some of which are occupied by Chinese residents, are to be carefully studied and allocated to the best uses consistent with the mutual interests of all concerned.

Such allocations will be discussed with the Chinese Association before any plan including them is filed, but will not be subject to the veto referred to in paragraph 8 below.

It is likewise agreed that the Medical Center Development Plan does not intrude in any way upon the Chinese community area
as above outlined except for the sub-area as outlined above and will not be permitted so to intrude in any urban renewal plan.

3. **New Low-Cost Housing**

The project will provide for the construction of new low-cost housing for the Chinese community and will not include provision for high-income housing in the area of the Chinese community. It is planned that new housing will be constructed on a step-by-step basis so as to preclude dislocation of the Chinese families within the area and to insure relocation of families within the Chinese community. In the development of new housing absolute preference and priority will be given to developers provided by or otherwise acceptable to the Chinese Association.

It is understood that new housing can be of several types or a mixture of types which may include the following:

(a) Section 221(d)3, privately sponsored with 3-1/8% interest. Rents under this program are currently estimated at $75 to $105 per month including heat for from one to four-bedroom apartments.

(b) If desired, public housing for families or for the elderly. Rents are equal generally to about 22% of income and vary according to family size.
(c) Housing units can be made available through rehabilitation with provision for long-term guaranteed mortgages. In this connection, it is expected that the Authority will assist rehabilitation efforts in every way possible and will make available financial and technical assistance for rehabilitation or conversion of existing housing.

Adequate parking space will be provided in the plan for this area.

4. Consultation and Advice

The Authority and its staff will consult regularly with the Urban Renewal Committee and the Chinese Association concerning all aspects of the proposed plan. It will assist and advise throughout the period in connection with the preparation of the plan and its execution. It will submit a draft to the Chinese Association and obtain specific views of the Association concerning it. Subsequent to any adoption of the plan it will continue to make available to the Chinese Association and to members of the Chinese community information and advice until completion of construction.

5. Time Table

It is understood that the Authority estimates the planning period for the project will be approximately 15 months and that the plan will be completed in 3 to 5 years. The Authority will make every effort to expedite the project.
6. **Avoidance of Exploitation**

It is recognized by the parties hereto that it is of the utmost importance that exploitation in any way of the property and interests involved by persons outside the Chinese community be avoided and it is intended that the urban renewal plan will provide protection against such exploitation in the future.

7. **Selection of Developers**

It is regarded as vital that the Authority reach agreement with the Chinese Association concerning the selection of a developer or developers for new housing within the Chinese Community, and that the developers be provided by the community or be acceptable to the community. The Authority will give priority in land disposition to a development corporation formed or organized by the Chinese Association.

8. **Endorsement or Rejection of the Plan**

It is contemplated that there be an Urban Renewal Committee as hereinafter provided to represent the Chinese community.

Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 hereof, no final plan incorporating the Chinese community as bounded in this memorandum will be submitted for adoption without the approval of the Urban Renewal Committee and the Chinese Association. The Urban Renewal Committee and the Chinese Association will from time to time submit to the Authority their views on aspects of the plan prior to its submission to such Committee and Association for approval.
9. The Chinese Association will undertake to do the following:

(a) Actively seek to form or sponsor in an appropriate way an organization or development corporation to develop new low-cost housing for the community.

(b) Form an Urban Renewal Committee to act as representative of the residents, organizations and businesses of the area. It will adopt by-laws and keep records of meetings.

(c) Engage professional consultants from time to time to assist the Association and the Urban Renewal Committee in their deliberations and to work with the Authority on the development of the plan.

WITNESS the execution hereof on the day and year first above written.

Witness:

Mary V. Callanan

Mayor of the City of Boston

Witness:

Robert J. Hayes

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

By
Development Administrator

Witness:

Linds Davis

CHINESE CONSOLIDATED BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

By
President
COOPERATION AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 17th day of January, 1966, by and between the Boston Redevelopment Authority, hereinafter called the "Authority", and the Tufts-New England Medical Center, an alliance pursuant to Chapter 40 of the Massachusetts Acts of 1930, as amended, of New England Medical Center Hospitals and Trustees of Tufts College, two charitable corporations organized under the laws of Massachusetts, said corporations acting jointly through said alliance and individually being hereinafter called the "Medical Center".

WHEREAS, the Authority has undertaken surveys and planning in connection with the South Cove Urban Renewal Project, No. Mass. R-92;

WHEREAS, an Urban Renewal Plan for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of blighted and deteriorating areas in the South Cove Urban Renewal Area, hereinafter called the "Project Area", has been prepared and approved by the Authority pursuant to the 1949 Housing Act, as amended, and Chapter 121 of the General Laws, as amended, and is attached hereto;

WHEREAS, the basic objective of urban renewal action in the South Cove Urban Renewal Area is to eliminate severe conditions of blight, deterioration, obsolescence, traffic congestion, and incompatible land uses in order thereby to facilitate sound development and orderly growth, and to achieve neighborhood stability. Specifically, the objectives are:
1. To promote and expedite public and private development.

2. To cause the rehabilitation and redevelopment of the South Cove as a stable neighborhood compatible in function and design with the neighboring Central Business District, the Back Bay, and the South End area.

3. To preserve and strengthen the residential character of the area in such a way as to promote and insure its future.

4. To facilitate efficient use of land in the area for housing, commercial and institutional use.

5. To strengthen and expand the real property tax base of the city;

WHEREAS, the Urban Renewal Plan provides for the acquisition by the Authority of certain land referred to in Chapter IV of the Plan and shown on the Property Map, which is a part of the Urban Renewal Plan;

WHEREAS, the Urban Renewal Plan provides for the disposition of such land as shown on the Disposition Plan, which is a part of the Urban Renewal Plan, for the uses and in accordance with the land use and building requirements contained in Chapter VI of the Urban Renewal Plan;

WHEREAS, the Medical Center desires to acquire certain property located in the Project Area for its proposed expanded facilities and intends to develop such property for such purpose in accordance with the Urban Renewal Plan;
WHEREAS, the financial plan for the Urban Renewal Project includes $2,141,252 in Section 112 credits representing expenditures made between June, 1958 and June, 1962 by the Medical Center for the acquisition of land and the demolition of buildings, which expenditures have been certified to by the Medical Center so as to make such expenditures available for Section 112 credits; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable to implement the provisions of the Urban Renewal Plan in order to accomplish the objectives of the Plan by specifying the actions to be undertaken by the Medical Center and the Authority, respectively.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto mutually agree as follows:

1. **Acquisition**

   A. Upon final approval of the Urban Renewal Plan, the Authority shall acquire the property referred to in Section 401 of Chapter IV of the Plan and shown on the Property Map as "Property to be Acquired" at prices established in accordance with the procedures of the Authority and regulations of HHFA and subject to concurrence by HHFA.

   B. The timing of the acquisition of any property containing parking spaces presently designated for Medical Center use insofar as possible will be coordinated with the availability of other suitable sites in the Project Area that can be temporarily used for Medical Center parking.
II. Disposition

A. Following acquisition, the Authority shall dispose of the parcels referred to in Chapter VI of the Plan and shown on the Disposition Plan in accordance with the regulations of HHFA governing practices for land disposition and pursuant to a land disposition agreement in a form similar to the ones currently employed by the Authority and in conformity with regulations of HHFA and which is approved by HHFA, at prices established in accordance with the regulations of HHFA and subject to HHFA concurrence.

B. The Authority shall sell and the Medical Center shall acquire and develop those institutional reuse parcels that are marked P-2 through P-11 in accordance with the land use and building requirements contained in Chapter VI of the Plan, provided that the properties in Tyler Street, Block 447, Parcels 5108 to 5111-1, inclusive, Disposition Parcel "P-2A", will not be sold by the Authority until such time as (i) new relocation housing has been built on Disposition Parcel "R-2", (ii) the Medical Center has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Authority that it has sufficient need for such properties, and, (iii) the Authority's staff
has reviewed and approved the Medical Center's plan for a small park which the Center will own, develop and maintain between Tyler Street and Harrison Avenue accessible for public use and providing for pedestrian movement between the two streets.

C. The Authority will make application to the Public Improvements Commission for the closing of the following streets in conformity with the Plan and will take such action, if any, as is required by it to insure Medical Center ownership thereof: Dore Street (partial), Dillaway Street, Hollis Street (partial), Common Street (partial), Bennet Street, Ash Street (partial), Nassau Street, May Place (partial), Hollis Square (partial) and Bates Place. This program of street closings will follow a timetable related to the schedule established for adjacent parcels and the schedule established for the construction of other street improvements in the South Cove Project Area.

D. The Medical Center shall maintain a right-of-way between Tremont and Washington Streets along the property line between property of the Don Bosco Technical High School and the Medical Center adequate in width to service its facilities, and
provide pedestrian access into all properties adjacent thereto, and preserve an adequate right-of-way for the benefit of the Don Bosco Technical High School allowing adequate vehicular access by such School to its proposed buildings adjacent to said property line. In addition, a minimum distance of 190 feet shall be left between the southerly corner of the Music Hall and the new property line to the south.

III. MBTA

The Authority will seek to acquire the right-of-way of the MBTA as soon as the MBTA determines that this right-of-way is no longer needed for the Forest Hills line. If the Authority acquires this right-of-way, it shall then make available to the Medical Center the property upon which the right-of-way (whether on, above, or below the surface) lying north of Oak Street is presently located for purposes that are consistent with the objectives of the Urban Renewal Plan.

IV. Disposition Time Schedule

Upon request of the Authority, the Medical Center shall supply, and review from time to time, a time schedule for when it will require Parcels P-2
through P-11. The Authority shall endeavor to make such properties available in accordance with the time schedule.

V. Design Review

The Medical Center will submit all site plans and building plans for all contemplated new uses constructed or sponsored by the Medical Center for design review and approval by the staff of the Authority in accordance with the Authority's design review procedures. Such review is concerned with the massing and arrangement of buildings, provision of open space, pedestrian walkways, and the exterior appearance of individual buildings.

VI. Housing

The Medical Center hereby indicates its interest in endeavoring to become a sponsor for new housing within appropriate areas designated for such use in the Plan. The Authority will consider such proposals as the Medical Center may set forth at the time of their submission.

VII. New MBTA Route

The Medical Center shall grant to the MBTA, at no cost, easements if any are required through its property for the location of a new MBTA route, the
basic location of which is shown on the attached plan, together with such reasonable temporary easements necessary for the construction of any part of such route which is located on property of the Medical Center.

VIII. Public Improvements

A. The Authority shall make application to the Mayor for the funds necessary to implement all public improvements pursuant to the terms of a Cooperation Agreement between the City of Boston and the Authority, a copy of which is attached. Such public improvements shall include a street tree-planting program for the entire South Cove Project Area.

B. The Authority shall endeavor to cause such public improvements to be constructed in accord with a time schedule consistent with the development time schedule of the Medical Center.

C. The Authority is presently studying the alignment of Stuart Street and will endeavor insofar as possible to avoid thereby narrowing the property adjacent to the Wilbur Theatre. The Authority will also explore the possible use of arcades in order to accommodate a widened right-of-way and sufficient building footage in that location.
D. The Authority will support the Medical Center in obtaining permission from the City's Public Improvement Commission to build across, subject to approval of the design of the bridge structure by the Authority, Washington Street or other rights-of-way in accordance with an approved Medical Center site plan.

IX. Wilbur and Music Hall

During the period ending January 1, 1980 and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth, the Medical Center shall lease both the Music Hall and Wilbur Theatre properties to theatre tenants as long as each of such properties provides the Medical Center with a return (net of taxes, expenses, etc.) at least equal to that received from such property in 1965.

Even if such theatre properties are providing the Medical Center with a return (net of taxes, expenses, etc.) at least equal to
that received from such theatre properties in 1965, the Medical Center may change the use of either or both of such properties, provided (i) it guarantees to the City until 1980 tax payments, or payments in lieu of taxes, from the property owned by it in the block bounded by Stuart, Tremont and Washington Streets and the Don Bosco School (in addition to any payments relating to commercial uses in the first floor or other appropriate floors of Medical Center buildings to be located along Stuart Street) which at least equal the amount of taxes received from such theatre property in 1965, and (ii) in the case of the Wilbur Theatre, it provides a replacement in kind at or about its present location.

X. Commercial Uses

A. The Medical Center shall make available suitable commercial uses in the first floor and shall endeavor to make available suitable commercial uses in other appropriate floors of Medical Center
buildings to be located along Stuart Street between Tremont and Washington Streets. The Medical Center shall, prior to the executing of a land disposition agreement for such properties give assurances satisfactory to the Authority of the types of commercial space to be contained in such commercial properties and of the nature of its arrangements with the City to provide the equivalent of full taxes on such commercial space, such arrangements to be acceptable to the City and the Authority.

B. The Medical Center shall endeavor to provide similar appropriate commercial space in properties to be constructed by it along Tremont Street.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, The Boston Redevelopment Authority and the Tufts-New England Medical Center have caused this agreement to be duly executed as of the day and year first above written.

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

Edward J. Logue
Development Administrator

TUFTS-NEW ENGLAND MEDICAL CENTER

By his Y. Wessell
Chairman, Adm. Bd.
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