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21st Century Housing

More apartment houses...fewer single-family homes...more housing needed and less land on which to build...more energy savers in the homes...fewer household wastes dumped into public outlets.

These predictions on the housing scene in the next century, only 26 years away, are made by the editors of *Engineering News-Record* in a special centennial edition titled, "Probing the Future" which even sees high land costs leading to "housing afloat that may take the shape of simple houseboats or may go as far as floating communities."

Municipal Problems

A survey of mayors and councilmen across the country reports that they consider refuse and solid waste their number one municipal problem. The next nine problems, in order, are: law enforcement, streets and highways, relations with county, fiscal and tax policies, downtown development, planning and zoning, citizen participation, public transit, and use of general revenue sharing. The survey was conducted by *Nation's Cities*, magazine of the National League of Cities, which compiled the roster of municipal problems from the returns of a questionnaire to municipal officials.

Solar Heat

Legislation introduced in the Congress would authorize a 3-year demonstration to test the efficacy of solar heating and a 5-year development and demonstration for combined solar heating and cooling systems. Sponsors of the legislation see solar heat as a potential solution to the energy crisis since, it is pointed out, 40 percent of the gas and oil used in the United States is for heating, ventilation, air conditioning, lighting and power systems in buildings. One version of the legislation would have HUD administer the demonstration.

Interstate Land Sales

The HUD Office of Interstate Land Sales Registration (OILSR) is putting 30 investigators through an intensive training session before sending them into the field to ferret out shady land developers operating in violation of the law. At a recent briefing of regional HUD public affairs officers, Administrator George K. Bernstein intimated the new field staff may have to be trained in karate and other forms of self defense before starting out on their assignments. He was only joking, of course, but Mr. Bernstein clearly got the message across that OILSR intends to enforce the newly strengthened regulations covering interstate land sales activities.

Minimum Property Standards

Minimum property standards, revised, consolidated and updated by HUD for construction of both low-rent public housing and housing approved for mortgage insurance by the FHA, depend more on a performance approach than heretofore, allowing flexibility to meet local conditions. They will help national and local efforts to improve the environmental factors involved in residential construction in urban areas. Moreover, they encourage design innovations and improved building technology.

The new standards are the result of three years of preparation and two field reviews by approximately 200 building industry organizations, government organizations, and qualified individuals, in addition to appropriate members of the HUD staff in its 77 field offices and 10 Regional Offices. They are mandatory for HUD-involved housing and housing built with assistance of the Veterans Administration and Farmers Home Administration. They are used as a guide for family housing built by the Defense Department for military personnel.

Zoning Ordinance Upheld

The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld a village zoning ordinance that outlaws occupancy of a single-family dwelling by more than two unrelated persons. The Court's majority opinion declares that a community may "lay out zones where family values, youth values, and the blessings of quiet seclusion and clean air make the area a sanctuary for people." The opinion concerned the Village of Belle Terre, Long Island, New York, which charged that its local zoning law was violated when the owner of a six-bedroom house rented it to a group of students. Any community, the Court ruled, has the right to outlaw boarding houses, fraternity and sorority houses and communes that constitute an invasion of quiet residential areas. It says, "A quiet place where yards are wide, people few, and motor vehicles restricted are legitimate guidelines in a land use project addressed to family needs." The Court's ruling is the first on a zoning issue since 1926 when it upheld broad zoning authority for localities.

Environment

Almost all home construction planned in the future will have to be weighed in terms of its potential impact on the local environment, in the opinion of James F. Searce, a consultant to the Environmental Protection Agency quoted in *Savings and Loan News*. Future planning of large construction projects, he said, would take account of water runoff, water supply and waste water treatment, air quality, and the ramifications of the energy crisis as they affect dwellings.
Community Development in the New England Tradition
By James J. Barry

We are delighted to have this opportunity to highlight HUD’s contribution to community planning and development in New England. While many of the projects are unique to a New England setting, the basic issues are common to every region. They involve constructing and preserving housing, maintaining and upgrading neighborhoods, formulating techniques for sound public planning, and a proper concern for the impact of government actions upon people and places.

Local and State governments in New England have long been active in these areas of concern. Community initiative and self-determination had 17th century origins and the tradition continues in the principle of home rule, the town meeting form of government, and the right of any citizen to petition the legislature. That tradition supports citizen involvement in community projects, and community influence on their nature and conduct. It also fosters environmental sensitivity.

These characteristics have ensured vitality at every level of government. State supported programs of low-income housing and slum clearance preceded Federal efforts. City planning, employed to lay Boston’s first settlement, Charlestown, in 1629, received legislative recognition in the 1900’s. Because of this history, the New England States were among the first to take advantage of federally assisted housing, development and planning programs.

Much of New England’s housing stock is relatively older than housing in other parts of the country, and many cities are fully built up with few, if any, development options. Neighborhood conservation and housing rehabilitation have thus become a practical necessity. Similarly, New England has welcomed and adapted innovative methods for producing new housing.

Government support for housing construction and community development has been paralleled by increased attention to planning and environmental considerations. Very active State and regional planning organizations have emerged with HUD support over the last few years, and private interest has been multiplying. Environmental management is fast becoming a necessity to the transaction of governmental business in this six-State area.

HUD’s experience in New England reflects the willingness and capability of localities to adapt to changing needs and conditions. The advent of greater flexibility under new community development legislation will provide local governments the opportunity to design programs to fit their needs. New directions for housing signal the recognition of “sense of place” and the melding of housing opportunities into the fabric of existing neighborhoods.

Governors, mayors, legislators and local officials throughout New England have been closely involved in housing and community development programs over the past years. They are aware of many of the deficiencies in the old approaches, and in the spirit of “Yankee ingenuity,” recognize the necessity of moving forward with the new.

On the eve of the 200th anniversary of our Nation’s independence, it is fitting to reflect upon the accomplishments of our forefathers in meeting the challenges of their new world. We are convinced that this same spirit lives in New England today to meet the modern challenge of providing a better living environment for all our citizens.
Change & Continuity in Boston’s Renewal

By Robert T. Kenney

Boston, capital of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, is a city of contrasts, of old and new at every turn, where 20th century towers symbolize the city’s economic resurgence and offer a counterpoint to the 18th and 19th century row structures that create much of the city’s old world atmosphere.

Yet with all these contrasts, there is a strong sense of continuity, from the past to the present, from the present to the future. Nowhere, however, are contrast and continuity more evident than in two of Boston’s most ambitious and farsighted federally assisted urban renewal projects: Government Center and the Downtown Waterfront.

Among other things, the projects themselves are contrasts in approaches to applying urban renewal in the oldest part of the city, the part of the city, not so incidentally, where the earliest settlement occurred, where the first commercial activities came into being, where the first government structures were located.

The Government Center, on the one hand, was a rundown, honky-tonk district infamous and world-renowned as Scollay Square. There were few buildings of architectural distinction in the area and over the years the buildings there had deteriorated to a point that few were of any economic value. It was logical, then, that renewal in the Government Center involved almost total clearance of the rundown buildings and the creation of an imaginative plan, one which called for dramatic juxtaposition of the new buildings to each other, and for expansive open space and pedestrian areas. At the same time, every effort was made to produce an overall design that would relate to nearby historic structures both in building materials and place.

The waterfront, on the other hand, included numerous buildings, among them the Faneuil Hall Markets, which were important architecturally and historically. Moreover, most of the buildings were structurally sound and could be restored for new uses and to strengthen the ties with Boston’s fabled past. Emphasis has been on restoration of older buildings and adapting them for contemporary uses. Another objective was to create a residential community on the waterfront that would serve to revitalize an area neglected and allowed to deteriorate for almost a century.

Government Center

As the hub of State and Federal governmental activities in Boston, Government Center has brought government back to the place where it started in the colonial times. Adjacent to the new Government Center are Faneuil Hall, the Old State House and Old South Meeting House, all of which served in one way or another as meeting places for colonials planning their break with England.

The 60-acre Government Center project was the cornerstone of the large scale urban renewal program initiated by the City of Boston in the early 1960’s in the Scollay Square area. As early as 1917 the area was considered for a civic center, but it was not until 1956 that the city Planning Board produced the comprehensive plan which led to the 1960 plan for a Government Center to be undertaken by the newly reorganized Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA).

Scollay Square’s proximity to the financial and retail districts and to existing government facilities; its access to highway, rail, and mass
transit; and the need for new government centralized offices—all made Scollay Square the prime site of a project to renew the area.

The BRA hired I.M. Pei and Partners to give final form to the long discussed master plan. Pei’s stress was on careful massing and placement of new structures in relation to each other, to existing buildings, and to open space, and the importance of choosing materials to blend and harmonize with the brick and stone of traditional Boston. There have been differences of opinion on individual buildings, but the net effect has been successful. The American Institute of Architects has cited Government Center for excellence in community architecture and as “a model of how urban renewal, when imaginatively conceived and carried out, can bring new vitality and beauty to a city.”

Government Center has come to represent, both in a symbolic and real sense, the economic resurgence of a city which, until a decade or so ago, was in a cycle of decline. The economic impact of Government Center is most obvious in the adjacent area where considerable private investment has been sparked by the urban renewal project. To the five public buildings that are part of the urban renewal plan (City Hall, the Kennedy Federal Office Building, the State Service Center, the Boston Police District Number 1 and the Government Center parking garage) private investment has added nearly a dozen buildings ranging in size from the 40-story New England Merchants Bank to the 3-story headquarters of a local TV and radio station. The net result for the city has been an increase of approximately $13 million in the tax base as well as construction of other new buildings on the periphery of the Center.
Waterfront

As Boston grew in prominence as a center of shipping and trade, its waterfront was, in a very real sense, the center of the city. Economic activity in the port of Boston reached a "fever pitch" in the early 19th century and the edges of the harbors became filled with new wharves, gradually filling in what was called the Great Cove. Unfortunately, as shipping relocated to the port of New York towards the latter part of the 19th century, the great brick and granite warehouses on Boston's waterfront fell into disuse. Nevertheless, considerable commercial activity did continue in an area adjacent to the waterfront, the Faneuil Hall Market district. The Faneuil Hall Market, also a development which grew out of the early 19th century, is often referred to as the nation's urban renewal project.

Faneuil Hall, constructed in 1742, was the original marketplace for the town of Boston. But by 1824, the Hall space was no longer adequate, and Mayor Josiah Quincy saw the docks which lay behind Faneuil Hall as a natural site for expansion. The docks were used as a dumping area and Mayor Quincy argued that his proposed use would rid the city of a blighting influence.

The six-acre project involved public as well as private investment, as did the Government Center. The city used its powers of eminent domain to acquire some of the needed land, while some was purchased privately. Alexander Parris, a noted architect, drew up a plan for three long rows of market structures. The center structure, called Quincy Market after the Mayor, was built by the city, which retains possession but leases the building to the BRA which, in turn, leases it to the developer of the present urban renewal project. The buildings on either side—on North and South Market Streets—were built privately, bay by bay, in strict adherence to Parris' design, and constitute an outstanding example of the Greek Revival style. Large blocks of Chelmsford granite, only recently available as a building material, were used, and the total effect is considered one of the best examples of early American urban planning. The markets are being restored to reflect contemporary uses, combined with office space and making good use of the potential for pedestrian circulation between the three buildings. With a $2.2 million HUD historic preservation grant, exterior restoration is nearing completion on the North and South Market Street buildings, which the BRA had acquired. The city is doing work in Quincy Market itself, and the James Rouse Company of Columbia, Md., is developing the complex.

Faneuil Markets is a major link in the Walk-to-the-Sea that is included in the BRA's Waterfront renewal plan. It provides the pedestrian connector between Government Center and the Waterfront at a pivotal point between these areas, the North End and the financial district.

Not surprisingly, the considerable renewal activity on the waterfront has generated much controversy. The continuing debate on what would be restored and for what use culminated in a court suit which, in turn, led to a stipulation and agreement whereby a community group was formed to "restudy" the waterfront plan.

Two major changes came out of the restudy. First, New Atlantic Avenue, the main roadway serving the Waterfront, will be realigned to provide more developable land. Second, by changing the shape and size of parcels created in the original plan, the BRA will be able to provide sites for the development of approximately 700 units of new housing, about half of them for low and moderate income families and senior citizens. The plan modifications also create nearly twice as much open space and parkland, including a four-acre Waterfront Park originally intended.

Thus, revitalization in the Waterfront depends not on the district's role as a shipping center, but on its creative adaptation to contemporary needs for housing and open space in the downtown. And in the process it has helped Bostonians rediscover the rich heritage of the Downtown Waterfront.

Mr. Kenny is Director of the Boston Redevelopment Authority.
Manville, Rhode Island, is a small country village, which had its first manufacturing enterprise in 1749. Around 1880, eight two-story brick buildings with ten apartments each, were constructed for mill workers employed by the Manville-Jencks Corp., at one time the largest cotton mill in New England. The village reached the peak of its growth and prosperity by 1912, and with the post World War II slump in the New England cotton industry the corporation went out of business and sold the buildings to individual owners. From that point on, the buildings as well as the neighborhood deteriorated. By 1960, the mill village was blighted and badly in need of renewal. The rows of buildings at the village core were populated by a combination of elderly, lifelong residents and large, young families living in the squalor of substandard housing.

In the late 60's, Edward Marteka and Norman Allaire, owners of Amco Construction Company, a small local firm located only two miles from the site, began purchasing the buildings with an eye to rehabilitation. When the package was completed, Marteka and Allaire owned 70 percent of the original 80 housing units. Their vision, however, met with little response from key people in community or financial circles, until the advent of HUD's Section 236 program. Working with the State of Rhode Island, the Rhode Island Historical Society, the nonprofit Citizens United for Renewal Enterprises, Inc. (CURE); and HUD's Providence Insuring Office, the developers undertook Rhode Island's first 236 project, Eagle Apartments.

During construction, temporary

Rehab in Two Old New England Communities

ABOVE—Rehabilitated dwellings preserving heritage of mill village.
TOP-RIGHT—Eagle Apartments Village as it looked in 1910.
BOTTOM-RIGHT—Eagle Apartments area prior to rehabilitation.
placement of tenants was often accomplished within a radius of a few blocks distance. This proximity was particularly important to the older residents, one of whom was born and had spent his entire 77 years there, and several of whom had lived there for over 50 years.

Thirty-eight of the 47 original tenants returned to the completed project, 40 percent of which is subsidized by rent supplements. The overall rental scale is from $67.00 to $131.00 per month for efficiency to three-bedroom units.

One of the most important aspects of this project was that it offered the people within the community clean, modern, low-rent living units, while still preserving the mill village heritage. The ripple effect of Eagle Apartments is clearly evident in accelerated new construction, as well as in private efforts to rehabilitate surrounding housing, and the relocation of several stores to the village center. With Eagle Apartments as its core, Manville has acquired a new stability as a residential area. Most importantly, it enjoys the demonstration lesson that faith and commitment by local people, combined with governmental assistance, can often reverse the tide of neighborhood blight and reactivate a community’s heritage.

Burlington, Vermont

In Burlington, Vermont, a community of 35,000 residents, a young man of average means tackled a large project and gambled his assets on a dream. As a result, a former icebox factory is now becoming home for 90 tenants.

Incorporated in 1865, Burlington, situated on the banks of Lake Champlain, was a major lumbering and shipping center for many years. Today, it is an important educational and business center, home of the University of Vermont, three private colleges, and major companies such as IBM and General Electric.

In a neighborhood which is now transitional and which includes quiet, light commercial industry, shopping centers, schools, and a 19-acre park with recreational and athletic facili-

ties, stood the old Baldwin Ice Box Factory, built in 1924. A solid, brick, two-story structure, the building was most recently used as a grocery warehouse. When it came on the market in 1970, David Du Brul, Burlington native who had previously purchased and rehabilitated local commercial space, recognized the factory’s potential for residential use. Assessments by local regulatory agencies, such as the offices of the building inspector and fire marshal, were encouraging, but financing seemed to pose the largest problem. Du Brul’s previous experience had been on a much smaller scale, so, with a verbal commitment on the property, he spent the next six months taking courses to educate himself in all phases of investment, construction, and management.

During this time, HUD was encouraging rehabilitation of existing structures, and the 221(d)(4) non-subsidized market rent program seemed a perfect vehicle for Du Brul. With encouragement from the Burlington Insuring Office, and the assistance of architect Jerry Leimenstoll, Du Brul began construction in December 1972. Because of limited funds, he relied primarily on his own talents in preparing studies, and in coordinating construction. He was his own general contractor, and employed a 100 percent local labor force for his $1.4 million Jackson Terrace project. Because the shell was sound, Du Brul created, by interior framing, a new building within the existing structure. The extremely high factory ceilings provide an insulating air space between floors. The 90 unit building opened in December 1973 is composed of efficiency to two-bedroom units at monthly rents from $154.00 to $259.00. The tenants range from students to elderly retired persons, and Du Brul, who also manages the project, encourages a “resident-owner” rather than “tenant-landlord” relationship.

Du Brul’s imagination, skill and perseverance have created a quality living environment in proximity to Burlington’s major growth area.

Both Marteka and Allaire in Rhode Island, and Du Brul in Vermont saw potential in rehabilitation, and much needed housing testifies to the success of their efforts.
The Contract Clause as a Tool of Civil Rights Enforcement in New England

Contract clauses incorporating equal opportunity requirements are being utilized with increasing frequency in New England. Instead of relying only on acts of Congress, such as the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968, or Presidential Executive Orders 11063 and 11246, complainants are utilizing contract law and theory to enforce their contractual equal opportunity rights.

In the Massachusetts case of Tufts College v. Volpe Construction Company (1970) the Court upheld the argument of Tufts College that the affirmative action requirements for minority hiring imposed upon federally assisted construction contracts by Executive Order 11246 could be enforced by the College in a breach of contract action against the Volpe Construction Company. Enforcement was not limited to the administrative compliance procedures of the Federal agency providing the funding.

In another example, the Secretary of Transportation and Construction for Massachusetts has imposed certain contract requirements upon contractors engaged in publicly funded construction work in Boston. The contractual provision requires the contractor to "maintain on his project . . . a not less than 20 percent ratio of minority employee man-hours to total employee man-hours in each job category . . . ." In addition there is a penalty clause providing for liquidated damages of $100 for each week the contractor fails or refuses to comply. In November 1973, the U.S. Court of Appeals upheld the legality of this contractual provision in the case of Associated General Contractors of Massachusetts v. Altshuler. In April 1974, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the case and thereby let stand the Circuit Court's opinion that the State could impose job quotas if there is a "compelling need" demonstrated for them, as there is in Boston.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development utilizes a contract provision to ensure that equal employment opportunity is provided by its funded agencies. Although discrimination because of sex is not prohibited by either the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or the Civil Rights Act of 1968, HUD's EEO contract does cover such discrimination. The clause not only prohibits discrimination, it requires affirmative action on the part of the grantee.

Equal Employment Opportunity Provisions Utilized

In March 1974, HUD relied on the EEO clause of a Loan and Grant Agreement with a redevelopment agency in Connecticut to hold its first debarment hearing against a funded agency. The case involved an alleged discriminatory act against a black employee who had been fired by the redevelopment agency, and had been investigated by the Assistant Regional Administrator for Equal Opportunity in Region I. An administrative law judge now has the case under advisement. In addition to the usual question of the presence or absence of discrimination in the termination, in a contract clause case there is the added element of whether or not the agency took affirmative action toward the complainant during the termination procedure.

In another employment discrimination case involving a redevelopment authority in Massachusetts, HUD, by utilizing the EEO contract provision contained in the Loan and Grant Agreement, as well as in the Terms and Conditions of the 701 Planning Grant, obtained sufficient funding leverage to negotiate a conciliation agreement which provided for damages of $55,000 to the families of employees of the authority who had been discriminated against.

A long-time female employee of a housing authority in Region I filed a sex discrimination complaint against the authority after being passed over on a number of occasions for the position of project manager. Although she was appointed to the next vacancy as project manager, the State commission against discrimination awarded her $30,000 in back pay and $15,000 for "humiliation and emotional pain and suffering." HUD is now attempting to negotiate a settlement with the authority based on the State Commission's finding, using the EEO clause of the Annual Contributions Contract as a jurisdictional basis. If this fails, HUD can then initiate debarment proceedings against the authority for breach of the contract. The Region I Equal Opportunity staff is currently investigating two other employment discrimination cases based on sex against housing authorities.

At an administrative meeting held by HUD Assistant Secretary Gloria E. A. Toote in Hartford, Conn., in May 1974, to receive testimony on discrimination in the financing of housing, an example was given as to how the use of the contract clause as a tool to combat discrimination can be extended from the employment field to the housing field. The Connecticut Bank and Trust Company, the largest bank in the State, announced that it will incorporate into its mortgage instruments a contract clause providing for default of the mortgage in the event the mortgagor engages in discriminatory housing practices.

By incorporating people's civil rights into contractual rights and by providing as an additional remedy to complainants a breach of contract action which might subject the respondent to financial loss, an additional weapon is added to the arsenal of civil rights enforcement.
Thomas G. Cody has been named Assistant Secretary for Administration by Secretary Lynn. As assistant Secretary for Administration, Mr. Cody is principal adviser to the Secretary and Chief Officer of HUD for administrative management.

HUD has expanded an experimental program of design and planning assistance to New England communities with the award of an additional $250,000 to a consortium of colleges and universities whose students are carrying out the work. The award went to PACE, Inc., a consortium of planning and design schools including Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Massachusetts, and the Rhode Island School of Design. PACE stands for Planning Approaches for Community Environments.

HUD Assistant Secretary Michael H. Moskow has announced award of a research contract to the Joint Center for Urban Studies of Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for study of the migration of people and jobs to and from the Nation's urban centers.

Timonium Elementary School near Baltimore has become the first in the Nation to obtain heat from solar energy, the AIA Journal/May 1974 reports. The Timonium experiment is one of four at schools in northern and middle latitudes of the U.S. to test the use of sunpower for heating funded by the National Research Foundation's program.

If an elderly person has a private bedroom unit rather than a studio apartment, it can mean the difference between an idle old age and an active one, says Bettyann Raschko, an authority on architectural design for the elderly and assistant professor of architecture of the University of California, San Francisco. Through research she has found that senior citizens who live in studios will give up an activity or fail to take up a new hobby because it "messes things up." But those who have a separate bedroom have space to store projects and will pursue new interests.

HUD Secretary James T. Lynn has appointed Joseph B. Blake Deputy Regional Administrator of Region VIII. Mr. Blake is a native of Denver, Colorado.

According to the Environmental Protection Agency, officials in at least six urban areas across the country have made definite commitments to build a system of burning trash and other solid wastes as fuel to generate electricity and recover waste for recycling by industry.

HUD has issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking developers, who, by themselves or in cooperation with local governments and/or utility companies, will provide sites for the Modular Integrated Utilities System (MIUS) demonstration, build and operate the MIUS, and permit HUD to evaluate the system under realistic conditions.

Roosevelt Jones has been appointed Executive Assistant to David O. Meeker Jr., HUD Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.

The design for a Neighborhood Center under construction at a HUD-assisted new community, Gananda, near Rochester, New York, will be displayed at a school architecture exhibit June 10-14 in Brussels, Belgium. The U.S. Information Agency, after close of the show, Didacta 1974—sponsored by the European Association of Manufacturers and Distributors of Educational Materials—will send the Gananda exhibit around the world. Gananda is one of 17 New Communities, which stress innovation in design and construction of private dwellings and public facilities.

HUD has moved its program of basic homes for the rural poor to the construction stage with awards to six subcontractors who will build prototype homes in rural areas of eight States.

Secretary Lynn has awarded a HUD Certificate of Appreciation to Ron Thompson, President of Optimist International, for his leadership in creating and supporting a national Optimist's program to help low-income families in inner-city neighborhoods.

The Federal National Mortgage Association is cooperating with the Mortgage Bankers Association of America (MBA) and the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) in presenting special seminars on FNMA's new program for the purchase of conventionally financed mortgages on units in condominiums and planned unit developments.

A special WATS lines has been installed in HUD's Washington office to provide information on the recent Flood Disaster Protection Act and other Federal flood insurance requirements. The toll free number is (800) 424-8872 or 8873.

HUD plans to de-lead some 250 dwelling units in four cities as part of an intensive effort to find the best, most cost-effective way of removing lead-based paint hazards from housing. Nearly all of the Nation's 30 million, pre-1940 residential units and a substantial number of units built between 1940 and 1960 have lead paint. Currently, the average cost of de-leading a single dwelling unit ranges between $1,500 and $2,000.
Captain’s Walk

New London, Connecticut, population 33,000, had been historically a regional shopping center for southeastern Connecticut, serving a trade area of over 225,000 people. However, by 1971, downtown New London faced a problem common to many towns of the same size which had been traditionally regional shopping centers—the proliferation of suburban shopping centers. Within the past ten years, six major shopping centers were built within a ten mile radius of downtown New London. Because of this change in shopping patterns, the investment local businesses had in downtown was at stake, and the tax structure was in danger of being seriously affected.

Because of its size, New London faced some problems peculiar to itself. New London is the smallest municipality in the State of Connecticut, consisting of only 3,968 acres, just slightly over six square miles, with 53 percent occupied by non-taxable educational, religious, and governmental facilities. Of the remaining acreage, only six percent is vacant and considered buildable. Burdened with ever increasing costs to provide the bare necessities in municipal services, threatened with the loss of its downtown vitality, and a slumping tax base, the city faced a problem.

In 1969, New London was the only community in the State to experience a decrease in taxable properties; in 1970, the list decreased again; 1971 saw a small increase, but not enough to offset increased costs caused by inflation.

A partial solution to New London’s problem, it was hoped, would be the Winthrop urban renewal project, which had been undertaken in 1962, and was well underway in 1971. While the renewal project would undoubtedly provide some improvement in the tax base, the project would certainly not solve the problem of downtown New London, even though it included State Street, the “downtown.” Reuse within the 100 acre project, when completed, was to be a mixture of residential, commercial, and light industrial. The project contained no specific proposals for the center other than a general facelift through voluntary rehabilitation—certainly nothing that would generate the kind of interest the downtown needed if it was to survive the growing tendency of its citizens to shop in the outlying shopping centers whose amenities were proving attractive. Something had to be done to counteract this shift in shopping patterns before it became a permanent change that could not be reversed.

The idea of a mall for the downtown area of New London had been under discussion in one form or another since the 1950’s. In 1969, the City’s Redevelopment Agency proposed the conversion of the six blocks of State Street to exclusive pedestrian use, as a total mall. As with many well intentioned plans, it was discussed, considered, and reconsidered, but nothing happened. However, by 1971 it was readily apparent the time had come to act on a plan for the downtown area. By this time though, the possibility of additional Federal dollars, which the total conversion of State Street to a pedestrian mall would most certainly require, was negligible. Additionally, because of the change in the approach to the funding of categorical programs, there was no hope of another project to treat State Street. Also, the development of the total mall concept posed some severe legal, administrative, and servicing problems for the community. Thus, the City and the Redevelopment Agency had to come up with the type of proposal that created sufficient impact to revitalize the area and produce a new downtown environment that would give State
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1. Looking west on State Street during initial phase of utility construction in March 1973.
2. Looking west on State Street in 1971 prior to construction of Captain's Walk.
Street a chance to survive, now. Discussions with local merchants produced one common response—do something and do it immediately. But the question of what evoked various solutions. The key objective quickly became to achieve a radical change in downtown in the shortest time possible.

In October, 1972, the Redevelopment Agency engaged the services of Johnson and Dee, Architects, of Avon, Connecticut, to design the semi-mall. In addition to considering how to restore the economic vitality of downtown by strengthening its competitive position with the suburban centers and how to protect this vital base of the community, another philosophy of development began to emerge—how to make State Street once again the focal point of community life. The concept is probably best stated by Richard Dee, of Johnson and Dee, when he describes the thought process he and his associates went through as they began to search for the right design concept for downtown New London. "We came upon a single concept that seemed to give a certain justification and encouragement to our thoughts about the street. The idea that the downtown area of New London and other communities has not only the opportunity, but also the responsibility to serve as the focus of the community. What the community is, what it stands for, where it is going, is stated by the downtown area. This single concept establishes a certain unique attitude that none of the competing suburban centers can ever fully achieve. Our clear goal became to re-establish the visual viability of downtown New London; not just to provide green ‘growies’ in pots on the street, not just to give the shopper some benches; but to create a space that could serve as the community podium; the community focus for the events and displays that remind its citizens and visitors of the energy and vitality of this New England Town."

State Street was a natural for the concept of a semi-mall (both vehicular and pedestrian use) that was to become the focus of community life. Six blocks long, and bounded on one end by the Thames River, historical Union Station, and the magnificent County Court House built in 1786, the street was a natural center of the area between City Hall and the majestic three-spired New England church on the opposite end.

**Planning Initiated**

Long known as the “Whaling City,” New London is historically one of the oldest ports of New England’s coast, and a nautical theme for the State Street semi-mall was obviously desirable. But since State Street also represented a look into New London’s future, and since today nuclear submarines pass the docks, which lie at the foot of the semi-mall, where the whalers once tied up, the architects decided a modern design should be used to depict the nautical theme of the “Captain’s Walk.”

Besides the work that was commencing on the physical aspects of the mall, considerable effort was being expended during this period by the Downtown New London Association (an organization of 65 downtown merchants and businessmen) to garner support for the project.

The City of New London had to come up with $50,000 to finance the local share of the $400,000 cost to the HUD-assisted renewal project that the mall was to represent, with the State of Connecticut Department of Community Affairs also providing another $50,000 in matching funds. The Downtown New London Association readily consented to serve as a vehicle for obtaining voluntary contributions to the local share. The contributions were to come from those directly benefiting, and directly affected, as soon was to be seen, from the undertaking—the merchants and businesses on State Street. In addition to securing the local share without burdening other New London taxpayers, the merchants felt this involvement of the Downtown Association would clearly demonstrate to the City Council and the community their faith in downtown and the desirability of the project. Local banks made financial assistance available to the State Street merchants at reasonable commercial rates for terms up to five years. The Downtown Association obtained commitments for the $50,000 in less than 3 months, and the project was finally at a point where things were actually beginning to happen.

**Construction Started**

During the initial period of construction, the merchants along State Street were cut off from their customers and were accessible only over plywood sidewalks. Yet, they enthusiastically supported the project and continued to support it. In fact, the merchants capitalized on the construction and sponsored a “hard hat” day during the height of the construction period. A massive promotional campaign, and free hard hats generated over 10,000 visitors to the State Street construction area.

**Mall Completed**

The mall was finally completed, except for some minor touch-up items that would be finished the next spring, in October 1973. Captain’s Walk, the name selected for it in a contest sponsored by the Downtown New London Association which drew over 2,000 entries, was officially dedicated October 22, 1973. The final product, although still referred to as a semi-mall, is, in reality, part semi-mall and part full-mall, with a
two block area in the center designed for pedestrian use exclusively. The upper and lower portions of the mall provide for vehicular traffic. It is conveniently located near two municipal parking garages, and a paved surface lot one block away provides space for an additional 200 cars. Thus, there is adequate and convenient parking for shoppers. Both municipal garages are linked with the newly constructed Interstate Highway (1-95) via the downtown connector which was built as a part of the urban renewal project.

Captain’s Walk

Captain’s Walk provides the pleasant atmosphere of a tree-lined walkway with sitting walls and benches, fiberglass canopies that capture the nautical theme and provide shelter for the exhibits and events held on the Captain’s Walk, and tree filled planter islands. The central pedestrian area is paved with cobblestone to provide freedom of pedestrian movement. A winding twelve foot right-of-way that weaves from side to side for the length of the pedestrian mall has been reserved for access by emergency and service vehicles, but prohibits normal automobile traffic. The winding effect has been achieved with the placement of planter islands into the weaving pattern. The planters themselves are elongated, something like a football, although quickly dubbed “whales” by the people of New London. The lower portion of Captain’s Walk containing a large tree-lined open space fronting the Thames River can be used for assemblies on the mall. The entire semimall has a two-tiered lighting system. One-hundred watt mercury vapor bulbs with clear bubble shaped lenses are set at 35 feet to provide normal lighting. A lower tier of 175 watt lights on ten foot poles were added to provide a special effect for nighttime functions. These were placed on the planter islands with the trees and create an added highlight as they illuminate the leaves of the trees.

New London has achieved the radical change sought for downtown New London, but has it achieved the other goal the City had set for itself of revitalizing the area with regard to shopping and community life? When asked, local officials were quick to respond with an unqualified, “Yes.” Although it is too soon to have specific statistics regarding the impact the mall has had on retail sales, local merchants feel the past Christmas produced more sales than ever—which means new people are shopping downtown. Merchants claim, “We saw people downtown in November and December that we haven’t seen in a long time.” The only statistical proof of the success of the mall is a 14 percent increase in short term parking in the parking garages which the city feels does indicate more shoppers are coming to downtown.

The mall has also generated other tangible benefits for New London. Two old third-class hotels on State Street are now undergoing major rejuvenation. One, vacant for many years, will provide 88 efficiency and one-bedroom apartments, plus a restaurant and shops. The other, an eleven story building, will be converted to 100 condominium units. Ed Perry, President of the Downtown New London Association, feels the construction of the mall “played the leading role in these two developments.” Phil Michalowski, Development Coordinator for the City of New London, credits the mall with creating a new image for New London. “The mall has caused a change in attitude towards the future. If you have optimism, then you can influence beneficial investment decisions.” The Redevelopment Agency recently sold two parcels of land near the mall—sales which they attribute to the effects of the mall on the potential of downtown New London. Two businesses which had been on the verge of closing their doors last fall before the mall was completed are operating, and indications are they will stay in business. Additionally, Johnson and Dee, the design architects, were honored with a first place design award by the American Society of Landscape Architects in competition with 99 other entries for urban three dimensional design. Entries also came from Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

The Downtown New London Association has organized Captain’s Walk, Inc., an organization which coordinates and publicizes the almost weekly events held on the mall. Flower shows, car shows, art and crafts shows, children’s plays, bands, and chowder feeds provide a continuous fare of activities that bring life downtown. Captain’s Walk, Inc. has even sponsored a medieval pageant and joust on the mall, sponsored by the Society for Creative Anachronism. Currently, a major boat show features the 295-foot United States Coast Guard Academy training barque.

New London, working through the Redevelopment Agency, has achieved a solution to the problem of its downtown with the decisive action that built the Captain’s Walk. The cooperation and effort of local merchants and businessmen which encouraged the City to act contributed materially to the success of the venture. The downtown is now alive; the tax base is protected and the flight of shoppers to the suburbs is halted. With what looks like success for the mini-mall, plans are underway to make the entire length of State Street into a full pedestrian mall!

James N. Forsberg
Hartford Area Office
Maine's Indian Housing

"This housing is one of the better things to happen to the reserve. People were able to take part in the construction and can certainly see improvements. It has been a morale booster to the entire community."

The speaker is John Stevens, a member of the Passamaquoddy Tribe and Commissioner of Maine's Department of Indian Affairs, applauding a recent occurrence on Indian reservations throughout the State of Maine—construction of federally subsidized housing and approval of Federal grants for neighborhood facilities and water and sewer projects.

Historical Ties with State

The status of Maine's Indians is unique, in that their reservations are within the jurisdiction of the State Department of Indian Affairs, rather than the Federal Government's Bureau of Indian Affairs. This came about in the early 1800's, when Maine was still a part of Massachusetts, and a treaty was signed between the Indian tribes and the State of Massachusetts. When Maine achieved statehood in 1820, it became the successor to that treaty. In 1965, in response to the desperate need for decent shelter and community facilities on the reservation, the State legislature enacted the Maine Indian Housing Authority Law, which created three Indian housing authorities in the State—the Penobscot Tribal Reservation Housing Authority in Old Town, the Pleasant Point Passamaquoddy Reservation Housing Authority in Perry, and the Indian Township Passamaquoddy Reservation Housing Authority in Princeton. In order to acquire reservation land, the housing authority must obtain a lease from the reservation's tribal council, which must then be approved by the governor of the State before activity begins.

However, for several years subsequent to the establishment of the authorities, Maine's Indian tribes opposed Federal participation in attempts to resolve housing and related problems. Continued efforts by HUD field staff, however, gradually brought about a change in attitude on the part of tribal leaders and established a basis for cooperative efforts. As a result, over the past few years, Maine's Indian tribes have joined with HUD's Manchester Area Office to plan and implement construction of housing, neighborhood facilities, and water and sewer projects.

While the Indian population is relatively small, with each reservation comprised of some 300 to 400 people, the problems of delivering services are critical. The distance from the Manchester Area Office, for example, to the Passamaquoddy reservations is approximately 360 miles, much of which is of the non-highway and backwoods variety. Compounding the geographical problem are the economic and social ones of very high unemployment and very low family incomes, stemming from the distance of two of the reservations from the centers of commerce.

The Passamaquoddy Indians

The Passamaquoddy Indians maintain two reservations situated approximately 40 miles apart. Pleasant Point lies near the easternmost point of the United States on the shores of Passamaquoddy Bay, while Indian Township sits inland and is comprised of about 20,000 acres. Existing housing is substandard and the lack of basic facilities is clearly evident.

In May 1973, the two housing authorities signed a contract for the construction of 70 single family housing units under the Mutual Help method. The Pleasant Point reservation received approval for 45 units to be placed at three different locations within the reservation and for the Indian Township reservation 25 units were approved, also to be placed on three different sites. The homes are all three to five bedrooms, and under the Mutual Help Program the families who have been selected for participation will contribute a minimum of 500 hours per family toward construction of the units. In return for this "labor donation" each family will earn $1,500 in an equity account which will ultimately help in the purchase of the unit.

The units are being constructed by a Talequah, Oklahoma, company which has used its experience with mutual help in the Southwest to assist the Passamaquoddiess in this, the first mutual help low rent project in New England. The Federal participation in the Pleasant Point reservation project will total in excess of $1 million, while the Federal participation in the Indian Township reservation will be in excess of $700,000. Thirty-five units at Pleasant Point and 15 units at Indian Township have been completed and are being occupied. Many of the vacated substandard units have been demolished.

In addition, a homeownership training program for the participating families has been developed which includes classes on home maintenance, minor repair, and the use and care of appliances and utilities. Each reservation has also received water and sewer and neighborhood facilities grants.
Penobscot Reservation - Old Town

Even though the Penobscot Housing Authority in Old Town, Maine, has had 40 units of low rent public housing under reservation since 1968, only recently did the Indian leaders express unqualified willingness to develop these units. At the present time, 40 conventional bid units are under design, with construction slated to begin this year.

The units are being developed under the Turnkey III homeownership opportunities program. Because of the reservation’s location on an island in the middle of the Penobscot River, detailed planning was conducted to insure that the units are located outside of the island’s flood prone areas. Concomitantly water and sewer grants have been approved for the Old Town reservation.

—Francis Gros Louis
Manchester Area Office
A Very Unusual Neighborhood Facility

An example of integrated use of public space is the combined Public Safety Headquarters Building and neighborhood center in Portland, Maine. By providing for both functions under one roof, the community brings together the police department with other types of community functions and makes each aware of the problems of the other, while creating an atmosphere of mutual respect.

The building is a 5-story attractive brick structure with underground parking, a pneumatic tube system, spacious work areas, bold graphics and bright colors. A HUD grant of $327,320 helped finance the $2.5 million 11,440 square foot East End Neighborhood Center which includes an auditorium, gymnasium, cafeteria, and classroom, and is free of charge to the public. It is operated by the Portland Parks and Recreation Department, and provides a comprehensive program of social, health, education and recreation services and activities.

The Center features an 1,836 square foot multi-purpose room which also serves as an auditorium with seating capacity of 110 that is used for a variety of weekly programs including a music workshop, a Judo program for boys and girls, community health services for in-service training, and family workshops by the Community Council. The 420 square foot classroom is used as an alternative meeting area, as is the cafeteria dining area which, through the use of a folding wall, combines to become a 1,300 square foot meeting space.

Numerous Programs Featured

Defensive driving classes are but one of many community programs conducted in the classroom, which is also used by the Police Department to conduct its in-service training and career development course. A result of this program has been a speaker's bureau which reaches out to some 6,000 individuals a month on varied topics such as bad checks, defense tactics for women, narcotics, problems of youth, and traffic.

The 5,880 square foot gymnasium accommodates a wide range of athletic sports. Youth and adults have various hours to utilize equipment such as the trampoline, parallel bars, training bag, rings and ropes. Youth activities include volleyball, badminton, boxing, wrestling, tumbling, floor hockey, kickball and dodgeball. A Sunday morning program for handicapped children and use of the basketball courts by both the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Little Brothers Organization are being planned. Monthly attendance since the opening of the center has averaged 1,600 young people.

The Center represents a successful experiment in community relations.
Building offers excellent setting for divergent activities of active young users of gym facilities (top) and official functions of city's Police Department staff (bottom).
From Scrap Parts to Green Parks

A small group of Indians, gathered on a rock ledge overlooking the Seekonk River, shouted "Wha Cheer, Netop," the first salutation ever heard by a white man from the shore of what was to become Providence, Rhode Island. The year was 1636; the white man was Roger Williams, expelled from Plymouth Colony for his religious liberalism, and traveling by canoe to seek a new place of settlement. That rock ledge, located at the head of Narragansett Bay, was used in later years as a harbor for vessels engaged in trade with India and was named, accordingly, India Point.

By the year 1968, however, this once lovely area had deteriorated and was being used as a junkyard and a railroad facility. It was an unsightly setting of broken wharves and buildings, old rail sidings, and pieces of scrap metal. Located within walking distance of Providence's Model Cities area, the site is bordered by a Federal highway, and parallel's an urban renewal project which includes residential reuses.

For several years, the residents of the area, proud of the historic and esthetic significance of India Point, had petitioned the State to acquire and develop the open space land for recreational use. Finally, in what turned out to be an extremely cooperative venture among Federal, State, local and community organizations, the restoration of India Point took hold. To provide the impetus for the park development, the State swapped the 2.7-acre parcel utilized by the junkyard for a similar parcel in another area, and in 1970 transferred title to the City of Providence.

A key contribution of $150,000 by Mrs. Mary Sharpe, a noted leader in civic beautification work and a long-time advocate of reclaiming the area for recreational use, was matched by city funds. Federal money was available on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis through HUD's Parks-in-Cities program. With an additional 9.5 acres purchased by the city from the railroads, the 12-acre eyesore was on its way to beautification.

Total Community Involvement

Community response was overwhelmingly enthusiastic. Boy Scout groups removed debris and planted trees; civic clubs and neighborhood groups donated time; businesses supplied workers and equipment. In addition, a major statewide fundraising drive helped pay for the land's development to its fullest potential. To make the park accessible for the neighboring community, a pedestrian overpass was built over the highway. Today, a carpet of green unfolds along the water-
front, with large open play spaces, picnic areas, promenades and overlooks. The project not only enhances one of the major gateways into the City of Providence but has made accessible to a densely populated urban region an otherwise unusable waterfront area.
Regionalization and consolidation of local housing authority programs in the smaller New England communities have resulted in more efficient and effective operation. A comparison of costs of pooled operation of regionalized or consolidated local authorities with the costs of conventional small-community LHA operation indicates savings in administrative costs, staffing, and maintenance equipment, as well as budgeting, accounting, and fiscal reporting functions.

Manchester Area Office
In serving the Public Housing Program in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, the Manchester Area Office deals with a multitude of smaller communities who have generally had less experience, less sophisticated local agencies, and in the case of small communities, have no housing authority at all. Implementation of housing programs in these more sparsely populated areas has required innovative techniques to develop feasible projects from a construction and management perspective.

The establishment of State housing authorities in each of the tri-states helped to meet some of the demands for housing. However, the need still existed for a better approach to meeting the needs of the small New England towns which historically exercised highly independent local control in projects of any substantial nature. Regionalization of individual authorities appeared to provide the answer.

In the fall of 1972 housing authorities were established in five coastal Maine towns—Swans Island, Tremont, Southwest Harbor, Mt. Desert, and Bar Harbor. The three largest authorities are presently sharing construction of 100 units of housing. These units are being developed under the administration of an executive director hired jointly by the five communities. In addition, a single fee accountant has been hired to perform accounting functions in connection with development and management of the housing projects. It is expected that the two remaining communities not actively constructing HUD-assisted housing will participate in the
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new Section 23 Leased Housing Program.

In concert with the regional consolidation concept the management functions of each authority will be combined as appropriate in such areas as administration, finance, investment, purchasing and maintenance. The reduced administrative expenses will allow each of the small communities more available dollars to meet their housing needs. This form of consolidation will provide a viable precedent for other northern New England communities.

Consolidation of Management

The housing management staff in the HUD Boston Regional Office is currently developing a demonstration pilot study for the consolidation of low-rent housing activities of the five authorities within the Blackstone Valley of Rhode Island. Each authority is now made up of a board of commissioners, an executive director, administrative staff, and maintenance staff.

The planned structure continues the autonomy of each authority with the exception of decisions related to such centralized functions as procurement, maintenance, telephone services, and accounting.

The planned centralized accounting procedure will benefit each of the authorities with: (1) a computer operation, (2) centralized rent collection, and (3) a financial management system. The program is intended to absorb the best of the management improvement devices.

Initial response to the proposal has been affirmative as described in the following excerpt from the Providence Evening Bulletin:

"The proposal from the Federal housing and urban development agency to consolidate various public housing services in the Blackstone Valley deserves public support from the five involved localities. Savings plainly would accrue if the several housing authorities consolidated their purchasing, maintenance, legal and accounting operations. These economies would help offset soaring fuel costs thereby easing the upward pressure on rents.

"It’s hard to imagine any of the five localities—Pawtucket, Central Falls, Woonsocket, Cumberland and Lincoln—quarreling with the concept. This bit of inter-community cooperation makes sense amid fuel shortages, and the larger thought—regionalization of public services—is familiar in the Blackstone Valley. No other group of localities in Rhode Island has made more progress in this regard...."

Subsequent to the establishment of this consolidated program, it is intended that three or four additional areas will be consolidated which will then encompass all LHA’s within Rhode Island.

HUD Regional Administrator, James J. Barry, has supported the regionalization/consolidation of medium and small authorities throughout the Region. He has emphasized that it is "economically unsound" for such housing authorities to maintain their own maintenance and procurement staffs.

Sirrouko Howard, Assistant Regional Administrator for Housing Management, emphasizes that this restructuring “is born of necessity.” Citing the increasing costs of fuel and energy and the Federal laws which prevent housing authorities from boosting rents beyond the ability of the tenants to pay, Mr. Howard has said “the handwriting is on the wall, we must economize.”
A few years ago a Committee on Experimental Programs was instituted in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Vermont to investigate certain problems of higher education. Among topics explored was the possibility of using the cluster college concept on the Vermont campus. After much planning, this idea has become a reality in the form of a Living and Learning Center, which provides living accommodations and teaching facilities for 600 undergraduate and graduate students and faculty.

"The center is not a separate institution but an integrated part of the University's teaching effort," says Brian Lloyd, Assistant Director of the Center.

"Courses will be developed and taught at the Center for a period not exceeding two years," Lloyd adds. "After courses are tried at the Center, they will undergo rigorous evaluation and will then be turned over to department chairmen for use outside the Center. The Living and Learning Center is also designed to encourage student planning of programs and allocates one-fifth of the spaces available to students. About 20 proposals will be submitted this year, with 5 to 20 students participating in each."

Supported in part by a HUD debt service grant of approximately $129,000 to support a loan of $4,985,000 as well as a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Center is designed to permit and encourage the integration of academic and social life in a non-institutional setting with full student and faculty participation. To help achieve this, plans call for an equal number of male and female undergraduate students from the freshman through senior years.

New Concept Given High Marks

This spring the first evaluation of the new concept was rendered in an opinion poll completed by members of the student body and faculty who had participated in the first living/learning experiment. Their overall reactions were highly enthusiastic about this new approach to academic study and living.

Seventy-eight percent of the participants rated the new concept much higher than dormitory living, found a better study atmosphere, and discovered the opportunity for more extracurricular activities. High on the list also were the potential for privacy and a climate that fostered serious discussion and the discovery of new ideas.

In order to promote cohesiveness, dining, recreational, and service facilities were designed within the complex.

The project is being monitored by educators throughout the Nation.
Operation Breakthrough Phase III
...It Works in New England

Operation Breakthrough is a three-phase demonstration program launched in May 1969 by then HUD Secretary George Romney. The program’s design research, prototype demonstration and volume marketing phases have proven the viability of diverse housing systems in the marketplace. Its objective was to test and encourage the use of volume-produced, factory-built housing for families of all income levels as a vital factor in attaining the Nation’s housing goals established by Congress. With its emphasis on new technology and management, its impact in New England—HUD’s Region I—has been exceptional.

Operation Breakthrough selected 21 housing systems producers from 236 private industry applicants which during Phase II, constructed some 2,900 prototype housing units on nine urban and suburban sites in eight States across the country. They demonstrated a wide variety of processes and materials that can be utilized to produce both single and multifamily housing of high quality in less time—and, with the advent of volume production in the marketplace, at less cost—than through conventional construction methods.

At the same time, Operation Breakthrough made great strides in overcoming the traditional constraints posed by diverse and restrictive building codes and regulations affecting other than conventional or “stick-built” construction. Toward that end, during the past four and one-half years of the concentrated Breakthrough effort, 31 of the 50 States have enacted statewide building codes or housing legislation permitting the use of factory-built housing and housing components in any community of the State.

There were other achievements for the housing industry—such as those in product quality testing, site planning, labor and trade practices, and mortgage financing—brought about by the formal Operation Breakthrough program; but it is in Phase III, or the volume production phase, that the benefits of this innovative HUD undertaking most significantly continue to be demonstrated by the prototype systems producers.

And nowhere in the United States has Phase III been more dramatically successful than in New England, which, coincidentally, had no Operation Breakthrough prototype site to help focus attention on the program. Instead, it was a distinctive educational process, for both the public and housing interests, by Region I’s Operation Breakthrough Director, Edward J. Cachine, with enthusiastic support from Regional Administrator James J. Barry, that resulted in a degree of acceptance of industrialized housing unparalleled anywhere else in the Nation. Commencing with the introduction of Breakthrough to New England at a three-day marketplace seminar in Boston in December 1970, shortly after the present Region I was created, housing developers and Operation Breakthrough producers (as well as non-Breakthrough industrialized housing producers) were brought together with understanding communities to achieve the success on which this report is based.

To assist its prototype producers in the Phase III marketing of their housing innovations, Operation Breakthrough gave them special allocations of units and rent supplements under HUD subsidized housing programs—principally the Section 236 multifamily program. Seven of the 21 Breakthrough producers have had their systems incorporated in more than 7,000 units of housing in New England, which boasts several Operation Breakthrough “firsts.”

First Housing Under Phase III

The first Phase III development by any Breakthrough producer in the United States was built at Springfield, Mass., by Hercoform Marketing, Inc.,
of Wilmington, Del. This project, processed through the HUD Boston Area Office, consisted of 270 townhouse units. The first housing in the country to be completed and occupied under Phase III was Brook Village North in Nashua, N.H. Processing the application for HUD assistance through the Manchester Area Office, the developer, First Equity Associates, Inc., of Boston, purchased 174 garden-type apartment units from the General Electric Company in Philadelphia. As an outgrowth of its Operation Breakthrough experience, particularly with Phase III in New England, GE expanded its housing manufacturing program to several foreign countries.

A broad memorandum of understanding, one of the first with a State agency, was signed on December 31, 1971, between Operation Breakthrough and the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency for the development of Breakthrough-approved industrialized housing units in Massachusetts. Currently, nearly 3,600 of the State’s 4,229 Breakthrough units are being financed through MHFA.

Largest Phase III Developments
The three largest Phase III developments in the Nation meeting the stringent site planning and other requirements of Operation Breakthrough are in New England. All have more housing units than any of the nine prototype sites. Two of them were developed by Carabetta Enterprises, Inc., of Meriden, Conn., which also obtained the New England franchise from Rouse-Wates, Inc., of Columbia, Md., a Breakthrough producer of precast reinforced concrete panels, employing the Wates Building System of England.

Bella Vista Elderly Community ultimately will provide 1,400 units of environmental housing and many on-site amenities at New Haven, Conn. The first phase of the project, processed through the HUD Hartford Area Office, consisted of 620 units, now occupied, in Carabetta-Rouse-Wates System high-rise buildings. A second 460-unit section is now under construction.

Theodore R. Britton, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, stated during a unique “lift-off” ceremony marking the start of Bella Vista’s construction in October 1972:

“This is a large development, and its size enables the developer to make available a wide range of facilities that are seldom, if ever, made available to low-income families. Bella Vista represents a whole new concept in housing for the elderly—a true community, meeting all life’s needs, constructed with industrialized housing. It also demonstrates how far industrialized housing has come in this country. This project would not have been possible three years ago.”

The only Planned Unit Development (PUD) in Operation Breakthrough Phase III is the 1,200-unit Lincoln Village, combining three Breakthrough systems with conventional Carabetta construction on a 76-acre former golf course in Worcester, Mass.

The third largest Phase III employer of an Operation Breakthrough-approved system will be the 858-unit mixed-income Harvard University housing development, construction of which is scheduled to start by late this fall in the Roxbury section of Boston.

Breakthrough housing now has been built in all of the New England States except Vermont, but industrialized housing has been proposed there by the Vermont Housing Authority under HUD’s Section 23 leasing program.

There are throughout New England many industrialized housing producers who were not direct participants in Operation Breakthrough, but they have been outspoken in their praise of the public awareness and acceptance of factory manufactured housing brought about by the Operation Breakthrough efforts of the HUD Boston Regional Office. These producers point not only to use of their systems through regular HUD housing assistance programs, but also to an ever increasing volume of business in the general housing market.

Wayne R. Fullerton, Jr., sales manager for the Bison Wall Frame System produced by C.W. Blakeslee and Sons, Inc., a 130-year-old firm which is headquartered at New Haven, Connecticut, and is now a subsidiary of Westinghouse Electric Corporation, summed it up this way:

“The advancement of the industrialized housing industry in New England has been greatly enhanced by the HUD Regional Office’s efforts to make not only Operation Breakthrough producers, but also other manufacturers of housing components or complete structures more readily acceptable to both developers and State and local officials. The administration of the Breakthrough program in this part of the country has dramatically demonstrated that technological building theories by research can effectively be transmitted into housing units in the market place.

“Specifically, C.W. Blakeslee and Sons, Inc., credits the assistance and guidance received from the HUD Regional and Area Offices for 960 of the 2,000 units of housing produced over the past three years through our Bison Wall Frame System plant at Branford, Connecticut. These 960 units, manufactured for Connecticut and Rhode Island developers, are in seven buildings ranging from four to 17 stories in height.”

In the words of Columnist Charles J. Stokes of the New Haven, Conn., Register “The word that is synonymous with Operation Breakthrough in New England is ‘success.’”

—Carleton Hovey
Public Information Officer
Boston Regional Office
A Decade of Technical Assistance in Housing

By Robert B. Whittlesey

In 1964, Greater Boston Community Development, Inc., a nonprofit organization, undertook a demonstration to determine whether the four- and five-story masonry row houses typical of Boston's South End could be rehabilitated with the aid offered by Federal programs to enable nonprofit organizations to provide housing—new or rehabilitated—within the means of low income families.

Prime mover in the formation of GBCD was United South End Settlements, a long established settlement house in Boston's South End. Organized as a charitable corporation under the general laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, GBCD obtained tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Board of Directors is made up of persons representing community interests and persons from institutions, professions and business. Several of the original Board are still active. A grant of $50,000 from United South End Settlements provided initial capital and a grant of $75,000 from the Committee of the Permanent Charity Fund of Boston. In a letter advising the corporation of the Committee's grant, Mr. William J. Bender, its director, wrote:

In making this grant, the Committee realizes that there's no insurance that the goal of this project, to demonstrate the feasibility under certain conditions of providing decent rehabilitated housing at rents that low-income families can afford to pay, will be achieved. Nevertheless, it believes that the problem with which this new enterprise is concerned is of vital importance to the future of Boston and other cities. (Experiences under the demonstration project and its results are reported in a book published in 1969 entitled The South End Row House and Its Rehabilitation for Low-Income Residents.)

Following the demonstration program, GBCD began to assemble a much larger rehabilitation effort in an attempt to develop a more economical project. This work led to an association with the Tenants' Development Corporation, a predominantly Black tenants' organization active in protecting tenants' interests. The resulting project was the first on which GBCD acted as a housing consultant to a local tenant organization which sponsored the project in its own name. About this same time, other sponsors came to the corporation for assistance with their projects. In view of an apparent need for technical assistance by community sponsors the corporation was reorganized in 1970 as a technical assistance agency serving sponsors throughout the Boston area. Citizen's Housing and Planning Association of Boston was instrumental in this reorganization and the expanded program was made possible by grants from the Ford Foundation, the Committee of the Permanent Charity Fund, and other local foundations.

The increasing workload of the corporation over the next several years verified the need for such services. GBCD assisted tenant organizations, civic organizations, church groups, OEO-funded agencies, Model Cities agencies, public housing authorities and local government agencies. In addition, GBCD was involved in a number of significant accomplishments:

• the first FHA-insured project mortgage loan in the South End of Boston;
• one of the first, if not the first project in the country, where a tenants' organization was designated to be the developer of the housing which they occupied;
• HUD Section 236 projects sponsored by limited partnerships in which the local tenants' community organization is the managing general partner;
• a Turnkey I project in which the local tenants' organization is the sole developer.

Recently, the corporation has become increasingly involved in projects financed through the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) and programs conducted by the State's Department of Community Affairs and is currently engaged in a number of interesting and innovative MHFA projects. These include a suburban mixed-income cooperative in which low-income families will receive equity, the renovation of an
obsolete elementary school into housing for the elderly and the conversion of public housing into mixed-income private housing.

A significant aspect of GBCD's activities has been the availability of seed money for projects. Over $500,000 is currently available to projects with which it is associated, $275,000 of which are funds advanced to GBCD by a local housing foundation.

Geographic Scope and Interests Expanded

An important factor in GBCD's reorganization in 1970 into a regional agency was the opinion that a technical assistance agency could not operate effectively on a neighborhood level. This was a problem experienced by many of the Model Cities housing development corporations, which were closely tied to a single neighborhood. On the other hand, GBCD's experience indicates the special and necessary role that local, community based organizations and their staff can play. Local sponsorship encourages: (1) advocacy of consumer and community interest; (2) local identity and political strength; (3) a vehicle for local participation; (4) mobilization of community resources; (5) involvement in related community needs; (6) An open and more easily understood operation. GBCD's experience supports the concept of a tiered system: an umbrella metropolitan organization or a citywide development corporation which can provide technical services on a continuing basis combined with locally based organizations which can provide community housing sponsorship and services. Such an arrangement takes advantage of local sponsorship's special strengths and still provides for technical assistance which is necessary because local sponsors with limited experience cannot deal effectively with complex and changing programs.

With its commitment to local sponsorship and involvement, GBCD has directed its attention to several new programs, including technical assistance to carry out sponsorship conversion of existing subsidized housing developed previously by non-community sponsors. There are important public issues in relation to the question of who will own and operate existing federally subsidized housing developments should the present owners decide to sell out or be foreclosed. Should there not be a process whereby such developments can maintain the existing subsidies and be turned over to community ownership or tenant control? Given the national figure of hundreds of thousands of federally subsidized housing units that might be confronted with ownership conversion, GBCD sees the need to formulate policies and procedures for such ownership transfers. This new effort is being supported by grants from the Ford Foundation and local foundations.

Mr. Whittlesey is Executive Director of Greater Boston Community Development, Inc.
MIXED-INCOME HOUSING: An Economic and Social Success in Massachusetts

By William J. White

The Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency (MHFA), similar in structure to other such agencies across the country, differs from its counterparts in a fundamental way: Its public purpose is to create housing for low-income people in mixed-income developments. Chapter 708 of the Massachusetts General Laws, as amended by the General Court in 1968, requires that in MHFA-financed housing developments a minimum of 25 percent of the units be made available to low-income persons. In June 1969 the Massachusetts Supreme Court upheld the law as a constitutional alternative to homogeneous public housing projects.

With this assurance of constitutionality, we began in a pioneer spirit to produce mixed-income housing and to date 23,528 units have been completed or are under construction throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

From the start it was apparent that, in addition to a demand for low-income and market-rent units, there is an enormous need for housing among people with incomes above the public housing limits but who cannot afford housing in the conventional marketplace. We knew that funds provided by programs such as Section 236 of the National Housing Act would be necessary to serve our moderate-income households.

In 1970 we began to work with Jim Barry at the HUD Regional Office and Dan Richardson at HUD's Boston Area Office to develop a process for incorporating interest reduction funds into our developments. We agreed on a simple procedure that has evolved into a cooperative venture by Federal and State officials to produce, without delay, the housing needed in this State. Interest reduction funds for 10,400 units have been made available for use in MHFA-financed mixed-income housing developments.

The MHFA program constitutes a 3-level economic mix. In five years of operation, we have become an important component of the housing industry. Our commitments total $802,212,674 of our bond authorization to make 232 loans for new construction and rehabilitation developments containing 34,297 housing units. One hundred and fifty-four of these committed loans have closed, constituting an investment of $528,288,512 in the Massachusetts economy.

The program has been an economic and social success. The units have been well received by all economic groups, and we have had no foreclosures. According to a recently completed social audit of our housing, mixed-income developments produce greater satisfaction at all income levels than do homogeneous housing developments that are either conventionally-financed or traditionally-subsidized. The principal reason for the difference is that MHFA developments are superior in design, construction, and management.

The study, sponsored by our Agency, was conducted over the past year by a research team that was given complete independence to investigate all aspects of the central question: Does the MHFA mixed-income program work?

The team was headed by Dr. William Ryan, Professor and Chairman of the Psychology Department of Boston College; Allan Sloan, a housing specialist on leave for the duration of the study from Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Dr. Mania Seferi, a social psychologist and Associate Professor of City Planning at the Harvard Graduate School of Design; and Elaine Werby, formerly Chief of Social planning at the Boston Housing Authority.

Their conclusions should be of interest to the housing industry and to the Nation's housing policymakers. They discovered that "...income mix 'works' or does not 'work' according to whether the mix occurs in well-designed, well-constructed, well-managed developments. These latter factors are the crucial determinants of satisfaction. Income mix and racial mix are, in themselves, of no particular relevance."

In its report the research team presented a detailed analysis of the first wave of our production—16 developments that had been occupied for a reasonable period of time when the study began a year ago. These were mostly garden-type apartments housing a total of 3,200 households in smaller cities and towns throughout the Commonwealth.

The research project included intensive interviews with about 200 residents who make up a representative sample of the low, moderate, and middle income households in the MHFA developments and with 125 households selected from three types of homogeneous housing: conventionally-financed, market-rent developments; moderate-income housing developments produced through HUD's Section 236 program; and low income public housing.

Greater Tenant Satisfaction Reported

According to the report, the MHFA tenants clearly expressed a higher level of satisfaction. A total of 89 percent were satisfied and only 11 percent expressed dissatisfaction, compared to the non-MHFA tenants, 78 percent of whom said they were satisfied and 22 percent who expressed dissatisfaction. According to social auditors, these differences are statistically very significant.

In addition to reporting higher overall satisfaction, MHFA tenants showed greater satisfaction with their apartments, their developments as a whole, and with management.

This level of satisfaction was also found when the
respondents were analyzed by group—low, moderate, and middle income.

As to the measure of satisfaction with neighbors, only the low-income tenants in MHFA developments showed noticeably higher satisfaction. For the moderate income group the satisfaction level of MHFA tenants was only slightly higher than the comparison tenants, and at the market level, the distribution of satisfaction scores was almost identical.

The report stated that the findings from the interviews with MHFA tenants “... suggests that, contrary to conventional wisdom, people at different income levels display pretty much the same distribution of values, social attitudes, and lifestyles. Thus the major theoretical reason for predicting difficulties around extensive income mixing—a dysfunctional clash in values and behavior—is probably based on misinformation.”

Advantages Built into Program

From the start we believed the mixed-income program would work if we made innovations in site selection, design, and management. Our policy has been to select the best possible locations, places where people like to live, whether they can afford market rents or need subsidies. In urban areas where conventional lenders are unwilling to take risks, we work with other governmental agencies to upgrade neighborhoods in many ways to reinforce our investments for new construction and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock.

We work with developers and their architects to get housing designed to meet the competition in the marketplace. In site planning, size and layout of apartments, quality of building materials, appliances, and floor coverings, in community and recreation facilities as well as landscaping, we not only meet the standards of unsubsidized housing but have actually raised them. Each development is based on an original design, thereby avoiding the creation of a stereotype of our product.

In design review and analysis of economic feasibility we struggle to remain flexible and to consider each development proposal on its own terms.

This flexibility has enabled us to finance unusual housing such as the Piano Craft Guild, a piano factory that has been converted to units where artists and craftspeople now live and work. One hundred seventy-four spaces ranging in size from 500 to 1,750 square feet are now occupied by creative people with low, moderate, and middle incomes. A building which in 1972 was an economic burden to the city and a physical liability to its neighborhood, now serves a segment of the population that can rarely find housing or studio space in the marketplace. The construction cost was $10.50 per square foot.

The quality of design that MHFA demands has been manifested in many forms: higher levels of tenant satisfaction; increased community acceptance of mixed-income housing, even in the suburbs; and state and national awards for excellence in architecture.

Importance of Management Stressed

In making mixed-income housing work, the importance of good design is matched by the need for sound management over the 40 years of the mortgage loan. Here again we have made progress in changing the style of management and improving the standards of the marketplace.

Our staff supervises the private management companies by visiting the sites at least once a month, checking on repair and maintenance activity, spotting problems early, and solving them before they become critical.

We oversee the tenant selection process and review each application for low and moderate income units to make sure we are meeting our public purpose of serving the people with the greatest need. We insist that property managers treat residents respectfully and fairly, irrespective of their income level. We require a special effort on the part of management to encourage members of minority groups to move into our developments.

Our powers of supervision of management include the right to require an owner to replace his management agent on 30 days notice from MHFA—a power that we have found to be extremely effective in maintaining our standards.

The participation of community groups and tenants in the ownership and management of MHFA-financed housing is encouraged by our agency in a variety of ways. In some cases these groups are general partners who benefit from the proceeds of the sale of limited partnership shares to private investors. We often ask developers to place funds for community facilities in an escrow account so the residents can have a voice in choosing the amenities.

MHFA innovations also include the use of new industrialized housing techniques. In 1971 MHFA and Operation Breakthrough signed a memorandum of understanding, which marked the beginning of production of industrialized housing units on a broad scale throughout Massachusetts. For three years, through the efforts of Ed Cachin, Director of Operation Breakthrough for Region I, industrialized housing producers have been put in touch with developers who make use of the new techniques developed to modernize housing construction. As a result, we have approved seven loans totalling $104,938,272 to finance 3,537 units built using Breakthrough systems.

We have welcomed the continued use of Breakthrough systems, as well as traditional construction methods, because of the enormous need for production of housing for all income groups in Massachusetts. One of every four families in the State, or 400,000 households, need assistance according to the 1974 Report of Housing Needs and Programs published by the Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs.

Mr. White is Executive Director of the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency.
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Currently, housing subsidy programs are being re-examined by both the United States and England and substantial legislative changes may be in the making. This book was written to contribute to the "growing debate over the future of housing subsidies, with a special emphasis on subsidized housing that is both publicly owned and rented and which serves the lowest income groups in our population." Author Daniel R. Mandelker, Professor of Law and Director of the Urban Studies Program at Washington University in St. Louis, provides an in-depth review of the legal and historical aspects of the programs in the two nations. As co-author of Housing in America: Problems and Perspectives and many other works, Professor Mandelker is well aware of all the elements necessary for a total housing strategy. The impact of housing subsidy programs on housing dispersal, renewal and rehabilitation, etc., is not neglected, although this book concentrates on the financial and related policy problems that are raised by housing subsidies.

Throughout the book, the role of rents in adjusting income is stressed. Subsidy formulas and rent policies in American and English public housing are of major concern. In the United States, the share of public housing costs met by subsidy is determined by the Federal statutory formula. However, the local public housing agencies determine the rent subsidy policies with little Federal or State statutory guidance. Most agencies base rent on a portion of income and assign dwelling units on the basis of need. This leads to substantial cross-subsidies. More affluent tenants in smaller units may pay proportionately higher rents than poorer tenants in larger units to keep the project financially solvent.

The rent determination problem for welfare tenants is most acute. The number of welfare recipients in public housing has increased while pressures are being exerted to decrease the financial costs of the welfare program. "Welfare agencies have responded to the situation by limiting shelter allowance grants at the same time that public housing agencies have attempted to shift more of their costs to the welfare tenant."

Like U.S. public housing, English council housing is supported by a national subsidy with limited controls of local authorities administering the program. While the subsidy has never covered debt service in full, it has provided relief for local authorities with higher than average housing costs, a monetary supplement only recently available in America. No income limits are placed on admission and most income categories are represented in the council housing projects. This meant that even affluent tenants received subsidies prior to 1972.

The Housing Act of 1972 adopted a "fair rent" regulation previously used only in the private housing sector. This standard makes allowances for the age and location of a dwelling, and because council housing is both newer and located in different areas of the community than private rental housing, "parity between the two sectors will be difficult to achieve." Also, fair rents will lead to comparatively higher rents as local authorities may tend to place their more affluent tenants in this housing to avoid high subsidy costs.

It is Professor Mandelker's conclusion that no one alternative will solve all of the problems or satisfy all of the many social and economic interests involved in housing subsidy programs. He suggests what is needed is a balance between government and private action which appears most appropriate for the economic and political system to which the subsidy program must be fitted. The trend, he believes, must be toward more centralization of housing subsidy and related programs and more government intervention in the housing market. Meanwhile, "In both countries the housing subsidy system remains a compromise of conflicting and diverse policy objectives."

—Doreen Buck Tilton
Reference Librarian, HUD Library


Because architects are increasingly involved in development building, the AIA's Task Force on Real Estate Financing guided the production of this book which surveys current practice in building finance. Contributors include major figures in development, law, economics, and mortgage banking. The glossary is designed to help architects, lenders, lawyers, contractors, and real estate entrepreneurs "speak the development language."


A collection of articles by administrators and observers of housing policy in their own countries.
HUD’s ROLE
IN THE
NEW ENGLAND
FEDERAL
REGIONAL
COUNCIL

The New England Federal Regional Council, in which HUD plays a leading role, is composed of nine Federal grant-making agencies with field offices serving the communities of the region. The Council is the Federal Government’s mechanism for coordinating the federally aided programs they administer. Coordination takes various forms that assist local communities in carrying out their projects. The leadership role of the Boston Regional Office in the Federal Regional Council of New England is demonstrated by the activities and accomplishments of the Regional Administrator and his staff in support of Council objectives.

The Federal Annual Arrangement Role
HUD was chosen to lead efforts of the Federal Regional Council of New England in establishing a simplified funding relationship with two or three municipalities or States for FY 1974. This arrangement or funding partnership was to be similar to the relationship devised for HUD annual arrangements. The Committee, chaired by a HUD employee, screened several cities and States to find those with the management capacity to handle the arrangement process. Efforts were made at the local level to bring separate departments together to form a unified planning and program mechanism so that in a single operation at the beginning of the fiscal year requests for Federal and State funds could be examined. Working agreements were signed by the Federal Regional Council and the city of Manchester, N.H., for FY 1974 and 1975.

Local Capacity Building Effort
One objective of the Federal Regional Council of New England is to provide direction and assistance to the several in-state organizations in the improvement of local management processes. To this end, the Council created a Local Capacity Building Task Force, chaired by the Regional Director of HEW, and manned by representatives of State municipal leagues and other service groups: HUD was represented by two staff members from the Office of Community Planning and Management.

The task force will assist municipalities in bringing together those public organizations that can assist in problem areas and demonstrate to other communities that the management methods utilized might be useful in the solution of their problems. Technical assistance teams, adapted to the special needs in each community, are sent into the cities to examine problems, recommend alternative solutions, and support the chief executive in implementing alternative approaches. Emphasis is on intergovernmental cooperation, local departmental input into the analysis and solution, and personnel, rather than special financial assistance. Each team is led by an employee of one of the Federal agencies, although it is richly supported by the talent of State, public interest, and local groups as well. Two of the teams are led by a HUD employee.

The cities of Meriden, Conn., Lewiston, Maine, Burlington, Vt., and five municipalities in Rockingham County, N.H., are being served so far. Each has a different set of needs, but all can be helped by this approach to management assistance.

Chelsea Recovery Program
Directly north of Boston lies the small city of Chelsea, Mass., an aging, densely-developed community that has declined in population from 45,800 in 1930 to 30,600 in 1970. Two events of 1973 combined to focus Federal Regional Council attention on Chelsea:

(1) In April 1973, the Department of Defense announced that the Chelsea Naval Hospital would be closed and the 88-acre site reported surplus. Bordering the Mystic River and commanding a panoramic view of the Boston skyline, the Naval Hospital property was perceived as a unique opportunity for the city but one requiring consideration of many development alternatives with local, State and Federal involvement. (2) In October a spectacular fire ravaged an 18-block industrial and residential area two blocks from the hospital. Five hundred people were left homeless and many without jobs. On October 16, 1973, the President declared the community a natural disaster area, setting off responses from State, Federal and local agencies.

On January 4, 1974, the Federal Regional Council entered into an
agreement with the city of Chelsea and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for a recovery program for the fire disaster area and re-use of the Naval Hospital. Shortly thereafter HUD assumed the lead role for the Council in coordinating the long-term Federal response. The HUD Coordinator’s responsibilities include development and oversight of a management organization to assure timely coordination of the Federal response and preparation of regular status reports on progress and problems.

Even before formal execution of the intergovernmental agreement in January, Chelsea had submitted several applications which have been approved in the ensuing months, including a HUD $4.625 million grant increase for an expanded urban renewal project adding 15.3 acres of fire-damaged property to the project. The Federal Disaster Assistance Administration (FDAA) has approved grants for restoration of public facilities destroyed by the fire. FDAA administers the President’s Disaster Relief Fund and musters and coordinates the disaster assistance efforts of Federal, State, and voluntary agencies. The problems of coordination do not end with grant approvals, however. Time limitations on the use of certain disaster relief grants and the timetable for disposition of the Naval Hospital site, for example, affect planning and marketing for the urban renewal project. The Regional Administrator forsee a long continuing role for the coordinator on behalf of the Federal Regional Council.

Uniform Relocation Task Force

In the spring of 1972, HUD proposed that the Region I Federal Regional Council establish a Task Force on the Uniform Relocation Act since the Act affected all Federal agencies and federally assisted projects. The Council included this item as part of its work plan for FY 1973 and designated the HUD relocation advisor as chairperson. The task force held its initial meeting in October 1972. Currently ten Federal agencies are formal members of the task force. It is expected the membership will be expanded to include representatives from official relocation agencies of the six States or, where such do not exist, other appropriate State representation.

Management Information Systems

The HUD Boston Regional Office has played a prominent role in the Federal Regional Council’s Management Information Systems project. For nearly three years the HUD Regional Administrator has taken the policy lead and guided the development and implementation of what has become known as the RGIS, a medium for local, State, and Federal cooperation in the sharing of information of common interest.
### Selected Housing Indicators
(Units in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>March 1974</th>
<th>March 1973</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing Starts</td>
<td>Units - *S.A.R.</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>-35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Shipments</td>
<td>Units - S.A.R.</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>-35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Applications, HUD-FHA</td>
<td>Units - S.A.R.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Homes</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance, Private, Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Starts, HUD-FHA</td>
<td>Units - S.A.R.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Owned Housing Authorized by Building Permits</td>
<td>Units - S.A.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>-31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>-23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 - Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>-31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing, Completions</td>
<td>Units - S.A.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>-25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more units</td>
<td></td>
<td>925</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>+10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New One-Family Homes Sold Private</td>
<td>Sales Sold - S.A.R.</td>
<td>$35,880</td>
<td>$31,400</td>
<td>+14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of New One-Family Homes</td>
<td>Units - S.A.R.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time from Start to Sale, Private Homes</td>
<td>Months Median</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New One-Family Homes for Sale</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>+7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Index-New One-Family Homes Sold</td>
<td>1st Quarter, 1967=100</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>+9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Price Index-All Construction Materials</td>
<td>1967=100</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>+11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Interest Rate-All Major Lenders New Homes</td>
<td>Percent Conventional</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>+12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Homes</td>
<td>Home Mortgage Loans- National Averages</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>+12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Interest Rate- Savings &amp; Loans Assocs. New Homes</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>+11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>+12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S.A.R.—Seasonally Adjusted Annual Rate

---
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