

379
N81
No. 3483

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT AND CODE ENFORCEMENT
IN FORT WORTH, TEXAS 1961-1966

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Ralph L. Liverman, B. A.

Denton, Texas

June, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Purpose | |
| Methodology | |
| Background of Code Enforcement | |
| Legal Status of Code Enforcement | |
| II. MINIMUM HOUSING STANDARDS ORDINANCE OF 1961. . . | 13 |
| Purpose | |
| Jurisdiction | |
| Methods of Implementation | |
| III. COMMUNITY RENEWAL PROGRAM. | 17 |
| Background | |
| Report No. 1 | |
| Report No. 2 | |
| Report No. 3 | |
| Report No. 4 | |
| Report No. 5 | |
| Report No. 6 | |
| Conclusions | |
| IV. UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1965 - CONCENTRATED CODE ENFORCEMENT. | 36 |
| Purpose | |
| Eligibility Requirements | |
| Methods of Implementation | |
| V. COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. | 46 |
| Background | |
| Concentrated Code Application | |
| VI. THE URBAN RENEWAL CAMPAIGN AND ELECTION OF 1966. | 59 |
| Background | |
| Campaign | |
| Election | |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| VII. THE NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 66 |
| Purpose | |
| Organization | |
| Methods | |
| Accomplishments | |
| VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. | 88 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY. | 93 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to outline and analyze the efforts of the City of Fort Worth in the area of community improvement through code enforcement in the years 1961-1965. It is hoped that this study will enable those in the field of municipal government or other related fields to gain a better understanding of the need for community improvement through code enforcement and a better knowledge of methods to implement such a program.

This study is a field research project based mainly on primary sources. It was written by one who participated in the programs discussed later. All materials were obtained through the municipal administration of the City of Fort Worth, Texas, the major newspapers of Fort Worth, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, and the International Conference of Building Officials.

For many years laws have existed for the purpose of housing regulation. However, it may also be said that for many years these laws never were enforced or at least enforced in the manner in which they now are being enforced in urban areas. The efforts in this area today come from a realization that a systematic application of housing codes can

effectively halt the spread of blight and conserve the existing housing supply. Some of the historical precedents of code enforcement are listed as follows:

Code of Hammurabi (2000 years before Christian era)
Sanitary Code of Ancient Hebrews (1000 years B. C.)
Building Regulations of Chinese
Sanitary Laws of King John II (France 1350)
Sanitary and Safety Requirements (London, 12th c. and after fire of 1666)
New York City (1647-1849)
First Legislation in America on Sanitation (Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1647-8)
Building Laws for New York City (First major legislation on housing in the United States, 1849)
State Tenement House Act (Pennsylvania 1895)
New York Tenement House Act (1901)
Title II, National Industry Recovery Act (1933)
United States Housing Act of 1937
United States Housing Act of 1949
United States Housing Act of 1954
United States Housing Act of 1959
United States Housing Act of 1964
United States Housing Act of 1965¹

One will observe that the last precedents listed are all federal programs. While the federal programs are financed wholly or in part by the federal government, they are run on the local level and the police power remains in the hands of the local governments. Federal aid makes it possible for a locality to use more broadly the power it always has had and in addition provides various types of assistance to property owners with voluntary compliance, and thus reduces the need for full exertion of the police power.

¹National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Orientation Workshops on Environmental Health and Related Housing Code Administration, 1965, pp. 3-7.

There are several legal aspects of code compliance: police power, right of entry, absentee landlords and properties in estates, effective court procedure, and courts and tenants.

The legal basis for code enforcement is found in the police power. The police power is an inherent power of the states which they, in turn, can vest in the municipalities. While in a broad sense the police power may encompass all governmental power for the public good, it is more specifically defined to mean the authority to enact and enforce regulations to preserve and to promote the health, safety and welfare of the people. In the first United States Supreme Court decision upholding a comprehensive zoning ordinance, Mr. Justice Sutherland made the following comment:

Regulations, the wisdom, necessity, and validity of which, as applied to existing conditions, are so apparent that they are now uniformly sustained, a century ago, or even half a century ago, probably would have been rejected as arbitrary and oppressive.²

The right of entry can be considered as a means of using the police power. The Supreme Court has sustained the right of entry where a probable cause is present but it has yet to approve the right of entry where no specific violation is suspected, such as a house-to-house inspection

²Village of Euclid v. Amber Realty Corporation, 272 U. S., 365, 386 (1926).

sequence. According to Barnet Lieberman, former Commissioner of Licenses and Inspections, City of Philadelphia,

There is need for a legal research project to bring together the sociological data and the legal decisions in what is called 'Brandeis Type' brief so that when a factually sound case develops, the research for a brief to the court would already have been completed.³

One of the major legal problems is that of the absentee landlord or the estate. A high percentage of code violation cases are those in which absentee landlords or estates are involved. Many property owners try to hide their ownership in order to avoid their responsibility. Therefore, the provision for affixing responsibility in a housing code is very important. If the landlord is not readily available, the person immediately in charge must be held responsible, yet there must be a way to reach the person who is really accountable.

The following points must be observed in considering effective court procedures:

- a. Their main purpose is compliance, not punishment
- b. Their procedures should be brief, both to avoid delays in compliance and taking too much time of code officials
- c. There is need for presenting conclusive evidence.⁴

³National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Orientation Workshops on Environmental Health and Related Housing Code Administration, 1965, p. 6.

⁴Ibid., p. 10.

Some cities have used special housing courts for codes violators. Baltimore instituted such a court in 1948. Since then some code administrators have questioned their value while others have suggested other administrative techniques for speeding up the disposition of housing code cases. However, they all agree that there are definite advantages to having a special court--or designating a unit of an existing court--to handle housing code cases. One of the major issues involved in housing code enforcement court procedures concerns the amount of time inspectors spend in court. Another problem is the inspectors' lack of legal knowledge, court procedures, and rules of evidence.⁵

A very serious question in code enforcement is the extent to which the courts are able to deal with tenant responsibility. Recently, in many of the larger cities rent strikes have become a tool of the tenants to put pressure on the landlords. However, this can be a disadvantage because the landlord can take the tenant to court for non-payment of rent. State legislation in 1965 legalized rent strikes in New York. The Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law as Amended to September, 1965, enables a tenant to obtain a "Section 755 Order" from a court, if there are sufficiently dangerous violations of record present, whereby he can pay his rent to the court rather than to the landlord. Furthermore, if the

⁵Ibid., p. 12.

landlord fails to correct the violations, to provide heat or essential services, the tenant can arrange to do so and apply to the court to have the bills paid out of rent monies deposited with it.

Other ways in which a tenant can obtain relief by bringing suit against the landlord include

- a. seeking actions of mandamus--that is, to seek the issuance by the court of a writ of mandamus ordering compliance on the strength of doctrines on abatement of nuisances;
- b. filing a criminal information;
- c. claiming on the basis of fraud that the lessor has concealed his knowledge of defects or has failed to disclose prior issuance of violation notes.⁶

There are several problems common in the field of code enforcement. These include political support, fiscal support, personnel, and relocation.

Some of the greatest support for code enforcement, especially in large urban areas, comes from minority groups and lower income groups. These groups are becoming increasingly articulate about their housing needs. The activity of these groups is rather new and can affect the code administrator in different ways. The code administrator may be blamed for failing to do those things for which he may have been seeking

⁶Ibid., p. 14.

political support, and, if he has made mistakes, these groups will be sure to discover them. However difficult it is for him, the code administrator will have to develop a thick skin and recognize that these groups are a strong source of pressure for the type of program they want. With the increasing emphasis on service to the property owner to assist him in improving his property, rather than emphasizing the need for compliance with the law, the attitude of many who previously resisted code enforcement programs will change.

The problem of inadequate political support of code enforcement programs has been a major factor in the lack of adequate financial support of these programs. However, as a better attitude develops, more and better financial support can be expected. Political pressure for more aggressive programs will help make more local funds available for code enforcement. One must also observe the role of the Federal government when discussing financial support for code enforcement programs, for many of the rehabilitation programs in all our cities today are supported either directly or indirectly by federal funds.

One of the greatest problems to the implementation of code enforcement programs is that of adequate personnel. At the present time there is no accepted standard of qualifications and training for housing code personnel. This results

from two factors: (a) the newness of the field, and (b) failure to understand the role of housing code inspection.⁷

Since housing standards in municipalities have increased so rapidly in the last few years, the development of professional standards has been hindered. Another problem is that housing codes are usually administered by health or building officials who see this function in terms of health or building activities. In addition, housing code inspectors are treated as subordinates to sanitary and building inspectors. The downgrading of housing inspectors has two harmful results: (a) It places the entire housing code enforcement operation at a very low level among municipal functions, and (b) it keeps the pay level so low that it is very difficult to attract capable men.⁸

The training process for housing inspectors is quite complex and yet general, since the housing inspector must know something in the fields of building, construction, sanitation, fire safety, law, public relations, and urban renewal. An inadequately trained inspector can seriously embarrass a code administrator and be a real political liability. This shows up when one inspector makes a reinspection of a violation reported by another inspector, and reports a number of violations that the first inspector did not notice.

⁷Ibid., p. 22.

⁸Ibid., p. 22.

While relocation is an important factor in code administration, it is not as important in a rehabilitation program in which there is little, if any, displacement. This is one of the main reasons that code enforcement is gaining support.

In order for a housing code to be effective it must be well defined. The Constitutionality of Housing Codes defines a housing code in the following way:

In general, a housing code establishes minimum requirements respecting the condition and maintenance and the occupancy of dwellings and the condition and maintenance of utilities and facilities in dwellings to the extent deemed necessary to achieve safety, health, and general welfare objectives. Housing codes prescribe regulatory measures for the maintenance, occupancy, and supplied facilities of structures and are concerned primarily with health, safety, and sanitation requirements of buildings after they have been constructed. But certain housing code requirements may indirectly influence the design and construction of new buildings as well. Housing codes must be broad in application and should cover all dwellings, irrespective of the date and type of construction, the nature of occupancy, the character of the ownership or location.⁹

It is a necessity that a housing code be clearly related to the protection and promotion of health, safety, and welfare in order to justify the use of the police power to obtain compliance with these standards. The objective of the housing code is to improve health, safety, and living conditions of the inhabitants of dwellings and not merely to improve the quality of housing.

⁹The National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Constitutionality of Housing Codes, 1964, p. 11.

According to the Constitutionality of Housing Codes the two main functions of a housing code are to prescribe minimum standards of housing quality and to provide procedures and sanctions for their enforcement.

A housing ordinance should contain

- a. requirements respecting facilities and equipment in dwellings, including lighting, ventilation, garbage and waste disposal, heating, water supply, sewage disposal, sink, bath, toilet, and means of egress,
- b. maintenance requirements covering general sanitary conditions and equipment, heating equipment, chimneys and flues, fire hazards, electric wiring, inflammable liquids, pest infestation, internal structural repair, external structural repair, and dampness,
- c. limitations on occupancy, including general room crowding, persons per room, persons per sleeping room, area crowding, sleeping area, non-sleeping area, and other factors leading to over-crowding.¹⁰

The procedures and sanctions of a housing code should have provisions

- a. indicating what dwellings and structures are within the purview of the code,

¹⁰Ralph J. Johnson, "The Requirements of a Good Housing Ordinance," as quoted in Orientation Workshops on Environmental Health and Related Housing Code Administration, 1965, p. 44.

- b. defining what the respective responsibilities of the owner, the tenant and the lessee are,
- c. prescribing penalties and other sanctions for violations,
- d. providing for the administration and enforcement of the code.¹¹

The field of housing code enforcement is "coming into its own"; it is being recognized and understood. However, in many cities the responsibility for the administration of housing code enforcement activities may be found in the health department, the building inspections department, or various other departments. Such a pattern of organization is confusing and presents serious obstacles in establishing organization and administration principles for this function. However, the real problem in housing code administration is related to low priority given to it by the third or fourth level of city governments. This is reflected in the low level of financial support usually provided for housing code enforcement and the weak political support that is the rule rather than the exception.

Citizen support is a vital element of code administration. It is necessary at two levels: (a) the city-wide level, and

¹¹Ibid., p. 44.

(b) the neighborhood level.¹² Citizen support has two important functions. First of all it creates an attitude conducive to favorable political and financial support. Secondly, it has a direct influence on the rate and degree of compliance to be achieved.

¹²Orientation Workshops on Environmental Health and Related Housing Code Administration, p. 47.

CHAPTER II

MINIMUM HOUSING STANDARDS

ORDINANCE OF 1961

In January of 1961, Ordinance No. 4381, Minimum Housing Standards Code of the City of Fort Worth, went into effect. The purpose of this ordinance was well stated in the introduction to the ordinance as follows:

The Fort Worth Minimum Housing Standards Code is dedicated to the development of better housing conditions, neighborhood improvements and the safety, health and welfare of the public, through the elimination of substandard housing and blighted dwelling areas and to the future orderly growth of the City of Fort Worth by protecting property values. To this end, the Code establishes the minimum standards under which housing may be constructed and maintained; fixes the responsibility of owners as a guide to better housing and living conditions. The Code presents a challenge to each individual citizen to accept his full share of the responsibility in a program urgently needed to preserve our City as a desirable, safe community in which to live.¹³

The twelve chapters of the ordinance deal with enforcement, the Housing Standards Commission, permits and inspection, definitions, space and occupancy standards, structural requirements, exits, fire protection, and sub-standard buildings.

Chapter two of the Minimum Housing Standards Code deals specifically with the enforcement of the code. It created

¹³City of Fort Worth, Texas, Minimum Housing Standards Code of the City of Fort Worth, January 1, 1961, p. 6.

the position of Housing Official who is authorized and directed to enforce all the provisions. The Housing Official is empowered to appoint other employees and to deputize these employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions required for enforcement. The Housing Official and his deputies are given the powers of police officers in the execution of their duties, and upon presentation of proper credentials, may enter at reasonable times any building, structure, or premises in the City to perform any duty imposed by the code.

The Housing Official is authorized to make housing surveys in any area of the City to determine the general conditions of housing, the extent of deterioration of buildings, the lack of facilities and maintenance, the unsafe and unsanitary conditions, the overcrowding which may exist, and other matters included within the provisions of the code.

If the Housing Official determines that a violation of the code exists, or if he has reason to believe that there is or has been a violation of any provision of the code, he is to give notice of the violation to the person or persons responsible for the violation. This notice, in writing, specifies the alleged violation, enumerates the corrective measures necessary, and provides a reasonable time for compliance.

Chapter III of the Minimum Housing Standards Code deals with the Housing Standards Commission. The Commission

consists of nine members, each of whom is required to be a resident of the City of Fort Worth and a qualified voter. The members of the Commission are appointed by the Mayor with the approval of a majority vote of the City Council. In addition to the appointed members, the Fire Marshal, Building Official, Planning Director, and the Sanitary Engineer serve as ex-officio, nonvoting, members of the Commission. The ex-officio members are required to attend all Commission meetings and to advise and consult with the Commission in matters pertaining to the enforcement of the code. If requested by the Commission, the ex-officio members inspect buildings, structures, or premises in violation of, or alleged to be in violation of, the code, and then submit a report to the Commission.

The Commission is given the following powers:

- a. To reverse or affirm wholly or in part or to modify any order of the Housing Official.
- b. To authorize upon appeal such variance in application of the terms of the code as will not be contrary to the public interest, where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of the code will result in unnecessary hardship; so that the spirit of the code will be observed and substantial justice done.
- c. To interpret the provisions of the code in such a way as to carry out its intent and purpose, and

from time to time, as it deems advisable, to make suggestions and recommendations for improvement of the code to the City Council.

- d. To conduct hearings where the Housing Official has cited the owner, or agent, of a building to appear before the Commission to show cause why said building or structure should not be condemned, and on the basis of such hearing, if the building is determined to be unsafe and a nuisance, to recommend issuance by the City Council of such orders as shall appear necessary.¹⁴

The right of appeal to the Housing Standards Commission is granted to any person affected by any notice of violation in connection with the code. Anyone wishing to appeal must first file in the office of the Housing Official a written request for a hearing. The appeal will be heard at the next regular meeting of the Commission if the appeal is made at least ten days in advance of the meeting; otherwise it will be heard at the next succeeding meeting. (If the appeal is filed within ten days after the service of notice of violation, compliance with such notice shall not be required while the hearing is pending. However, if it is the opinion of the Housing Official that a stay of proceeding would result in eminent peril to life or property, no such stay will be observed.)

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 11-12.

CHAPTER III

COMMUNITY RENEWAL PROGRAM

In 1962 the City of Fort Worth entered into a study which became known as the Community Renewal Program. The program represented the first overall attempt by the City of Fort Worth to inventory and evaluate its assets and liabilities for the purpose of Community Improvement.

The program, which was financed by two-thirds Federal funds, was organized as an agency under the City Planning Department. When the Community Renewal Program was prematurely terminated by a later City Council, its functions were assigned to the City Planning Department, which in turn published the last report.

Report No. 1; Prospectus

The first report of the Community Renewal Program was presented to the City Planning Commission by the City Planning Department. It dealt mainly with the philosophy, methods, and goals of the Community Renewal Program, and was not a technical report. Its primary objectives were listed as follows:

- a. To explain the meaning of renewal and its importance to Fort Worth.
- b. To provide the basic concepts, goals, and approach from which action programs for city improvement could be developed.
- c. To recommend community action required for the Community Renewal Program to be developed.¹⁵

The philosophy or concept of the Community Renewal Program was defined as "renewal," or an effort to maintain urban values in the face of rapidly changing technology and accelerated obsolescence.

The method or approach to be used by the Community Renewal Program consisted of four steps. The first step was to make an analysis of the nature and characteristics of Fort Worth in relation to renewal. The second step was to form an evaluation of the problems in relation to needed improvements. The third step was to make an evaluation of the resources available for improvements. The fourth step was to develop a program which would implement the necessary action.

The following goals were established to guide the Community Renewal Program.

- a. Community Awareness.--To develop, among citizens and their leaders, an awareness of the nature of urban

¹⁵City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Prospectus, Report No. 1, p. 1.

living, and to instill in the entire population an understanding and appreciation of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of living in Fort Worth; to explain the importance of renewal efforts in insuring the continued vitality of the community; to encourage a spirit of cooperation among property owners, business leaders, and the city government in community improvement efforts.

- b. Economic Strength.--To develop and maintain a sound, balanced, and vital economy to provide a stable base for community improvement; to assist in meeting the problems of economic obsolescence to prevent future blight and to encourage growth; to program the utilization of community resources for renewal needs, obtaining their maximum potential for the benefit of the community; to strengthen existing business as well as attract new growth; to develop and coordinate means of financing.
- c. Abatement of Slum and Blight.--Slum and blight, whether in residential, commercial or industrial areas will be analyzed to determine its location, extent, degree, nature, causes and trends, and a workable program for corrective treatment will be prepared. The highest and best use of land and improvements will be of prime concern; to

encourage and assist all properly located areas to develop and implement self-improvement programs for conservation and rehabilitation.

- d. Housing.--To provide decent housing for everyone, regardless of economic status; minimum standards for housing and enforcement will be evaluated to insure community safety, health, and welfare and their integration into the renewal effort; to analyze and recommend improved code and enforcement policies; to provide necessary financing and other assistance as required to enable owners to make property improvements.
- e. Relocation.--To plan to minimize the problem of relocation caused by community improvement efforts and to provide a maximum efficiency in expediting and assisting relocation victims, regardless of whether they are of a residential, commercial, or industrial character.
- f. Unique Characteristics.--Fort Worth has an unique heritage and tradition which should be conserved and enhanced because it serves to maintain civic pride and awareness of community responsibilities, make life richer for its citizens, and attract people and money to the city by making it a more interesting and attractive place to visit.

- g. Quality.--To develop positive attitudes and a desire for continuous improvement instead of apathy and indifference which allows obsolescence and deterioration to generate blight; to establish the highest goals for the community consistent with its resources, capability and wishes for achievement; to recognize quality as well as quantity in community development. Higher standards of quality serve to make existing community life richer as well as retard the effects of deterioration and obsolescence and blight in the future.
- h. Economy.--The maximum community benefits from the program consistent with the proper respect for the personal interests and rights of the citizens minimizing cost and insuring economy will be accomplished by scheduling action to benefit from market conditions and private investment.¹⁶

Report No. 2; Nature and Character

This report consisted of an analysis of the existing physical, social, economic, and organizational characteristics which prevailed within the City of Fort Worth. It presented a study of the relationship of these factors and a brief study of the land units in the metropolitan area. The main

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 9-11.

objective of this report was to provide background information on the existing and potential elements of the community which created the need for renewal and which offered a resource for renewal implementation.

While the purpose of the Nature and Character Report was not to establish conclusions, but rather to provide background information for future decisions, several conclusions were reached by the staff preparing the report.

The staff concluded that the problems could be classified into two distinct categories. The first category consisted of community-wide problems, which were concerned with policy and organization. The second category dealt with problems relating to specific geographic or functional areas.

The community-wide problems were listed as follows:

- a. A need for greater participation by the citizens in civic and community affairs in order to develop a sense of civic responsibility and to become more sophisticated in the use of their existing tools of government, the ballot and the lobby, for the purposes of bettering the community.
- b. A need for cooperation, at least on a county-wide basis, to solve such problems as housing, public transportation, and economic growth.
- c. A need for reorientation of existing functional or service agencies, such as schools, government utilities, in order that they may engage in comprehensive improvement.

- d. A need for close coordination of existing agencies, and a need to develop a structured community organization which will provide leaders for long-range programs.
- e. A need for existing social and welfare programs to implement improvement programs.¹⁷

The specific area problems were classified under five headings: physical, housing, social, economic and organization.

Physical problems were due to several factors. The past growth of Fort Worth resulted in mixed and incompatible land use. In many instances, areas that should have been primarily pedestrian were being encroached upon by the automobile. Areas adjacent to industry were becoming blighted. Several geographic problem areas were classified in the following way:

- a. Pockets--small land areas separate and distinct from those around it.
- b. Mixed Use Areas--Incompatible uses thrown closely together.
- c. Strip Commercial--Unplanned and disorderly, frequently marginal commercial establishments scattered along thoroughfares.
- d. Exurban Growth--Excessive scattering of suburbs without concern for cost of supplying services.

¹⁷City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Report No. 2, Nature and Character, pp. 2-3.

- e. Non-Residential Blighted -- Poorly planned, poorly located or obsolete industry or commercial areas.
- f. Undeveloped Land -- Land within the urban area but with no provision for urban use.¹⁸

Housing problems were considered mainly the result of aging residential structures. The particular areas were those containing houses which were thirty-five years or older, or those which were built after World War II in the building boom. The housing problems were considered to be related to ethnic areas of extreme social tension. These areas also showed a high degree of rental occupancy.

The majority of the social problems were found among the Latin American and Negro groups. The problems included:

- a. A lack of incentive and opportunity for these groups.
- b. Higher birth rates resulting in additional birth rates.
- c. A need for the care of the elderly.
- d. A need for additional services.¹⁹

The economic problem area showed a need for increasing the economic base through attracting market oriented manufacturing, a need for local financing of businesses, and a need for the creation of an industrial development corporation.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 4.

Two solutions were recommended to solve the organization problem. First, a statement of goals was needed to aid in improving community organization, and second, the Town Hall movement should have been made a formal organization with a staff and a budget.²⁰

Report No. 3, Methods and Procedures

The purpose of the report was to establish work procedures on which each phase of the program could be constructed. The report was designed to inform the City Council, the Planning Commission, and the citizens of the types of data utilized and the detailed processes involved in preparing the study. The establishment of detailed work procedures was to serve three purposes. First, it would assure that the technical preparation of the program would be developed in a logical sequence using standardized uniform methods. Second, it would assure a system in which information could easily be kept up for future use. Finally, it would assure a record system in which all data would be available for use by other city departments and private agencies, thus achieving overall economy.²¹

The work schedule established by the third report consisted of four stages. The first stage was the establishment

²⁰Ibid., p. 5.

²¹City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Report No. 3, Methods and Procedures, p. 1.

of the proper concept for the program. This was completed and presented in the first report.

The second stage involved the collection of data. This consisted of field inspections, the use of census data, photographing and mapping, the use of the assessor's cards, and other sources such as the various departments of the city government, the Community Council, and the Chamber of Commerce. From these sources the data would be correlated for the next stage.

The third stage called for an analysis of the problem. In making the analysis, certain criteria had to be established. This consisted of a rating system for defining locations where problems were acute enough to justify community action. After the criteria had been established the specific areas to be improved would be identified. This would then lead to the analysis of blight, and evaluation of local resources, and economic and market studies within the areas. The final step called for an inventory of the deficiencies.

The final stage of the work schedule was the actual programming. This step consisted of the determination of renewal action. It included organization requirements, economic and market requirements, and relocation requirements. From these factors there would be an inventory of the costs which would determine the final long-range program.

Report No. 4, Problem Area Analysis

This report provided the factual basis for developing the long-range program of improvement. The report had five basic objectives:

- a. To report the physical elements contributing to blight.
- b. To locate and identify problem areas within Fort Worth.
- c. To assess the extent and character of deficiencies.
- d. To evaluate re-use proposals for problem areas.
- e. To develop tentative treatment proposals.²²

In order to achieve the objectives of the report, the Community Renewal Program staff studied four major land uses in the city--public, residential, commercial, and industrial. Each category was field inspected and classified as to its character, intensity, quality, and relationship to its surroundings. General characteristics of the population, development trends, and the type and quality of improvements in each land use classification were recorded and evaluated.

The third part was divided into three sections. The first section explained the procedures of the analysis as established in the third report of the Community Renewal Program.

²²City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Report No. 4, Problem Area Analysis, p. 1.

Section two, the Total Community, included a discussion of the nature of deficiencies and alternative methods of accomplishing the correction of deficiencies.

Section three, Problem Areas, presented detailed analyses by geographic areas. The proposed treatments showed the relative proportion of substandard structures, the community facilities requirements, the additional commercial and industrial land required within each area, and the general location of problem and potential problem areas within the study unit.

Report No. 5, Resources for Treatment

The purpose of the report was to develop a systematic program for community improvement. The report dealt with identifying resources necessary for community improvement and developing broad guidelines for relating their utilization to an over-all improvement program.

The fifth report was divided into six sections. The first section, Recommended Community Improvements, presented four implementation methods to carry out the proposed scope of treatment. The methods suggested were to provide a balanced program and to increase the program's ability to meet a variety of problem conditions. The methods were as follows:

- a. A code enforcement program.--This was designed to insure that property and neighborhood maintenance standards were maintained and property values conserved. Code enforcement would be the basic tool

for rehabilitation and conservation efforts. It would insure that minimum standards were maintained throughout the city.

- b. A strong, organized voluntary improvement effort.-- This effort would supplement code enforcement and would assist those property owners who found minimum standards difficult to meet. It would also encourage a level of performance in the community higher than the minimum standards set forth in the code. The efforts of this group to encourage voluntary compliance and to provide supplementary action were considered essential to the success of the code enforcement effort.
- c. Economic Expansion Projects.--These projects were conceived to stimulate private investment, generate growth, broaden the economic and tax base, and to instill confidence in the community improvement effort. These projects would normally depend on the private economy for the impetus to develop.
- d. Deficiency Area Proposals.--Those areas which were badly blighted or otherwise in particular need of concentrated action and special assistance from outside the neighborhood were given special attention. These areas were generally economically, as well as physically and socially, blighted to

the extent that the private economy could not be expected to initiate improvements in these areas.²³

Section two, Scope of Proposed Treatment, outlined six alternative treatments as means to implement community renewal. These were:

- a. Private rehabilitation to code standards.
- b. Private rehabilitation beyond code standards.
- c. Rehabilitation requiring public assistance.
- d. Direct public action.
- e. Private clearance for re-use.
- f. Clearance for re-use with public assistance.²⁴

The range of treatment permitted by the six alternatives was a major concern in recommending a specific course of action or series of priorities. In terms of marketability, relocation, and related questions there were two basic categories of concern. These were:

- a. Redevelopment treatment - the elimination of present structures through clearance and a redevelopment of the area for the present or another future land use.
- b. Rehabilitation treatment - the upgrading of existing structures to eliminate blight-causing defects.²⁵

²³City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Report No. 5, Resources for Treatment, p. 1-1.

²⁴Ibid., p. 11-1.

²⁵Ibid.

The third section dealt with an analysis of the downtown area. It presented an analysis of the market feasibility, relocation requirements, and community financial resources required by the proposed community renewal program for the downtown area.

The fourth section, Market Feasibility of Proposed Treatment Program, evaluated the market feasibility of the various land uses recommended for redevelopment under the ideal treatment program. Residential demand was divided into demand generated by the proposed treatment program and other causes, mainly new growth. Demand was then evaluated by house value and rent level, as well as by single-family (owner occupied) and multi-family (renter occupied) categories. Consideration was given to the racial and income characteristics of the population of Fort Worth, potential marketability of the land proposed for residential, industrial, and commercial re-use under the ideal treatment program was evaluated.

The fifth section of the report, Community Financial Capabilities, discussed the financial capability of the City of Fort Worth to undertake the proposed treatment program. It evaluated the city's financial position including sources of revenue, expenditures, capital improvement programming, and debt financing. Other taxing bodies affecting the citizens of Fort Worth such as the school district, water district, county and state were also evaluated in relation to the levies they imposed.

Section six, Recommendations for Future Community Renewal Planning, offered two steps for improving the effectiveness of long-range improvement planning and keeping it continuously updated. The two steps were continuous programming and periodic review.

Report No. 6, Summary

The purpose of the report was well stated in the introduction:

We, the people of Fort Worth, can rid our city of slums, blight, and other liabilities which prevent this community from achieving its full potential. In the process, we can expand local economic opportunities, promote efficiency, and make our city a more attractive, better place in which to live. We can do all this--if we want to. Not overnight, but over the next twenty or twenty-five years, if we start now and continue improvement in a systematic and orderly fashion.²⁶

The final report presented, in summary form, a practical and specific program designed to achieve these goals before the close of the century. It was practical in that it took into account resources available to do the job as well as the goals that needed to be accomplished.

The primary action proposed by the report was extensive rehabilitation, through code enforcement and organized, voluntary, neighborhood improvement. This was to be in connection with a public improvements program designed to provide,

²⁶City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Report No. 6, Summary, p. 1.

when and where needed, facilities such as schools, parks, improved streets and drainage, and street lights. Clearance and redevelopment were suggested for those areas in which rehabilitation was not economically justifiable. This was intended for those areas which had outgrown their usefulness. Redevelopment was recommended where it promised to expand the economic base by upgrading or putting land to better use.

Even though the City of Fort Worth had building and housing codes with a code enforcement program, five recommendations were offered to upgrade and strengthen the codes. These were

- a. the revision and updating of the zoning ordinance to relate it directly to the comprehensive plan and to the present conditions,
- b. the review of construction codes (including the plumbing ordinance) to insure that they provided for safety without imposing unnecessary costs,
- c. the consistent application of housing code enforcement to occupied as well as unoccupied dwellings,
- d. the elimination of any conflicting requirements existing within and between codes, and
- e. the establishment of a continuous code review procedure.²⁷

²⁷Ibid., p. 4.

The basic change proposed in the code enforcement program, particularly in those codes which required minimum standards for existing structures, was for a change from a complaint procedure (at this time much of the code enforcement program was based on a strict complaint procedure) to a planned and programmed procedure designed to accomplish the total job. A citizen's organization in the nature of a "steering committee" for code enforcement was recommended to:

- a. inform citizens and enlist their cooperation and help,
- b. aid citizens in communicating with the staff and City Council to achieve coordination of private and public improvement actions,
- c. advise individuals and groups as to the methods for improvement of their properties, to secure financing for needed improvements, and to get the most for their improvement dollars, and
- d. serve as a sounding board for community needs, advising public officials as to desirable program changes.²⁸

The scope of the proposed program was quite ambitious. It anticipated the improvement of about one of every four structures in the city, most of which would be residential. Proportionately, however, the percentage of industrial and

²⁸Ibid., p. 4.

commercial structures to be redeveloped or rehabilitated was even greater. About one of every four residential structures (29,140) was scheduled for improvement or clearance, while two of every five business structures (3,906) needed to be brought up to standard or redeveloped.

Conclusions

The six reports of the Community Renewal Program were written primarily from a technical viewpoint and definitely in a technical form. Therefore they are quite repetitive and in many instances oversimplified. However, as it was pointed out in the introduction, this was the first attempt of its kind and certainly in such a situation all materials had to be well organized and simplified. Also the Community Renewal Program could be considered to be successful in that it provided the City of Fort Worth with a Workable Program thus allowing the city to participate in Federal rehabilitation programs with a partial Federal financing.

CHAPTER IV

UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1965-- CONCENTRATED CODE ENFORCEMENT

In July, 1965, the Congress of the United States passed the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, which provided Federal financial assistance for code enforcement. This had been provided in the Housing Act of 1964, but the 1965 act presented a new and simplified basis. In response to this act, the Urban Renewal Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency issued Local Public Agency Letter No. 345, which set forth the policies and requirements for Federal financial assistance for local code enforcement programs.

These programs for code enforcement were designed for the purpose of aiding cities in the enforcement of housing and building codes. They represented a new approach by the Federal government to aid the cities in establishing a rehabilitation program for potential slum areas.

L.P.A. 345 provided two means for financial assistance for code enforcement:

- a. Direct grants to cover part of the cost of concentrated code enforcement programs in a designated area or areas within a city, other municipalities, or county.

- b. Eligibility for the cost of code enforcement activities carried out in an urban renewal project area.²⁹

Several policies and requirements were established for the implementation of a code enforcement program. In order to obtain Federal assistance for a code enforcement program a municipality was required to have a Workable Program for Community Improvement. A municipality also was required to adopt a comprehensive system of codes that would meet the minimum requirements set forth in the "Municipal Code Standards Requirements" and to be carrying out an effective program of code enforcement.

A municipality also was required to agree to maintain its regular code enforcement program, excluding the areas in which there was Federal assistance, at a level not less than the level prior to the concentrated code enforcement program. This level was to be determined on the basis of the annual average amount expended by the municipality for code enforcement in the two immediate preceding years.

Also a municipality was required to adopt a satisfactory program for providing all of the necessary public improvements within the area or areas to be assisted by a code enforcement grant. An area selected for concentrated code enforcement

²⁹Department of Housing and Urban Development, Urban Renewal Administration, Local Public Agency No. 345 (August 18, 1965), p. 1.

was limited with respect to the work load, in order that the buildings in the area could be brought up to the code standards within three years or less.

The municipality was required to assure any individuals or families in the code enforcement area who needed to be relocated that they would be relocated in decent, safe, and sanitary housing within their means, and to provide related relocation assistance.

Municipalities adopting concentrated code enforcement programs were required to have a systematic program of code enforcement that provided:

- a. A definite plan and schedule for bringing all properties into code compliance.
- b. An adequate number of trained inspectors.
- c. An effective notice, permit, and records system.
- d. Close coordination among all local governmental units and officials responsible for inspections and other compliance actions.
- e. Administrative and legal procedures for the prompt and equitable handling of noncompliance and appeal cases.
- f. Close coordination between all municipal agencies participating in the program and citizens and neighborhood organizations to obtain understanding and support for the program.³⁰

³⁰Ibid., p. 5.

In order for an area to be eligible for a concentrated code enforcement program the following requirements were to be met:

- a. The area must be built up and predominantly residential in character, with residential uses distributed throughout the area.
- b. Census, survey or other data must indicate that code violations appear to exist in at least twenty per cent of the buildings in the area and that these violations are distributed throughout the area.
- c. Conditions in the area must be such that the proposed program for concentrated code enforcement and the provision of the proposed public improvements will be adequate to eliminate code violations and arrest the decline of the area.³¹

As mentioned earlier, a municipality was required to adopt a code regulation program that would meet the "Municipal Code Standards Requirements." This included a comprehensive system of codes that regulated the minimum conditions of use, location, construction, alteration, repair, maintenance, demolition, and removal of private property. The codes had to prescribe adequate standards of health, safety, and welfare, including the following minimum requirements:

³¹Ibid., p. 3.

- a. The comprehensive system of codes was to include:
 1. A housing code or equivalent.
 2. Zoning regulations, and building, electrical, fire prevention, and related codes.
- b. Provision of codes and other pertinent regulations for police power enforcement actions were to have sufficient applicability to existing properties to correct or remove all substandard property conditions in the designated code enforcement area. Standards, requirements, and provisions for enforcing the housing code were to be applicable to all existing and new dwellings and dwelling units.
- c. The basic standards and requirements of the municipality's housing, building, plumbing, electrical, fire prevention, and related codes were to be comparable to the standards and requirements either contained in the most recent editions of the nationally recognized model codes or developed and promulgated by nationally recognized standards setting organizations.³²

Federal financial assistance for concentrated code enforcement programs was made available by two methods, direct grants without repayment, and long term, low interest, loans.

A municipality could receive a grant to assist in planning and carrying out a concentrated code enforcement program,

³²Ibid., pp. 5-6.

including the provision of eligible public improvements.

These grants would be made on the following basis:

- a. Up to two-thirds of the cost of the program for municipalities with a population of over 50,000 according to the 1960 census.
- b. Up to three-fourths of the cost of the program for municipalities of a population of 50,000 or less according to the 1960 census.³³

A municipality could also receive a Federal relocation grant to cover the entire cost of relocation payments to eligible families, individuals, businesses, and nonprofit organizations that were displaced due to the code enforcement program.

Direct Federal loans with a three per cent interest rate were made available to eligible property owners or tenants for financing the rehabilitation required to make property conform to applicable code requirements.

Direct Federal rehabilitation grants, with a maximum amount of \$1,500, were made available to eligible families and individuals for repairs or improvements required to make property conform to applicable code requirements.

Before it could receive a grant a municipality was required to assure the Federal government that it had a satisfactory program for the provision of all necessary public

³³Ibid., p. 4.

improvements for the designated code enforcement areas. This requirement was to insure adequate public facilities and services for the stability of the neighborhoods and the prevention of blight, both directly through the provision of an incentive to owners and tenants for maintaining the properties in the area.

In its grant application a municipality was required to show evidence that it had considered the total needs of the area for public facilities such as schools, parks, neighborhood centers, streets and sidewalks, and street lighting. The municipality was also required to provide adequate assurance that any additional facilities needed to assure the stability of the area would be provided prior to completion of the concentrated code enforcement program.

There were three eligible costs allowed for a concentrated code enforcement program. These included code administration, related staff services, and public improvements.

The following activities were made eligible to be included under code administration:

- a. Organizing, programming, scheduling, coordinating, and supervising a code compliance program.
- b. Assisting in the preparation of permit applications.
- c. Collecting permit fees.
- d. Checking plans and specifications.
- e. Making property inspections, re-inspections, and valuations.

- f. Advising owners and builders.
- g. Preparing reports, notices to owners, and other correspondence.
- h. Establishing and maintaining file and record systems.
- i. Maintaining control and flow of correspondence, job forms, receipts, reports, and pertinent information relative to individual properties.
- j. Developing and maintaining statistical data and summaries necessary to reflect progress, develop the budget, maintain job control, and establish staffing needs.
- k. Holding administrative and appeals board hearings, including testimony by staff and preparation of transcripts of the proceedings.
- l. Costs normally charged to court prosecution of property owners who refuse to comply with code requirements.
- m. Demolition of unsound structures.
- n. When necessary or desirable in order to facilitate assistance to property owners and tenants, the cost of renting office space within the designated area for a site office.³⁴

The following activities were made eligible to be included under related staff services:

³⁴Ibid., p. 7.

- a. Relocation assistance to displaced families, individuals, and businesses.
- b. Advice and assistance to property owners and tenants where appropriate, including assistance in the preparation of applications to obtain direct Federal rehabilitation loans or grants or FHA determination with respect to an FHA insured loan.
- c. Advance notice and explanation of the proposed code enforcement program to property owners, tenants, and neighborhood organizations and related activities to develop understanding of and support for the program.³⁵

For public improvements the costs of planning, installing, constructing, reconstructing, or repairing eligible public improvements could be included in the program costs. The following activities were made eligible also as costs:

- a. Streets, except expressways, freeways, and other limited access streets.
- b. Curbs, gutters, and public sidewalks.
- c. Traffic lights and signs.
- d. Street name signs.
- e. Publicly owned street lighting and stationary fire and police communication systems.
- f. Street tree planting.³⁶

³⁵Ibid., pp. 7-8.

³⁶Ibid., p. 8.

Two other requirements were placed on municipalities adopting code enforcement programs with Federal assistance, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and equal employment opportunity.

CHAPTER V

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Community Improvement Program of the City of Fort Worth was first listed in the 1965-66 annual budget. It was listed as a new program under the supervision of the City Manager, who was given the responsibility for coordinating efforts by public and private agencies aimed at the rehabilitation of areas of substandard housing in the city.³⁷

Three "pilot" project areas were selected to test the effectiveness of the existing means of the city to combat substandard housing and other problems contributing to the high cost of all governmental services provided in such areas. The activities of the Planning, Health, Building and Housing Inspection, Park and Recreation, Police, and Public Works Departments were to be coordinated by this program. The Community Improvement Coordinator would also work with local financial institutions, the Real Estate Board, the Home Builders Association, and voluntary improvement organizations to provide a unified, concerted rehabilitation effort by private and public agencies.

³⁷City of Fort Worth, Texas, Annual Budget, 1965-66, p. 59.

The 1965-66 Annual Budget provided a total of \$17,925 for the Community Improvement Program. This was allocated in the following way:

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Personal Services | \$13,830 |
| Supplies | 700 |
| Contractual Services | 1,940 |
| Capital Outlay | <u>1,455</u> |
| Total | \$17,925 ³⁸ |

There were two persons budgeted in the Community Improvement Program, a Community Improvement Coordinator and a Clerk Typist II.

The three project areas were broken down in the following way:

Pilot Project I - Long Street Area - Jacksboro to Azle Avenue.

| | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Housing Conditions | |
| Dilapidated | 28% |
| Deteriorating | 48% |
| Median Annual Income | \$5,000 |
| Families with Income under \$3,000 | 20% |
| Median School Years Completed | 10 |
| Street Development Needed (1.f.) | 8,800 (90% of total) |

³⁸Ibid.

Pilot Project II - Vicinity of Maddox and Riverside

Housing Conditions

| | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Dilapidated | 7% |
| Deteriorating | 70% |
| Median Annual Income | \$4,260 |
| Families with Income under \$3,000 | 38% |
| Median School Years Completed | 9.4 |
| Street Development Needed (1.f.) | 4,900 (90% of total) |

Pilot Project III - Worth Heights

Housing Conditions

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Dilapidated | 13% |
| Deteriorating | 36% |
| Median Annual Income | \$5,600 |
| Families with Income under \$3,000 | 18% |
| Median School Years Completed | 11.5 |
| Street Development Needed (1.f.) | 10,800 (30% of total) ³⁹ |

The 1965-66 annual budget also stated that as time permitted and as the need required, the Community Improvement Coordinator also would assist the City Manager's Office in coordinating other community improvement activities requiring

³⁹Ibid.

city participation. This was to include industrial development projects and requests for community facilities contracts.⁴⁰

Concentrated Code Application

On December 13, 1965, the Community Improvement Coordinator was instructed to prepare an application for the implementation of a concentrated code enforcement program in three residential areas of the city. The areas to be included were basically the three areas originally assigned to the Community Improvement Program.

For the purpose of preparing the application the Community Improvement Coordinator was loaned one inspector from the Housing Inspection Division of the Public Works Department. The information used in the application was obtained by automobile surveys of the three areas and the use of the Community Renewal Report of August 9, 1965.

The application was completed and presented to the City Council for approval on February 7, 1966. The following represents a summary of the application by area.

Area A

This area was designated as Project Astro, and is about four miles northwest of the downtown area of the city. The area was predominantly residential with some scattered commercial property. The residential area was built up with a majority

⁴⁰Ibid.

of single-family houses, a few duplexes scattered throughout the area, and one project of ninety-eight duplexes. The average age of the houses in the area was thirty-seven years. The area east of Northwest 21st Street was annexed by the City of Fort Worth in July 1922, and the area west of Northwest 21st Street and south of Long Avenue was annexed in July 1964. The area north of Long Avenue and west of Northwest 21st Street was annexed in May 1953.

Size of Area

| | | | |
|------------------|----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| City Blocks | 49 | | |
| Acres | 266 | | |
| <u>Buildings</u> | | <u>No. with code Violations</u> | <u>Per Cent with Code Violations</u> |
| Residential | 762 | 263 | 34.51% |
| Non-residential | 28 | 4 | 14.28% |
| Mixed | <u>2</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>100%</u> |
| Total | 792 | 269 | 33.96% |

Dwelling Units

| | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------------------|
| Residential Buildings | 866 | 280 | 32.33% |
| Mixed Buildings | <u>2</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>100%</u> |
| Total | 868 | 282 | 33.49% ⁴¹ |

A total of twenty residential dwellings and two commercial buildings were to be demolished in Area A. An estimated

⁴¹City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program, Application for Code Enforcement Grant, Number I, February 14, 1966, p. 3.

thirteen families would have to be relocated. However, there was sufficient standard, vacant housing available within the area or adjacent to the area to provide several selections for each displacement.

Project A was conveniently located to shopping centers, schools, and parks. The area suffered from the lack of curbs, gutters, paved streets, and drainage improvements. Since the area was an older part of the city in which existing water and sewer facilities have been in place for many years, it was quite likely that any street grading operations would require lowering of the existing water facilities while such grading would have minimal effects on existing sewers. From recent experience with lowered in-place water lines to new street grades, it had been concluded that the most economical means of adjusting affected water lines to new street grades was that of replacement with new mains. No evidence had been found for the need for the enlargement of existing water facilities in the area.

The improvements to be provided in Area A and charged to the code enforcement cost were as follows:

| <u>Improvements</u> | <u>Cost Estimate</u> | <u>Completion</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Curb, gutter, and pavement | \$770,625 | 24 months |
| Drainage inlets | 13,000 | 24 months |
| Culverts | 40,000 | 24 months |
| Street lights | 16,950 | 18 months |
| Land acquisition | <u>66,550</u> | 12 months |
| Total | \$907,125 ⁴² | |

The improvements to be provided in Area A and paid by the City of Fort Worth were as follows:

| <u>Improvements</u> | <u>Cost Estimate</u> | <u>Completion</u> |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Storm drains | \$ 89,400 | 18 months |
| Water distribution | <u>14,375</u> | 24 months |
| Total | \$103,775 ⁴³ | |

The structural condition of Area A was generally considered deteriorating with limited dilapidation, but it could be brought into code compliance and the deterioration could be arrested with a code enforcement program.

Area B

Area B, which was designated as Project Beacon, is located about two miles southeast of the downtown area. The area was predominantly residential, with commercial use along Riverside

⁴²Ibid., p. 13.

⁴³Ibid., p. 16.

Drive and East Rosedale. The residential area consisted of single-family houses and duplexes. The area was conveniently located to parks, schools, and shopping centers. It had good access to the downtown area on the Poly Freeway.

| <u>Size of Area</u> | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| City Blocks | 18 | | |
| Acres | 55 | | |
| <u>Buildings</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>No. with Code Violations</u> | <u>Per Cent with Code Violations</u> |
| Residential | 106 | 68 | 64.15% |
| Non-residential | <u>29</u> | <u>15</u> | <u>51.72%</u> |
| Total | 135 | 83 | |

Dwellings

| | | | |
|-------------|-----|----|----------------------|
| Residential | 108 | 69 | 63.48% ⁴⁴ |
|-------------|-----|----|----------------------|

There was no displacement or relocation anticipated in this area. It needed curbs, gutters, and paved streets. Since it was an older part of the city, it was anticipated that street grading operations would require the lowering of existing water facilities. It was concluded that the most economical means of adjusting the affected water lines to the new street grades was that of replacement with new mains. No evidence had been found for the need for enlargement of existing water facilities in the area.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 18.

The improvements to be provided in Area B and to be charged to the code enforcement program were as follows:

| <u>Improvements</u> | <u>Cost Estimate</u> | <u>Completion</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Curb, gutter, and pavement | \$217,013 | 24 months |
| Rehabilitation of Rosedale | 28,300 | 12 months |
| Drainage inlets | 5,700 | 24 months |
| Culverts | 13,150 | 24 months |
| Street lights | <u>3,750</u> | 18 months |
| Total | \$267,913 ⁴⁵ | |

The improvements to be provided in Area B and paid by the City of Fort Worth were:

| <u>Improvements</u> | <u>Cost Estimate</u> | <u>Completion</u> |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Storm sewers | \$15,900 | 18 months |
| Water distribution | 6,687 | 24 months |
| Sewer collection | <u>2,700</u> | 24 months |
| | \$25,287 ⁴⁶ | |

Area B was considered to be a deteriorating area, yet it could be rehabilitated through a code enforcement program.

Area C

Area C, which was designated as Project Cosmos, was located about four miles south of the downtown area along the South

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 31.

⁴⁶Ibid.

Freeway and north of the Seminary South Shopping Center. The area contained an elementary school and was mostly residential, with a few duplexes scattered through the area. On the west side of the area was an industrial district that created an employment area, as did the Seminary South Shopping Center.

Size of Area

| | |
|-------------|-----|
| City Blocks | 50 |
| Acres | 215 |

| <u>Buildings</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>No. with Code Violations</u> | <u>Per Cent with Code Violations</u> |
|------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Residential | 713 | 265 | 37.16% |
| Non-residential | 22 | 5 | 22.72% |
| Mixed | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>100%</u> |
| Total | 736 | 271 | 36.82% |

Dwellings Units

| | | | |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------------------|
| Residential | 722 | 269 | 37.25% |
| Mixed | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>100%</u> |
| Total | 723 | 270 | 37.20% ⁴⁷ |

It was estimated that eleven buildings in this area would have to be demolished, and six families and one business would be displaced.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 32.

A majority of the streets in the area were paved, but there was a need for the remainder of the streets to be paved and for curbs and gutters to be installed. Since it was an older part of the city in which existing water and sewer facilities had been in place for many years, any street grading would require the lowering of existing water facilities. It had been concluded that the most economical means of adjusting affected water lines to new street grades was that of replacement with new mains. No evidence had been found for need for the enlargement of the existing water facilities.

The improvements to be provided in Area C and charged to the code enforcement program were as follows:

| <u>Improvements</u> | <u>Estimated Cost</u> | <u>Completion</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Curb, gutter, and pavement | \$314,812 | 18 months |
| Drainage inlets | 1,200 | 18 months |
| Sidewalks | 9,600 | 10 months |
| Street lights | <u>6,750</u> | 18 months |
| Total | \$332,362 ⁴⁸ | |

The improvements to be provided in the area and financed by the city include:

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 43.

| <u>Improvements</u> | <u>Estimated Cost</u> | <u>Completion</u> |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Storm drains | \$40,000 | 24 months |
| Water distribution | <u>12,688</u> | 24 months |
| Total | \$52,688 ⁴⁹ | |

Area C also was considered to be a deteriorating neighborhood, yet it could be rehabilitated through a concentrated code enforcement program. The total estimated cost of the program by area was itemized as follows:

Area A

| <u>Item</u> | <u>City</u> | <u>Federal</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Municipal facilities | \$406,150 | \$604,750 | \$1,010,900 |
| Rehabilitation loans | - | 249,952 | 249,952 |
| Rehabilitation grants | - | 79,500 | 79,500 |
| Relocation costs | - | 4,600 | 4,600 |
| Code enforcement and administrative costs | <u>72,707</u> | <u>145,413</u> | <u>218,120</u> |
| Total | \$478,857 | \$1,084,215 | \$1,563,072 |

Area B

| <u>Item</u> | <u>City</u> | <u>Federal</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Municipal facilities | \$114,591 | \$178,609 | \$293,200 |
| Rehabilitation loans | - | 52,800 | 52,800 |
| Rehabilitation grants | - | 39,000 | 39,000 |
| Relocation costs | - | - | - |
| Code enforcement and administrative costs | <u>11,530</u> | <u>23,058</u> | <u>34,588</u> |
| Total | \$126,121 | \$293,467 | \$419,588 |

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 43.

Area C

| <u>Item</u> | <u>City</u> | <u>Federal</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|--|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Municipal facilities | \$163,475 | \$221,575 | \$385,050 |
| Rehabilitation loans | - | 198,534 | 198,534 |
| Rehabilitation grants | - | 69,000 | 69,000 |
| Relocation costs | - | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| Code enforcement and administrative costs | <u>58,089</u> | <u>116,177</u> | <u>174,266</u> |
| Total | \$221,564 | \$608,486 | \$830,050 ⁵⁰ |

The total cost of the project was estimated to be \$2,812,710, of which \$826,542 was to be paid by the city and \$1,986,168 to be paid by the Federal government. The city's expenditures would be primarily for storm drains, water distribution, and sewer collection, which are facilities which are not included in the Federal participation.

⁵⁰Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

THE URBAN RENEWAL CAMPAIGN AND ELECTION OF 1966

With the presentation of the Concentrated Code application the issue of urban renewal was brought up for a second time in Fort Worth. The first time the issue came up in the 1958 election, it was defeated by a vote of 5,426 to 1,687.⁵¹ In the 1958 campaign and election the major issues were the Gruen Plan and the Lake Como renewal project. The Gruen Plan involved a comprehensive renewal program for the downtown area, which was designed by architect Victor Gruen. The plan called for a complete renovation of the downtown area for business, cultural, educational, and entertainment purposes. However, many people believed it to be a scheme to revive the downtown area solely for the downtown businesses. The Lake Como area renewal proposal called for the rehabilitation of a Negro neighborhood on the west side of town which could best be described as a slum area. The area contained a great deal of substandard housing and virtually no paved streets. The major issue of the campaign however was the Gruen Plan. While the

⁵¹City of Fort Worth, Texas, Minutes of the City Council, December 31, 1958.

campaign concerned some people very much, an overall lack of interest by the community was demonstrated in the size of the election turnout.

When the City Manager presented the application to the City Council for its approval, one member criticized his fellow members for "putting urban renewal in effect before the people had a chance to vote on it." Councilman Marvin Shannon made the statement: "This is strictly urban renewal. It's urban renewal without the power of eminent domain."⁵²

Mr. Shannon also asked that if an urban renewal election were to pass, would the City abandon the code enforcement program? While the City Council voted to approve the application, Mr. Shannon and Councilman Harris Hoover, both of whom voted against the program, were successful in getting the City Council to set a date for the purpose of holding an urban renewal election. Under the Texas Urban Renewal Law an election must be held in order to implement an urban renewal program with the powers of eminent domain. On March 7, 1966, the City Council officially set April 12, 1966, as the date for the urban renewal election and agreed to put the words "eminent domain" on the ballot. The power of eminent domain would give the City or an urban renewal agency the power to condemn private property for clearance and resale for development.

⁵²The Fort Worth Press, February 4, 1966.

With the election set officially the various groups both for and against urban renewal began to form. Of the established groups favoring the approval of urban renewal, the largest and most active was the Chamber of Commerce. On February 9, 1966, the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce went on record as favoring approval of urban renewal with a vote of 19-4. The board also passed the following resolutions stating the purposes and objectives of the Chamber's Community Renewal Committee:

- a. To exercise its influence in gaining a favorable vote for urban renewal.
- b. To serve as a source of information and data concerning all phases of urban renewal.
- c. To maintain a continuing review of the progress of urban renewal in the City and thus, to aid, guide and influence its direction and course, whenever appropriate and practicable.
- d. To assist in making it an effective program.
- e. To assist public officials and private individuals wherever and whenever it is appropriate in the pursuance of an effective urban renewal program.
- f. To assist business and industry members of the Chamber in a better understanding of urban renewal.⁵³

While the City government was considered to be neutral as far as the issue was concerned, several City officials spoke out

⁵³The Fort Worth Star-Telegram, February 9, 1966.

for the approval of urban renewal. All of the City Council members, with the exception of Councilmen Hoover and Shannon who opposed urban renewal, and Councilman Stovall, who remained neutral, strongly supported urban renewal. The member who took the leading role in the campaign was Mayor Willard Barr. The Mayor placed all of the influence of his position on the passage of urban renewal. From the administrative staff only City Manager J. L. Brownlee came out publicly in support of urban renewal by allowing his name to appear in a newspaper advertisement.

As usual in any campaign of this nature, an organization was formed to promote the approval of urban renewal. A Citizens Committee for Urban Progress was formed whose members and leaders were mainly individuals affiliated with the Chamber of Commerce or the Downtown Association.

Gradually other civic and business groups came out in favor of urban renewal. The first group to do so was the Tarrant County Central Labor Council, which pledged to support the urban renewal issue early in January.

On March 12, 1966, the Fort Worth Federal Business Association passed a resolution supporting the urban renewal issue. The resolution stated: "The City can, under such a program, eliminate blight and rehabilitate the City to the benefit of all taxpayers."⁵⁴

⁵⁴The Fort Worth Star-Telegram, March 12, 1966.

Two former mayors of Fort Worth, both of whom were associated with the Republican party, came out in support of urban renewal. Tom McCann, who had been mayor during the Eisenhower years, made the following statement:

I had hoped we would be able to do the jobs ourselves without Federal intervention, but nothing has happened and time has passed. So it looks like urban renewal is our only alternative for solving urban problems.⁵⁵

Bayard Friedman, a more recent mayor, made a strong plea for support of the issue.

When it became apparent that an urban renewal election was forthcoming the opposition began to form. Late in January Mr. Tyson Popell, an automobile dealer, announced the formation of the Citizen Committee for the Protection of Property Rights, which became the leading organization against urban renewal.⁵⁶ Another organization which came out in opposition to urban renewal was the Fort Worth Freedom Center. The executive director of the center, Kenneth Ryker, became a vital part of the opposition.⁵⁷

As the campaign got underway both sides became very active. Meetings were held all over the city. Each side distributed its own literature. The proponents organized trips to various cities to visit the urban renewal projects. They also brought in various out-of-town business executives

⁵⁵The Fort Worth Press, January 28, 1966.

⁵⁶The Fort Worth Press, January 28, 1966.

⁵⁷The Fort Worth Press, January 30, 1966.

to speak in favor of urban renewal. While the opposition did not promote any trips to other cities, they did import their own speakers. The opposition were successful in getting Martin Anderson, a Columbia University professor, to come to Fort Worth to speak against urban renewal. Anderson, a highly outspoken critic of urban renewal, is the author of The Federal Bulldozer and The Fiasco of Urban Renewal.

As the campaign progressed each side became very critical of the other and each side accused the other of not being objective. The proponents accused the opposition of being against progress and the opponents accused the proponents of trying to destroy property rights. However, there was only one real issue, that of eminent domain. The opposition feared the use of eminent domain while the proponents maintained that the City had been exercising eminent domain for years.

On April 12, 1966, the citizens of Fort Worth went to the polls to vote on the issue. City Secretary Roy Bateman had predicted that no more than twenty-four thousand persons would vote out of approximately eighty-five thousand persons who were eligible to vote.⁵⁸ Early in the day many election officials noted a heavy turnout. By the end of the day it was obvious that the turnout was larger than had been predicted. When the returns came in, urban renewal suffered

⁵⁸The Fort Worth Star-Telegram, April 12, 1966.

a tremendous defeat. The vote was 38,397 against to 9,248 in favor. The result was considered by some people to be a political setback for Mayor Barr and a victory for Councilman Hoover.⁵⁹

After all was said and done, the urban renewal campaign produced nothing more than ill-will among the citizenry of Fort Worth. Neither side had offered workable alternatives. The situation was well stated in an editorial that appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on April 13, 1966.

The problem of course still remains. The citizens of Fort Worth have said "no" to urban renewal.

We must acknowledge that the leaders of the opposition waged an adroit and effective campaign to promote a feeling of fear on the part of citizens that their homes were threatened by the power of eminent domain and their freedoms threatened by possible Federal participation.

But, of course, it isn't enough to just say "no." It only takes a casual stroll through large sections of downtown and a quick ride in an automobile down some of our blighted residential streets to know that we must do something to meet this problem.

So now we invite the opponents to come up with a plan of action. What is to be done? Where do we get the tools to do the job? Where do we get the money? The City of Fort Worth can not sit on its bottom like a houndog [sic] and cry at the moon. Building a city takes work, dedication, money and ideas.

Now is the time to start with some ideas. We hope the leaders of the urban renewal opposition have some. We need them badly.⁶⁰

⁵⁹The Fort Worth Star-Telegram, April 13, 1966.

⁶⁰Ibid.

CHAPTER VII

THE NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

On February 7, 1966, City Manager J. L. Brownlee submitted Mayor and Council Communication G-906 to the City Council. This communication had two purposes: first, to present to the City Council for its approval the application for the Concentrated Code Enforcement Program, and second, to establish an organizational structure to implement the program.

The organizational framework proposed was for the creation of a Neighborhood Improvement Program. The new program was to consist of two sections: one to work in the three project areas of the concentrated code enforcement program, and the other to continue the work of the Minimum Housing Standards Inspection Division, which at that time was a part of the Building Division of the Department of Public Works. It was felt that the reassignment of the housing inspection program, which had much in common with the Neighborhood Improvement Program, would allow coordination of the overall housing improvement efforts. It would also place the operation under the supervision of the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator, who would have more time to direct its activities than the Building Commissioner.

While there were basically no personnel changes to be made in the Housing Standards Division, the Concentrated Code Division had to be staffed completely. The central administrative office was to consist of the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator, an Administrative Analyst, a Relocation and Loan Specialist (Housing Counselor 111), and a clerk-typist.

The concentrated code enforcement operations were to be conducted from two field offices in the project areas. One office was to be set up in the northside area and another in the larger southside area. Each field office was to consist of a Housing Counselor 111, who would supervise the office, two Housing Counselors 11, and a clerk-typist.

Both the Concentrated Code Enforcement Division and the Minimum Housing Standards Division were to be supervised by a Housing Supervisor, who was to be responsible to the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator. However, this was later changed and a supervisor was provided for each division.

The work of the Neighborhood Improvement Program was to be assisted by the various departments of the City government which were financed from the general fund, and would be reimbursed for related staff services. The services would be charged on a cost basis for work performed by the Legal Department (one attorney), the City Planning Department (one planner, maps), the City Manager's office, the Research and Budget Office, the Finance Department (Accounting, Data

Processing, and Land Division), the Fire Department, the Building Division (inspections), and the Health Department (inspections). The engineering expenses of the Public Works, Water, and Traffic Engineering Departments would be included in the overall costs for construction of public facilities in the project areas.

In order to maintain financial control of the Neighborhood Improvement Program it was proposed to establish a separate fund which would receive funds from the Federal government, bond allocations for capital improvements from the city government, and receipts from assessments levied against property owners for their share of the cost of paving improvements in accordance with the standard assessment-paving policies of the city.

The preliminary estimates indicated that the fund would create a surplus which would reduce the normal City bond fund costs for the area projects. The estimates of revenues and expenditures of the fund in the course of implementing the three projects were summarized as follows:

Receipts

| | |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Federal Matching Funds | \$1,289,582 |
| City Bond Funds | 502,466 |
| Paving Assessments | 378,000 |
| Sub-Total | <u>2,170,048</u> |

Expenditures

| | |
|---------|--------------------------------|
| Surplus | <u>1,934,374</u> ⁶¹ |
| | \$ 235,647 |

⁶¹City of Fort Worth, Texas, Mayor and Council Commu-
nication G-906, February 7, 1966, p. 6.

These figures did not include Federal expenses for rehabilitation loans or grants which would not require any city participation and would not pass through the fund.

In addition to the funds handled by the Neighborhood Improvement Program, for which partial reimbursement would be received from the Federal government, there would be other expenses to the City which would be paid directly from bond funds and which would not be subject to partial participation by the Federal government. These expenses, for minor water and sewer extensions and storm drain construction, were estimated at \$181,750 for the three project areas. This included a major storm drain that was to be built in connection with the Long Avenue extension project scheduled in the Capitol Improvement Program.

The communication ended with the following recommendations:

1. That the City Council adopt a resolution transmitting the program application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
2. That the Neighborhood Improvement Program Fund be established to finance the program upon approval of the proposed application by the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
3. That an advance of \$75,000 from the General Fund Reserve be approved to provide the initial requirements to finance the Neighborhood Improvement Program, with the same amount to be returned to the General Fund when sufficient funds accrued in the Neighborhood Improvement Fund;

4. That the unspent appropriation in the Public Works Department budget, Account No. 1-20402, "Housing Inspection", be transferred to a new account number 1-10150, "Housing Standards", to implement the transfer of supervisory responsibility of this activity from the Public Works Department to the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator.⁶²

The recommendations were approved.

With the approval of M&C G-906 the City Manager appointed Mr. N. O. Shepherd, the Community Improvement Coordinator, as the new Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator. The Community Improvement Program as established in the 1965-66 budget was to be deleted as soon as the code enforcement application was approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Immediately Mr. Shepherd began the necessary work to set up the new program in order that it could be implemented as soon as possible following the approval of the application. On February 14, 1966, the application was sent to the Federal government for approval. The same day the Minimum Housing Standards Office was transferred to Mr. Shepherd. There were no changes of personnel or duties involved in the transfer.

In spite of the Urban Renewal campaign which was being conducted at the time and which many people confused with the concentrated code enforcement program, public meetings were held in each of the project areas. At the northside area (Astro) six hundred and two persons were in attendance, at the Maddox Street area (Beacon) eighty-four persons attended, and at the Worth Heights area (Cosmos) five hundred and ten attended. The meetings generated considerable interest in

the program from the residents of each area. The Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator even visited the homes of several families in each of the three areas, who were unable to attend any of the neighborhood meetings, to explain the program. Meanwhile the work of the Housing Standards Division continued to increase and personnel morale was considered to be at an all time high.⁶³

On April 12, 1966, Mr. Leonard E. Church, Regional Director of Urban Renewal, sent a letter to the City Manager informing him of the approval of the concentrated code application.⁶⁴ The letter stated that the Neighborhood Improvement Program could incur costs in conformity with the budget and the contract from the date of the letter. Costs incurred before the execution of the contract could be considered as program costs provided they were incurred in conformity with the provisions of the contract. The program was to be completed by April 11, 1969. On May 2, 1966, the contract between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the City of Fort Worth was signed.

⁶³City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program, Activity Report, March, 1966.

⁶⁴Letter to J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, Fort Worth, Texas, from Leonard E. Church, Regional Administrator, Urban Renewal Administration, April 12, 1966.

A. Concentrated Code Enforcement Division

Following the notification of the approval of the application there were two tasks to be completed. The first was to recruit the personnel to implement the program, and the second, to set up field offices in the project areas from which the personnel would work. Because the program was new it was decided to staff it with the best and most experienced personnel. Therefore the positions called for Housing Counselors 11. Obviously the most experienced personnel were the Housing Counselors in the Housing Standards Division. As a result most of the counselors in the Housing Standards Division were transferred to the Concentrated Code Enforcement Division. However, before these men could be transferred new men had to be recruited, employed, and trained to carry out the work of the Housing Standards Division. The contract with the Federal government required the City to maintain its regular housing inspection program at a rate equal to the average of the previous two years. This process was carried out over a three week period with very satisfactory results. Each new man was assigned to one of the Housing Counselors to learn the necessary work procedures and methods.⁶⁵

There was one exception to the staffing pattern for the Concentrated Code Enforcement Division due to the employment

⁶⁵City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program, Activity Report, May, 1966.

of an individual who had no actual working experience in the field. Mr. Gilbert Garcia had been a member of the Minimum Housing Standards Commission but resigned to accept a position as a Housing Counselor 11 in the southside area (Cosmos), which was largely populated with Latin-Americans. It was felt that Mr. Garcia's background, his ability to speak Spanish, and his experience with the Minimum Housing Standards Commission would be of great value to the program.

It had been the decision of Mr. Shepherd at the time the application was being prepared to establish field offices in the project areas. This was believed to have several advantages. First of all it would move the working operations closer to the people in the areas. This would allow for more convenience for the counselors and would allow the people in the areas to become better acquainted with the program in a smaller, close-to-home atmosphere. The second reason for setting up field offices was to create model homes within the areas. The field offices were to be set up both internally and externally as demonstration homes to show the people within the areas that their homes and neighborhoods could be improved.

Since the Cosmos area and the Beacon area were both on the southside and since the Beacon area was very small, a decision was made to set up one field office for the two areas, with the other field office in the Astro area on the northside. A search was then made of the areas for possible

field offices. In the northside area a house was found which needed no remodeling or repairs. This house was rented for \$72.00 per month on a one-year lease.⁶⁶ In the southside area a house was found which was definitely in need of repairs and remodeling, the cost of which was not expected to exceed five hundred dollars. This house was rented for forty dollars per month on a one-year lease.⁶⁷ After the repairs and remodeling were completed at the southside field office the local residents were able to see an outstanding "before and after" contrast.

On May 30, 1966, the field offices were opened. The northside office was completely staffed and fully equipped. The southside office lacked a secretary and one counselor. In addition the remodeling and repairing of the house was in progress. Nevertheless two counselors began operations from the office. For the first two weeks the work was restricted to informing the residents in the areas of the program. This was accomplished by holding small group meetings in each office two or three times per day. In order to inform the residents of the meetings the counselors distributed notices on a door-to-door basis to each house.

⁶⁶City of Fort Worth, Texas, Mayor and Council Communication L-1163, May 23, 1966, p. 1.

⁶⁷City of Fort Worth, Texas, Mayor and Council Communication L-1164, May 23, 1966, p. 1.

At the end of the first two weeks twelve meetings were held in the southside field office with forty-nine persons attending. Ten meetings were held in the northside office with sixty-six attending.⁶⁸ In addition to the meetings the counselors went, upon request, to various homes to meet the people and to explain the program. On Monday, June 13, 1966, the regular work was begun.

The tasks ahead of the field office personnel were to survey all property and improvements (buildings) in the area, locate all property in violation of the Minimum Housing Standards Code, and inform the owners or occupants of the deficiencies and the various aids (grants and loans) available to help them correct the deficiencies. By September 1966, the initial surveying of all areas was completed, with much less trouble than had been anticipated. The few individuals who at first refused to allow the counselors to survey their property gradually began to cooperate with the counselors. In several cases property owners began to fix up their property without any financial aid even though it was available to them.

The workload statistics of the field offices from June to September were as follows:

⁶⁸City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program, Activity Report, June, 1966.

| | <u>June</u> | <u>July</u> | <u>August</u> | <u>September</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| Surveys | 1359 | 1218 | 533 | 2 |
| Special Surveys | 1431 | 276 | 1027 | 902 |
| Re-Surveys | 22 | 182 | 265 | 74 |
| Buildings Demolished | | | 1 | 5 |
| Buildings Repaired | | | 2 | 6 |
| Debris Removed | | 17 | 28 | 18 |
| Loan Application Received | | | | 1 |
| Grant Applications Received | | | | 3 |
| Family Histories Received | | | 15 | 41 ⁶⁹ |

On Friday, September 30, 1966, the first grant application was processed and submitted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for approval.

B. The Housing Standards Division

At the same time the concentrated code enforcement program was being implemented the Housing Standards Division continued to operate at an increased rate even though it was somewhat overshadowed by the new program. The division was operating with four new men with limited experience and the working area was reduced since this division would not work in the project areas. At the end of June the Housing Standards Supervisor resigned, thus creating another vacancy. Since the man who had filled this position also had served as the supervisor of the Concentrated Code Division, it was decided to add another position so that each division could have its own supervisor.

⁶⁹City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program, Activity Reports, June-September, 1966.

The workload statistics for the Housing Standards Division from June through September were as follows:

| | <u>June</u> | <u>July</u> | <u>August</u> | <u>September</u> |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| Surveys | 154 | 436 | 108 | 181 |
| Special Surveys | 1077 | 698 | 1360 | 1280 |
| Re-Surveys | 1005 | 1023 | 1222 | 1042 |
| Buildings Demolished | 82 | 83 | 87 | 61 |
| Buildings Repaired | 31 | 41 | 57 | 60 |
| Debris Removed | 37 | 25 | 48 | 29 ⁷⁰ |

The totals for all work categories of the period of June through September compared to the previous four month period, February through May, were as follows:

| | <u>February-May</u> | <u>June-September</u> |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Surveys (all) | 6348 | 9586 |
| Buildings Demolished | 338 | 313 |
| Buildings Repaired | 153 | 189 |
| Debris Removed | 100 | 139 ⁷¹ |

By comparing the totals one can see that the new personnel in the latter period were not only able to keep up with their predecessors but were able to exceed them in three out of four categories.

Since its creation in 1957 the Minimum Standards Division had followed a policy of working mainly on vacant houses. While the ordinance gave the division the power to work

⁷⁰City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program, Activity Reports, June-September, 1966.

⁷¹City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program, Activity Reports, February-September, 1966.

occupied houses, it was done strictly on a complaint basis. The procedure for forcing the property owner to improve his property (or to demolish his property) started with the initial survey by the counselor. Afterwards if no action were taken by the property owner the case would be referred to the Housing Standards Commission. The Housing Standards Commission would then review the case and advise the property owner to bring his property in compliance with the Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance or the case would be referred to the City Council for condemnation. The City Council would review the case and if there were no questions, the City Council would condemn the house and refer the case to the Legal Department for demolition proceedings.

Despite the ordinance and the work of the Housing Standards Division and the Housing Standards Commission, there was a considerable backlog of cases pending in the Legal Department in the summer of 1966. This was due mainly to the reluctance of the Legal Department to push these cases, which in turn was due to the lack of interest shown by the various City Councils up to that time. Then again, the City Councils had not been pressed by the citizens to really back the Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance. However, the situation was beginning to change.

On July 22, 1966, at the request of several members of the City Council, City Manager J. L. Brownlee sent a memorandum to the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator asking him

to study various means to speed up the removal of substandard property. Mr. Brownlee asked the following questions:

1. What is the backlog of substandard houses condemned by the City Council but still standing?
2. Can the City take action to remove buildings found to be substandard if such buildings have been boarded up? If so, what action is available?
3. What systematic program do you suggest for alleviating this problem? What additional manpower, if any, is required by your office, the Legal Department, or other City Departments? What would be the cost of such a program? What tools would be utilized? How much time is needed to eliminate the present backlog?
4. Are ordinance changes required to implement an effective program for removing the "problem" substandard buildings? If so, specify the changes needed.⁷²

Mr. Brownlee asked Mr. Shepherd to work with the Legal Department in the study.

One of the major problems with the backlog of substandard houses was that the owner was allowed to board up an empty substandard house to prevent any entry and then let it remain that way indefinitely. The only thing he had to do was to keep the lawn in compliance with the Weed Ordinance. This action was considered to be in compliance with the Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance.

After several weeks of consultation and study Mr. Shepherd sent a report to Mr. Brownlee informing him of his findings. The summary was as follows:

⁷²Letter to N. O. Shepherd, Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator, from J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, July 22, 1966.

At the present time there are in excess of three hundred and fifty substandard houses in the City which have been referred to the Legal Department for demolition by the City Council and which are still substandard and vacant. Some of these date back to 1958, however, the majority were condemned between 1962 and 1965.

Past policy regarding substandard houses which the owner could not repair or demolish required the owner to close the house so that no entry could be made without breaking in. The owner was also required to keep the grass and weeds cut, and all debris cleared at all times. If the owner complied with these requirements, he was complying with City ordinances and the City could take no further action.

It is the opinion of the Legal Department that the only action the City can take against these houses is to declare them fire hazards. In order to do this a Fire Inspector must consider such a house to be a fire hazard and must be able to prove this in court. This would allow the City Council to refer the case to the Legal Department for demolition, or to file a case against the owner for permitting a fire hazard to exist. The conditions existing at the time would determine which action the City Council could take. Some cases would be impossible to prosecute and in this situation the City could do nothing except to work with the owner and hope to persuade him to correct the deficiency.

If the City goes into an all-out program of using the fire ordinance as a tool to get rid of these substandard houses, the Fire Department Inspections Bureau would need at least two more fire inspectors and two vehicles to accomplish the added load of inspections and to attend court sessions. The Neighborhood Improvement Office and the Legal Department could handle this program without additional expense.⁷³

In order to verify the extent of the backlog of cases, Mr. Shepherd had all of the counselors in the Housing Standards Division to re-survey every case pending in the Legal Department. In addition, a dated picture was made of each house to verify its condition. The backlog of cases in chronological order was as follows:

⁷³Letter to J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, from N. O. Shepherd, Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator.

Year first surveyed

| | |
|-------|-------------------|
| 1957 | 1 |
| 1958 | 1 |
| 1959 | 2 |
| 1960 | 5 |
| 1961 | 13 |
| 1962 | 13 |
| 1963 | 38 |
| 1964 | 60 |
| 1965 | 92 |
| 1966 | <u>129</u> |
| Total | 354 ⁷⁴ |

Of the three hundred and fifty-four cases, forty-two were being actively cleared, with the property owner in the process of physically removing the structure and clearing the lot. More than half the structures were found to be open, and twenty were occupied. Nearly all had a considerable growth of weeds and debris on the premises.

After several weeks of additional study and review Mr. Brownlee submitted Mayor and Council Communication G-996. This message reviewed the authority of the City to condemn and to remove substandard buildings, and recommended a program to speed up the removal process. In addition to the Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance and the Building Code of the City of Fort Worth Mr. Brownlee called to the attention of the City Council two provisions of the Charter of the City of Fort Worth. Chapter xv, Section 4, dealing with public health was as follows:

⁷⁴Letter to J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, from N. O. Shepherd, Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator, August 23, 1966.

The Department of Public Health and Welfare shall abate or cause to be abated all nuisances within the City limits that are offensive to the senses, or that are, or threaten to become, detrimental to public health. . . . Whenever any such nuisance exists within the City limits the Director of the Department of Public Health and Welfare shall order their owner or occupant of the premises whereon such nuisance exists to abate or remove the same within such time as may be specified in the order. If the owner or occupant fails, neglects or refuses to obey such order, or if the premises be unoccupied, and the owner or his agent cannot be found, the Director of the Department of Public Health and Welfare shall abate or remove such nuisance and shall defray the expenses thereof out of any moneys in the City Treasury available for such purpose. All expenditure so incurred shall be charged against the owner and shall be a lien on the lot and premises whereupon such nuisance existed. . . .⁷⁵

Chapter XXVIII, Section 28 dealt with the removal of hazardous structures by condemnation at the expense of the owner.

Whenever in the opinion of the City Council any building, fence, shed, awning or other structure of any kind, or any part thereof, is liable to fall down and injure persons or property, the Council may order the owner or agent of same, or any owner or occupant of the premises on which said building, shed, awning or other structure stands, to take down and remove the same within such time as it may prescribe, and may by ordinance provide that failure to comply therewith shall be a misdemeanor and prescribe the penalty therefor. The City Council shall have the additional power to remove the same at the expense of the City on account of the owner of the property, and assess the expenses thereof, including condemnation proceedings, as a special tax against the land, and the same may be collected as other special taxes provided for in this Charter, or by suit in any court of competent jurisdiction. The City shall have full power to condemn all dangerous buildings or obstructions of every kind, and may provide regulations therefor by ordinance.⁷⁶

⁷⁵The City of Fort Worth, Texas, The Charter of the City of Fort Worth, Texas, p. 19.

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 50-51.

Mr. Brownlee informed the City Council that the principal reason for the large number of pending cases was the lack of definite procedures for carrying the cases to their ultimate conclusions, and insufficient staff time in the Legal Department to assist in developing effective legal procedures. The task facing the City was to provide legal proof that the substandard structures constituted a serious hazard to public safety, health, or welfare that justified their demolition without compensation to the owner. The matter of private property rights was closely connected with the forced removal of privately-owned substandard structures, and a strong preponderance of evidence of hazards was necessary before demolition was undertaken by the City or its contractor. If legal action were necessary to accomplish the removal of substandard structures which were beyond repair, the City Attorney recommended that the better cases be prepared for possible action in the District Court.

The City Manager went on to say that the staff was prepared to provide the evidence for the findings based on the provisions of the ordinances. The Neighborhood Improvement Office would coordinate the staff efforts, which would include the assistance of the Building Division of the Public Works Department, the Public Health Engineering Division, and the Fire Prevention Division of the Fire Department. The Tax Division of the Finance Department would provide opinion

as to the value of the property before and after the removal of the substandard structures when necessary. The Legal Department would add an attorney to its staff, whose main assignment would be to continually process and prepare cases for the abatement of substandard buildings. The Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator and the City Attorney would develop specific inspection procedures with a form to present to the City Council on substandard buildings requiring demolition by the City.

In conclusion the City Manager recommended that a new program to remove condemned substandard buildings first be directed toward the initial clean-up areas covered by "Operation Clean-Sweep", in which coordinated action by citizens and various City departments was already underway. ("Operation Clean-Sweep" was a publicity campaign sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce and the City to clean up the City.) Since there were thirty-one structures beyond repair in these areas which had been condemned by the City Council, it was recommended that the property owners be given one more opportunity to remove the structures. If the owners failed to do so, the City would contract to have the buildings demolished, with the costs to be made a lien against the land. Upon approval by the City Council of the accelerated program to achieve repair or removal of substandard buildings, the staff would proceed with the development of evidence and presentation of data on the thirty-one houses

involved in "Operation Clean-Sweep." Thereafter, substandard buildings in other areas of the City would be pursued, with the objective of achieving repair or demolition of all structures found to be substandard by the City Council.⁷⁷

The City Council approved the recommendations and instructed the administrative staff to proceed.

On September 29, 1966, Mr. Brownlee presented the "Procedure For Securing Demolition Of Substandard Structures."

The procedures were as follows:

1. After a reasonable time to allow voluntary compliance with City Council action by the property owner, the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator will review the case file, determine the condition of the structure and consider action taken or planned by the owner. If a decision is made that the condition of the structure justifies action to seek City removal of the structure, the Coordinator will request the following:
 - a. That a Building Inspector from the Building Division of the Public Works Department make an inspection of the structure to determine if it is repairable or not repairable. An inspection report shall be filed that is thorough and explicit, explaining in detail what was considered in classifying the structure as repairable or not repairable.
 - b. That a Fire Inspector from the Fire Department make an inspection of the structure to determine if a fire hazard exists. He shall submit a report setting forth in detail factors making the structure a fire hazard.
 - c. That a Health Inspector from the Health Department make an inspection to determine if a health hazard exists. He shall submit a report detailing the specific conditions making the structure a hazard to the public.

⁷⁷City of Fort Worth, Texas, Mayor and Council Communication G-996, September 26, 1966, pp. 2-4.

- d. Have a photographer make at least two photographs of the structure from different angles so that the true condition of the structure may be observed.
2. The Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator will collect all reports and add them to the existing case history of the property and will then:
3. Review with the Legal Department the violations of City Ordinances documented by the inspection reports, that cause the existing threats to the health, safety, and welfare of the public, and obtain an opinion if the case is sufficiently strong to justify the City removing the structure or causing it to be removed, in order to abate the hazards.
4. Upon completion of the Legal Department's review and determination to proceed, the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator will:
5. Notify the owner of the existing conditions that violate City Ordinances and cause hazards to the health, safety, and welfare of the general public, and inform him that unless he removes the structure and cleans up the property within thirty days, a recommendation will be made to the City Council that the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator be authorized to secure removal of the structure and clean-up of the premises, with the costs, including all administrative costs, to be placed as a lien against the land.
6. During the thirty day waiting period, the Public Works Department, in cooperation with the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator, will advertise for bids to remove the structure and clean up the premises, with a stipulation that the successful bidder will be awarded the contract if the City Council approves and if the owner does not remove the structure within thirty days.
7. If, at the end of thirty days, the owner has not taken action to eliminate the hazard, a Mayor and Council Communication will be prepared by the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator recommending to the City Council that the property be condemned, and that the lowest and best bid for demolition be accepted and the contract be awarded to remove the building and clean up the premises.

8. Upon City Council approval, the demolition contract will be executed and a work order issued. If several substandard properties are included in one contract, the contractor must submit a bid on each individual piece of property. The City will reserve the right to delete from the contract any structure or structures listed, if property owner compliance is obtained prior to the initiation of the demolition work.
9. The Neighborhood Improvement Housing Counselors and the Public Works Inspectors will survey the property to determine if the contractor has fulfilled the contract, and thereupon payment will be made by the Neighborhood Improvement Office.
10. The Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator will provide the Legal Department with a detailed listing of total costs, including all administrative costs, so that a lien may be filed against the property.
11. Amounts of the liens, the description of the property, and the names of property owners will be provided to the Tax Division of the Finance Department by the Legal Department, in order that property owners may be billed periodically for the amount due.
12. The Finance Department will be responsible for establishing and implementing collection procedures on all liens filed.⁷⁸

The preceding procedures represented a new emphasis on housing and community improvement for the City of Fort Worth. After nearly nine years of indifference the City was beginning to recognize these areas as important factors of urban life.

⁷⁸Letter to N. O. Shepherd, Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator, to J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, September 29, 1966.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The years 1961 through 1966 were years of tremendous progress for community improvement in Fort Worth. Especially of significance was the advancement in the area of code enforcement. As has been pointed out, the Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance of 1961 set forth the legal basis for code enforcement. In addition it established a framework from which the ordinance could be enforced as well as procedures and methods of implementation. Prior to this time Fort Worth had had a housing inspection program that suffered for need of strong legal and political support. The Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance gave it the legal support it needed.

The Community Renewal Program with its reports represented the first attempt by the City to study the entire community from a physical, social, and economic viewpoint. This resulted in what could be described as the first real inventory of the community's assets and liabilities for the purpose of obtaining means for making Fort Worth a better city for its citizens. Prior to the Community Renewal Program the City had no means of knowing its resources, its land use patterns, or the physical

condition of its structures, nor had it made any attempts to do so for the purpose of overall improvement for the community.

While zoning ordinances had been in effect for many years and all of the City was classified categorically, no attempt had been made to physically survey the City for actual development. One must realize that zoning itself will not keep areas from deteriorating and changing of the zoning classification does not alleviate the problem of existing substandard structures.

In the early 1960's a re-evaluation study of the entire City was undertaken by the Tax Department but the results of this study were not available for the Community Renewal Program. Prior to the re-evaluation study the tax records were inadequate and the information was arranged in such a way as to make a study from the tax records impractical. Then there was the problem that one could not tell whether or not a house was standard merely by looking at the tax record.

While the Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance and the Community Renewal Program aroused little more than nominal interest from the public, both achieved their purposes. However, the urban renewal campaign, which aroused considerable interest, achieved very little. The two conclusions that can be derived from the campaign would be that the voters displayed a strong feeling toward property rights and a fear of Federal intervention at the local level.

From his experience in gathering the material for this study and from his experience in working with the Neighborhood Improvement Program it is the opinion of the writer that the Neighborhood Improvement Program represents the greatest advancement of the City of Fort Worth to improve the overall community through code enforcement. It gave the housing inspection the necessary political and organizational support that it needed. The program indicates that the City government has a role in providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing, not from a negative or preventive standpoint, but in a very positive manner. Action by the City government to alleviate substandard housing has been beneficial to the whole community both socially and economically. The overall standard of living of the community can be elevated by such a program and the local economy certainly benefits from the stimulus of business due to the actual rehabilitation and construction expenditures. By physically improving an area on an overall basis, tax evaluations are increased, thus bringing in additional revenues.

The program has also been an example of effective inter-governmental relations. The relationship between the City of Fort Worth and the Federal government has been one of utmost cooperation by both parties. In no instance has the Federal government tried to come in and run the local agency. The only controls of the Federal government have been those

relating to financial matters and those relating to the basic regulations of the concentrated code enforcement program. In most matters the Federal government has requested that the local agency make its own administrative and operational policies. Another source of inter-governmental cooperation has been between the various agencies of the state and the personnel of the Neighborhood Improvement Program. These agencies have supplied information to determine the eligibility of the people in the project areas for financial assistance and in many cases have been able to extend benefits to people who were eligible but unaware of this.

It was unfortunate that the program was started at the time of the urban renewal campaign and election. While the timing was not intentional the presentation of the application seemed to crystallize the urban renewal issue. As was mentioned previously, the urban renewal issue started in January of 1966, while the City Manager began to prepare for the concentrated code enforcement program in October of 1965. The question has also arisen as to whether or not the concentrated code program is merely urban renewal in disguise. It is the opinion of the writer that this program must not be considered to be identical with urban renewal for two reasons. First, it does not have the power of eminent domain for land clearance and redevelopment. The purpose of the program is to rehabilitate residential areas, not to redevelop them. Under Texas law a locality must hold an election before it

can enter into an urban renewal program with eminent domain. No election is necessary for participation in a concentrated code enforcement program. Second, the program enforces only city ordinances. The Federal government merely provides tools to aid in the enforcement and compliance with the ordinances.

It seems that the City of Fort Worth has gone through several stages of growth in trying to achieve community improvement and that the Neighborhood Improvement Program represents a stage of maturity. While this program has been implemented with considerably less attention than that given to the urban renewal campaign, it has been successful in overcoming the issue of the implementation of Federal programs and the use of Federal funds at the local level. The fact that there was no eminent domain involved destroyed the best argument of the opponents of the program. It is also interesting to observe how people condemn the use of Federal funds but will accept them rather than use their own. This program has provided assistance to those who need it in order that they may comply with the Housing Ordinance.

At this point it is difficult to predict the future of the Neighborhood Improvement Program. Obviously it will always be subject to criticism of staunch opponents of Federal programs. It may be made an issue in future City Council elections. However, it is the opinion of the writer that its key to success is how well the first projects are

executed. If the projects are completed in a satisfactory manner within the three year period, and if no serious mistakes are made, the program will be continued. While no long range plans have been stated, it is hoped that the program will take other project areas after the first have been completed. These future areas would be selected from the priority areas listed in the Community Renewal reports. On this basis the program could last from ten to twenty years.

In examining his work with this program and the research for this study, it is the opinion of the writer that there are two important conclusions which must be presented.

First of all if a municipality is to have a strong code enforcement program, in addition to having an ordinance and an inspection program, there must be a coordination of efforts on the part of several divisions such as police, fire, health, planning, building, and housing. All of these separate functions can contribute some knowledge and assistance that can allow for a stronger code enforcement program. For instance, fire and health officials can investigate deteriorating areas for preventive measures and police officials can furnish information as to areas in which a great amount of crime is concentrated. All of these agencies can work together to help each other.

The second conclusion is that all citizens must realize that property rights have property responsibilities. Modern

man living in an urban society has the right to own his own home, or his own property, and indeed he should. However, this does not give him the right to allow his property to deteriorate to such a condition that it would destroy or injure his neighbor's property. When this is done, he has violated the property rights of his neighbor. If property rights are to be protected, property responsibilities must be fulfilled.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reports

- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Prospectus, Report No. 1, 1963.
- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Nature and Character, Report No. 2, 1963.
- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Methods and Procedures, Report No. 3, 1964.
- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Problem Area Analysis, Report No. 4, 1964.
- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Resources for Treatment, Report No. 5, 1964.
- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Community Renewal Program, Summary, Report No. 6, 1965.
- National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, The Constitutionality of Housing Codes, Washington, D. C., 1964.
- National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Orientation Workshop on Environmental Health and Related Housing Code Administration, Washington, D. C., 1965.

Public Documents--City

- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Annual Budget, 1965-66.
- City of Fort Worth, Texas, The Charter of the City of Fort Worth, Texas.
- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Minimum Housing Standards Code of the City of Fort Worth, 1961.
- City of Fort Worth, Texas, Minutes of the City Council, December 31, 1958.

City of Fort Worth, Texas Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Application For Code Enforcement Grant Number 1, Feb-
ruary 14, 1966.

Public Documents--City (Closed File)

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Mayor and Council Communication
G-906, February 7, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Mayor and Council Communication
L-1163, May 23, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Mayor and Council Communication
L-1164, May 23, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Mayor and Council Communication
G-996, September 26, 1966.

Public Documents--Federal

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Urban Renewal
Administration, Local Public Agency Letter No. 345,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1965.

Village of Euclid v. Amber Realty Corporation, 272 U.S. 365,
386 (1926).

Unpublished Materials

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Activity Report, February, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Activity Report, March, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Activity Report, April, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Activity Report, May, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Activity Report, June, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Activity Report, July, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Activity Report, August, 1966.

City of Fort Worth, Texas, Neighborhood Improvement Program,
Activity Report, September, 1966.

Letters

Letter to J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, Fort Worth, Texas,
from Leonard E. Church, Regional Administrator, Urban
Renewal Administration, April 12, 1966.

Letter to N. O. Shepherd, Neighborhood Improvement Coordina-
tor, from J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, July 22, 1966.

Letter to J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, from N. O. Shepherd,
Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator, August 12, 1966.

Letter to J. L. Brownlee, City Manager, from N. O. Shepherd,
Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator, August 23, 1966.

Newspapers

The Fort Worth Press, February 4, 1966.

The Fort Worth Press, January 28, 1966.

The Fort Worth Press, January 30, 1966.

The Fort Worth Star-Telegram, February 9, 1966.

The Fort Worth Star-Telegram, March 12, 1966.

The Fort Worth Star-Telegram, April 12, 1966.

The Fort Worth Star-Telegram, April 13, 1966.