

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
 OF THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
 HELD ON MAY 13, 1959

The Members of the Boston Redevelopment Authority met in regular session at the offices of the Authority, Room 350, 73 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts, at 10:00 a.m. on May 13, 1959. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Colbert, acting Chairman in the absence of Mr. Lund and Msgr. Lally, and upon roll call those present and absent were as follows:

<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
James G. Colbert Melvin J. Massucco Stephen E. McCloskey	Joseph W. Lund Msgr. F. J. Lally

A copy of the NOTICE OF MEETING, pursuant to Section 23A of Chapter 39 of the General Laws, with the CERTIFICATE AS TO SERVICE OF NOTICE OF MEETING attached thereto, was read and ordered spread upon the minutes of this meeting and filed for record.

NOTICE OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given in accordance with Section 23A of Chapter 39 of the General Laws that a meeting of the Boston Redevelopment Authority will be held at ten o'clock a.m. on May 13, 1959 at 73 Tremont Street in the City of Boston.

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

By *fv <U>XrJAA\* m lan*

     May 8, 1959      Title:      Secretary     

CERTIFICATE AS TO SERVICE OF NOTICE OF MEETING  
 (Sec. 23A, Chapter 39, General Laws)

I, Kane Simonian, the duly appointed, qualified and acting Secretary of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, do hereby certify that on May 8, 1959, I filed, in the manner provided by Sec. 23A, Chapter 39, General Laws, with the City Clerk of the City of Boston, Massachusetts, a NOTICE OF MEETING of which the foregoing is a true and correct copy.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of said Authority this 8th day of May, 1959.

*Kane Simonian*  
Secretary

LS

The minutes of the meeting of May 6th were read by the Secretary. On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: to approve the minutes as read.

The Executive Director presented the Supplementary Budget in the amount of \$54,125. On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: to adopt the Supplementary Budget and authorize the Executive Director to submit it to the Director of Budgets, Administrative Services, City Hall.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: to employ Thomas P. McCusker as Coordinator at \$10,000 per annum, effective June 24, 1959.

The Executive Director stated that there was a need for an additional secretary and recommended that the present switchboard operator, who is qualified, be reassigned as a secretary. On the recommendation of the Executive Director and on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: to reclassify Mrs. Evelyn MacIntyre from Switchboard Operator to Secretary at a salary of \$3700 per year, effective June 24, 1959.

The Executive\* Director recommended the appointment of Mary Irwin as Switchboard Operator at \$4000 per year to fill the vacancy created by the transfer of Evelyn MacIntyre. The Executive Director stated that Mrs. Irwin is presently employed as switchboard operator in the Mayor's Office at a salary of \$4490.72. On the basis of the information presented the Authority determined that a salary of \$4000 per year for an expert switchboard operator is comparable with pertinent practice in the locality, and on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: to appoint Mrs. Mary Irwin as Switchboard Operator at \$4000 per year, effective June 24, 1959.

The Executive Director read a letter from Dr. Carl S. Ell of Northeastern University requesting information on the cost of carrying out redevelopment projects. The Executive Director was authorized to acknowledge the letter and provide Doctor Ell with the necessary information.

The Executive Director read a letter from the Elizabeth Peabody House, praising the Authority's activities in the relocation of families in the West End. The Executive Director was instructed to acknowledge the letter and place it on file.

The Executive Director presented a memo from Robert McGovern, Land Acquisition Consultant for the Authority, regarding the extension of the Whitney Redevelopment Project proposed by an Order of Councillor Foley. After a discussion of the memo and on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: that the report be placed on file.

The General Counsel, John C. Conley, told the Authority that the Regional Office has verbally concurred in the recommendation made by the Authority with respect for fees for per diem trial attorneys. However, until such time as the approval is received in writing, the General Counsel recommends that we make payment only to the extent for which written approval has been received.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: to authorize payment to the trial attorneys on the basis of written approval presently on record from the URA.

Letter from Fred E. Hertan, representing Valmont Homes, was read and placed on file.

Letter from Cerel-Druker Redevelopment Corporation was read and placed on file.

Demolition and Relocation Reports were distributed.

After a discussion of the Site Office reports and on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: that the Executive Director be instructed to write to Mrs. Lou Gallagher, 22 Lynde Street, telling her that she will have to move out by June 1; otherwise the Authority will evict her on that date.

After a review and discussion of the Site Office reports and on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: that the following tenants be evicted and that the Executive Director be authorized to issue eviction warrants: Martin Conroy, Michael Delia and Alfred Martin.

Several other Site Office reports were reviewed and the Executive Director instructed to obtain further information.

The Executive Director presented the problem of countersigning checks in the absence of the Chairman and Vice Chairman. After a discussion and on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: that under the provisions of Section 4 of the By Laws of the Authority, in the absence of the Chairman and Vice Chairman, any Member of the Authority, except the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurer, and the Executive Director are hereby designated as countersigners of checks and orders in payment of money.

The Executive Director submitted a list of tenants who had moved to addresses unknown, leaving a rent arrearage in the amount of \$12,513\*76- The Executive Director notified the Authority that the Site Office had contacted the Gas, Edison and Telephone Companies and Post Office on various dates, seeking to obtain the new address of the former tenants. None of these tenants has made application for relocation payment for moving expenses.

On the recommendation of the Executive Director and on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: to make the following findings: (1) that all steps towards collection required by the Authority's policies have been made, and (2) that there is no reasonable prospect of collection or the probable cost of further efforts to collect would not be warranted, considering the amount of the delinquencies, and further that the Authority charge off as uncollectable rents receivable due from former tenants on the list dated May/ 1959 who have moved to addresses unknown.

(The foregoing list is filed in the Document Book of the Authority as No. 59.)

The General Counsel discussed the terms of the proposed lease for the Whitney Redevelopment Project. After a discussion, the General Counsel was

instructed to meet with the attorneys for the Beacon Redevelopment Corporation and prepare a draft in accordance with the discussions.

Mr. Romeo Rosano and Fred E. Hertan, attorney representing Valmont Homes, entered the meeting at this point to discuss their proposal for the re-development of the Mattapan Project. The following pertinent points were brought out:

They have discussed the matter with the F.H.A. and received favorable consideration. Their basic idea is to redevelop with about 800 units in a minimum of five-story elevator apartments; would erect these on desirable land and leave land which would be expensive to put in shape for use as parking and play areas, etc. Their surveys found row-type housing unfeasible and poor use of land economy-wise. They would be willing to construct more than five-story structures if permission is granted.

Their proposed development would cater to \$8000 to \$5000 income group and apartments would rent at an average of \$37 per room; would be of semi-fire-proof brick construction, but they would, of course, be willing to conform to building codes of the area. Parking area would amount to more than one space per family. The total cost of proposed project would be eight to ten million dollars, or better than \$10,000 a unit. They would be willing to commence project as soon as FHA approval is received, and FHA has promised to expedite approval if project is undertaken.

Their firm has good experience in this line of developing and are presently building 150 homes on Long Island, N. Y. and have just finished 160 similar ones. They are prepared to post bonds and give financial references; are definitely interested in similar redevelopment opportunities in this area and would like this project to serve as an opening wedge to prove themselves capable.

They have previously discussed with the Executive Director the possibility of not buying the land but arranging a leasehold and giving the city about 20% of gross income in lieu of taxes. As the estimated gross income would be a million

dollars, the city would get close to \$200, 000.

The proposed development would not be in the name of Valmont Homes because dwellings would be apartment type, but possibly would be called Mattapan Gardens or some similar name.

The Executive Director raised the question of a small amount of engineering and planning work being necessary in order to change present plans of the area inasmuch as since original plans were drawn, some changes have occurred in the area. Herten would be willing to assume this cost and do the work.

A date for another meeting with the Authority was tentatively set for May 27th,

With regard to penalty bond if redeveloper failed to carry through the project, this would be forfeited unless through no fault of the redeveloper he was unable to carry the project through to completion, such as refusal of City Council to okay plan, or disapproval of the FHA.

The potential redevelopers left the meeting at 12:25 p.m.

Onjnotion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Kaus Sumrain