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Land, Liberty and Local Control

The 94th Congress has before it an unprecedented number of urgent pieces of legislation designed to address the nation's serious energy and economic problems.

It is my own firm belief that land-use legislation also before this Congress is a vital part of any energy program and ought to be adopted as a part of the comprehensive energy plan that will surely be enacted before the end of this year.

The President's energy package includes a proposal for legislation pertaining to the siting of energy facilities. We are told that the next several years are critical in terms of lead time if we are to plan and begin to construct the new powerplants, the coal-fired generating plants, oil refineries and associated terminal, storage, transportation facilities, and other major projects associated with the administration's ambitious energy proposals.

We do need those new facilities, but there are going to be significant land-use problems that accompany them. The social, economic, and environmental implications of what we do in the next several decades in terms of energy development will have a significant influence on the quality of life in this country for a long time to come.

It is for this reason that I believe we must not continue with the same emphasis on single-focus, mission-oriented federal programs, but instead make a serious commitment to some sensible land-use planning on the state and local levels with federal legislation and federal funds to provide the broad policy and financial incentives required by this effort.

It is for this same reason that I regret the Administration's recently-announced opposition to H.R. 3510, the Land Use and Resource Conservation Act which I introduced with Texas Congressman Alan Steelman and other co-sponsors.

What needs to be done, and my bill will provide for it, is a system of procedures to assure that all interested parties, including the public, can participate in the process, while providing relief for developers who now must go through a maze of requirements and duplicative proceedings before a decision is finally made.

Planning is one answer, but more importantly, state and local governments must develop a process in which land-use decisions can be made in reference to established policies and regulations — and with some finality.

In summary, H.R. 3510 contains two main objectives. One, to provide the financial incentives and policy directions for the states who wish to develop state land-use programs. Second, the bill would provide more coordination between federal agencies and the states concerning federal activities that significantly affect land-use.

Land-use is still the most fundamental and unaddressed environmental problem in this nation. We must do something about the costs of sprawl, the continuing loss of our prime farmland and the waste of energy which results from inadequate land-use planning.

Morris K. Udall
U.S. House of Representatives
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PPG: a Concern for the Future
Managing Texas' Lands

The following remarks from the Lieutenant Governor were released in February of this year.

Land-use planning is a most controversial issue which is likely to be the subject of legislation during the 64th Legislative Session. Some view land-use planning as the destroyer of a most basic freedom — the freedom to own property and do with it what we will. Others view it as our only hope that the land will not be ravaged by unplanned use until it is without value or beauty or future potential.

We have long viewed the land as our greatest natural resource. We used the land as if it were limitless. When we were few, the land, indeed, seemed limitless. But, now we are many, and we know the land is finite. We have come to recognize the need for prudent land-use management.

The State of Texas has had a varied experience in the area of land management. In the Nineteenth Century, the state was concerned primarily with the disposition of the public domain and encouraged private development.

The early Twentieth Century saw the establishment of regulatory programs for production of oil and gas and use of surface water.

During the 1960's, serious statewide planning led to the Texas Water Plan and the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan.

In legislation enacted in 1967, the Governor was designated the Chief Planning Officer of the State. With this authority, the Governor created the Interagency Council on Natural Resources and Environment. It is charged with the responsibility of fostering the development and protection of the natural resources and environment of this state.

The last few years have witnessed much legislative activity, both state and federal, in this area. Much of the legislation proposed was not adopted. The major portion of legislation which has been adopted relating to land use planning has centered on the management of coastal resources.

In 1972, the federal Coastal Zone Management Act took effect, encouraging the states to develop land-use plans for their coastal areas. In 1973, the Texas Legislature adopted the Texas Coastal Public Land Management Act which indicated that the intent of the Legislature was for the General Land Office to develop such programs as suggested by the federal legislation.

The Coastal Zone Management Project, within the General Land Office, is the only land-use planning effort of significance in Texas today and may serve as the model for future land-use planning programs of broader scope.

The 64th Legislature may well consider legislation similar to House Bill 1431 which was considered but did not pass during the 63rd Legislature. That bill would have created a Texas Land Resource Commission within the General Land Office to develop a comprehensive inventory of all land and related resources within the state.

In any discussion of land-use planning, the advice and suggestions of each citizen will be most helpful.

William P. Hobby
Lt. Governor of Texas

May/June 1975
"Exhaust the land in Texas? You gotta be kidding!" To say that land is running out in the nation's second largest state provokes little concern and often a few chuckles. But the Houston man who moved his family into a new three-bedroom home now sinking into the marsh is not chuckling. Neither are commuters stalled along miles of crowded freeways, nor the poor who cannot afford rising gasoline prices, nor the family whose children must cross the freeway to get to school, nor the West Texas farmers whose life-giving supply of underground water is drying up. And down on the coast, conflicting demands for commercial, industrial and recreational land will reduce an environmentalist to tears.

Texas — It's So Big

The right to hold land with which to do as one pleases is viewed by many Americans as a basic freedom, and the concept of land-use planning suggests to some the threat of outside control over this most precious possession.

On the other hand, it is the pricelessness of our finite land resources that illustrates to an increasing number of people the desperate need for coordinated management of the dwindling ration of land per capita. Only through a concerted effort, they feel, will our land escape being ravaged by unplanned use until it is without value or beauty or future potential. "Land management is the most difficult battle you are going to wage," the Governor of Oregon, Tom McCall, told a group of concerned citizens in Colorado, "and if you lose it you might as well write-off future generations. If you don't have these protections then this generation is going to use up the land."

How is it possible that the land in Texas can be endangered? Our 267,339 square miles of territory appear almost inexhaustible. Yet the problem in Texas is just as critical as elsewhere, and possibly more so, as the illusion of bounty tends to diminish the specter of exhausting it.

Condition on Coast: Critical

Perhaps the most immediate threat to our land resources is along the Gulf coast. This is the area of Texas which seems most vulnerable to rising demands. The bays and estuaries productive of sealife are also necessary for terminals and shipping lanes which attract industrial growth. The incredible growth of tourism in Texas, with its positive economic impact on the state, means more development along the beaches. Second home developments on the coast have been periodically wiped out or damaged by tropical storms and hurricanes. Condominiums built along eroding shorelines may in 20 years have the ocean flowing through their lobbies. "I can think of no greater tragedy to Texas," says state Senator A. R. "Babe" Schwartz, "than to have a coastline of second homes or leisure homes as they are called which will ultimately be reduced to matchsticks in future hurricanes and can have no possible value to the millions of people who desire to use that land for recreational and aesthetic purposes during their lifetimes."

How Do We Manage?

Existing mechanisms for coping with these and other land management problems in Texas have traditionally been confined to the municipality — where demands on the land have been most intense. Increasingly, however, land pressures exist outside municipal boundaries and Texas currently has no statewide land-use plan or agency responsible for land management. A variety of state agencies do coordinate with cities to regulate some
aspects of industrial and commercial development, but the gaps are imposing and hazardous.

Among the state agencies, boards, and commissions involved in land resource management are the General Land Office, which administers 22.5 million acres of public land; the Texas Highway Department, which has the power of eminent domain in constructing and maintaining roads; and the Texas Water Development Board, which conserves and develops water resources and administers the Texas Water Plan. The Soil and Water Conservation Board creates conservation districts and carries out state flood prevention plans. The Parks and Wildlife Department develops outdoor recreation areas, maintains a comprehensive recreation plan, has an ongoing program of acquiring new park lands, and aids private land owners in managing their land. Other agencies such as the Texas Industrial Commission, Texas Agriculture Department, and Texas Forest Service respectively, plan and attract new industry, advise farmers on land management, and control forest lands.

Another type of state agency imposes regulations on land owners. They hold hearings, establish rules and regulations, issue orders, and enforce legislation. The Texas Air Control Board is responsible for controlling air pollution. Water pollution and water use are regulated by both the Water Rights Commission and the Water Quality Board. By regulating railroads, trucks, buses, and oil and gas production, the Railroad Commission is supposed to prevent oil and gas waste and pollution. These are all important land-use functions.

Many special-purpose authorities have also been established in Texas to deal with particular problems of land and resource use. They include the River Authorities, Navigation Districts, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, and Airport Authorities.

The major responsibility for statewide planning and coordination lies in the Governor’s Office, specifically the Governor’s Division of Planning Coordination, in league with the state’s Interagency Council on Natural Resources and the Environment. A coastal resource management system, power plant siting, and deep-water port development are some of the issues being considered by these offices.

Land Use — A Local Matter

In local land-use two aspects can be identified: those authorizations, procedures and actions that directly influence land use, and those that indirectly influence it.

Counties in Texas have no zoning power, but they may regulate new subdivisions, and establish construction standards for new buildings. Zoning has remained the cities’ most effective tool. This is closely followed by building codes, which, by city ordinance, regulate the design, construction, materials, location, and designated equipment of structures built within the city’s jurisdiction. Cities may also enforce regulations by withholding services, refusing building permits, and delaying plat approvals.

Indirect actions of local governments have land management consequences. Water Districts acquire and distribute water, and in some places, provide sewage disposal, fire protection, and plumbing supervision. Local government in extending sewer lines may change the direction of urban expansion. City governments may use electric and water services as a bargaining lever. Growth patterns are largely influenced by a city’s transportation and
sewer network. And in the near future, some cities may hope to influence land-use by passing historical preservation and environmental policy ordinances.

Problems of Local Control

One drawback to policies centered in small, limited jurisdictional units of government is controlling large developments that spill over their jurisdictional lines. Should matters of statewide interest be left to local units? There are at least three areas of land use in which the state should have an overriding interest: (1) areas whose environmental aspects make development a statewide concern (i.e., destruction of unique or critical environments); (2) developments that create state or regional costs or benefits; and (3) any developments that, due to their scale, exceed local jurisdiction.

As stated in the "Significant Policies" report of the Texas Land Use study, "The objectives of a land-use policy must be to reform the institutions of government in such a way that important conservation areas are protected, vital developmental needs are accommodated, and major developments and facilities are controlled." Only regional and statewide policies and programs can effectively guide land-use decisions of more than local significance.

Outside Influences

In the last few sessions, Congress has faced growing pressure to enact a National Land-use Law. Such legislation would establish guidelines requiring the direct involvement of state governments in land-use planning and management. Through federal grants, state and local agencies would be stimulated to develop their own management schemes. One of the proposed bills would have created an Office of Land Use Policy within the Department of the Interior. Up to this point, however, the Federal bill has failed to gather the required votes.

A similar bill limited to the coastal zone, however, sailed through with nearly unanimous approval. A key factor in its passage seems to have been a recognition of competing pressures in the nation's coastal regions. Under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, all eligible states have applied for and received federal funds for planning. In Texas, the General Land Office is the coordinating agency.
Land-Use in Other States

One of the trends in land management has been the attempt by individual states to pass land management legislation. Traditionally, states have delegated this authority to local government, but, as mentioned, the limits of local jurisdiction have been too narrow to encompass regional environmental systems or to encourage desirable patterns of regional economic development. Three issues have received attention in state legislation: (1) protection of critical environments, such as wetlands, estuarine areas, and floodplains; (2) control over the location and character of key developments, defined either in terms of size or significance or both; (3) control of growth on the periphery of urban areas. These are the same issues facing Texas today.

With few exceptions, the land-use patterns in all 50 states can be fitted into one of three categories, the first and largest being those states which have done virtually nothing. They have shifted the responsibility to local government, and, for the most part, growth continues haphazardly and uncontrolled in these states. The result is an undesirable land-use pattern with exorbitant costs to the
rest of society. Presently, Texas is in this category, although the state was an early leader in designating open beaches and adopting a Coastal Zone Management Act. Furthermore, the General Land Office is now working on a coastal zone management program to be presented to the legislature in the next session.

States in the second category have instituted a land management program with a high degree of state control in conjunction with local discretion. These states include Hawaii, Vermont, and Maine. Hawaii developed statewide zoning power in 1961. A state board designated all land in the state as agricultural, conservation districts, rural districts, or urban districts. The board established land-use regulations for each designated area to be administered by the counties.

Common characteristics of those states which have implemented state-controlled land management programs are smallness and a relatively homogeneous geographical and social make-up. Hawaii, for example, is small and easily administered. There is only one level of government below the state level (county-city), and Hawaii had previously adopted statewide property tax assessment.

The third group consists of those states that have instituted land management plans, but still delegate authority and discretion to local governments. In some cases land-use decisions at the local level are screened by a statewide agency. In other states, localities are forced to implement a specified program, under penalty if they do not. In Florida the role of the state in land management is confined to those decisions which were judged to have a substantial impact outside the boundaries of local government in which the land is located. Areas of critical concern were designated, and local jurisdictions submitted plans for administering these special areas. Another approach is to require counties to adopt and enforce subdivision regulations such as Colorado has instituted. Data pertaining to geologic hazards, soil types, and proof of an adequate water supply must be submitted by developers. Meanwhile, Colorado has established a Land-Use Commission to propose a comprehensive statewide plan.

Texas might opt most profitably for the latter approach: local governments would implement a systematic program monitored by the state, which would coordinate the operation and reserve ultimate authority. In particular, the Colorado experience should be inspected, as land uses there were classified into matters of state, regional, and local concern, and the roles and responsibilities at each level were carefully defined. (The state of Texas already has a regional form of government in the Council of Governments.) If each level were given sufficient authority in its area of concern, a suitable land management program might be developed.

A common element in all existing state plans is the gear-up time needed to map out and implement statewide land management. For a program to be operative by 1980 or 1982, planning must begin today.

The question of state vs. local control must be answered. It is a hard, critical issue that the legislators must face. It cannot be sidestepped with a wishy-washy compromise. Last, Texas should implement a plan designed for and by its people. We are a large, heterogeneous state. A copy of another state's plan will not meet our needs. The plan must respond to the input of urban communities, coastal communities, and agricultural communities. It must be fitted to the unique needs of this state.

What do we have to lose? Unsightly sprawl, an artificially high energy consumption system, an overabundance of strip development, and an alarming level of environmental degradation.
Texas Land Commissioner Bob Armstrong is regarded by some as the state's most savvy official on land-use policy. Indeed, as we sat down in his office for an interview, he warned us that he could be verbose on the subject. He even asked if we had an extra cassette for the recorder. We did. And here is just a part of what he had to say:

Land-use is a very sophisticated and diverse kind of subject when you look at an area the size of Texas. So when you go to the legislature, or to any governing body, I don't think you have very good luck with grand schemes or programs. What I think you should do is isolate problems that can be felt or seen and say, "What can we do that will help us avoid these problems?" Isolate those problems geographically.

We did this at San Antonio, at the first governor's meeting on this some two-and-a-half years ago, and we came up with pretty unanimous consensus that the coast was a problem area, the river basins and lakes were problem areas, the extra-territorial jurisdictions — outside the cities and in populated counties — were problem areas. And fourthly, you had a problem area which I would call the unique geological or ecological situation — Edge Falls, Capote Falls, maybe one stretch of a free-flowing river, the Sawtooth Range, Matagorda Island.

The coast is a good example because the whole thing is easy to see. You're talking about such things as the shrimp industry, or about red fish or trout — something you can ascertain as diminishing and then maybe assign some causes. And some of the causes are in the way we use the land adjacent to these productive areas.

Look at two goals I think we're beginning to see in the Coastal Zone Management program. One is protection or sustaining of the renewable resource capability of that area — water, bay and estuarine productivity, shrimping. We have the largest shrimp production anywhere in the world off the Texas coast; India is a pretty far-back second. And not many people realize it but it's not just the shrimp that you eat, it's the shrimp that are part of the life cycle of the trout and red fish. Then you can convert renewable resource capability pretty easily into dollars. Shrimping is a $95 million proposition to the state every year. 750,000 people fish on the coast, and with all the money they spend — in bait shops, seaside motels, buying beer and everything else — we now have a $2.1 billion tourist industry.

Given this renewable resource
capability the legislature I think is beginning to see that this is something that's worth doing something about. It's not just pie in the sky, or quality of life, or anything else. It's all those to begin with, but just mark all those off and look at it as pure financial loss if inadvertently we destroy these capabilities. You begin to get some people's attention. And of course these things also apply in the uplands to renewable resources like agriculture and timber. This is what I, in one speech, called "the last piece in the puzzle." You can do everything you want to in air and water quality, and in your energy management, but you have to look at the land as a resource, and as a finite resource.

But then look at the second land-use goal, which I characterize as hazard avoidance. And again, the coast is easier because it's so clear there. If you locate a plant at the head of a bay, and it's not diked, we know that the hurricanes move from seaward in — everything in that bay is going to end up in their lap after a hurricane. Contrast this with moving that plant over to an upland site which is away from the head of the bay, and you accomplish four immediate things: you avoid the hurricane problems, you're building on a clay substructure instead of sand, you prevent expensive maintenance dredging, and you avoid pollution of the bay.

One of the sub-rules I think is very important is, "Where you don't need it, don't do it." In 95 percent of West Texas, if you just insure that you do not do something by the use of your land that would contaminate an aquifer — with a feed lot, or some other effluent — your land-use problems are whipped. It's just about that simple. They are not subject to the same kinds of problems, but the problems are occasioned by concentration of population. What we have is a geographical area in Texas, where the population concentration is there, but there are no rules. And I think the legislature feels this; I think an extraterritorial jurisdiction bill — on an optional basis — may have a chance. I get this feeling from talking to the proposed opponents who have been successful — the Farm Bureau, the realtors, the cattlemen. I think they're seeing some things — that maybe a sensible program that would do the things that need to be done would accommodate them, maybe in the area of taxes. I'm not sure you do this thing totally with regulation; I think you may do it with incentives.

Now on these unique areas that need preserving — what do you do about these?

"When you have people gathered together, you have to make rules so they don't violate other people's rights to enjoy their property."

Maybe one approach would be to go to the land owner and just say, "If someone makes you a good offer, give the state a chance to meet it." I don't think you should go around condemning land for parks; but if it becomes public, then somebody pays for it. If the state thinks it's important enough that these unique areas be acquired, then we can probably work it out. But this is an approach that will take care of that type of concern; it's not basic to a land-use bill.

Obstacles

My thinking about land-use has continued to gel, and be further defined, as we've gone along. It's come as a result of the public hearing process we've had in the coastal zone management area, which has been very helpful to me as a person in government in trying to see what's on people's minds. The basic feeling in Texas is just sort of anti-government. And it's first anti federal government, and second anti state government, and they're not so sure about county officials.

But what I've tried to make clear to them is that I agree with this. And so I've come up with another thing which I call the lowest common denominator theory, which is that as long as the problem is of a local nature, it should be solved by local people. If the problem is greater than local — the intracoastal waterway, a river basin, a flood control project — then you would broaden the scope of authority to a larger geographical area.

And let me say this . . . I'm not big on zoning. And I'm not sure that's going to be the approach. Maybe you don't draw squares on a map, which has been the problem with zoning, because they've been squares on a map, but the map has been a flat map. This square is "Residential" and that square is "Heavy Industrial," but you didn't have the input of the resource capability of that square when you made your decision. What you may need is to make a "laundry list" of things that you don't want to do because of their bad effect . . . When you have people gathered together, you have to make rules so they don't violate other people's rights to enjoy their property. Somebody says, "Well you're gonna destroy my private property rights." But what you're doing is protecting private property rights. And this is a hard thing to explain to the farmer, for example, because he thinks you're going to tell him where he can build his fences.

Now the state can do a couple of things that I think people do not find offensive . . . and one of them is providing decision makers with the kinds of tools they need to make good decisions. We've discovered that maybe the people want to do it (adopt land-use measures at the county level), but then you say, "Well what real capabilities do you have to handle this problem? Do you know everything by way of an inventory acquired, say, from the soil conservation service? Have you looked at what another county is doing in a very sophisticated way?" And they say "no." But they'd like to see it. So I think the state could be in the same role they now play in airport siting — in providing some capability to people who want to do something.

I think the basic problem (if a county chose not to adopt any enabling legislation that might be passed) would be the effect of a county's inaction that might do violence to an adjoining county — harming its water supply, for example — then you might see the state move. But I really don't see that as a problem. At least it's an isolated problem.

Pending Legislation

Henry Jackson's Bill (proposing federal land-use legislation) is not really a land management plan. The federal government is saying we will fund you if you will engage in a process by which a plan can be developed. Now, the process involves public input and hearings, it involves public advisory committees, it involves a lot of common sense if you do it right. But they don't dictate how you do it; they recognize each state is different. And, consequently, I believe you will see — if you see a federal move — that it will be in the process direction.

The Agnish bill (by state representative Fred Agnish) is a process bill. It directs a group of people to sit down and come up with recommendations to the legislature, after holding public hearings, after conducting inventories, and that sort of thing. But what I'm trying to do is to get people to realize that this word "government" is as offensive to me as it is to them. Let's really look and see who government is, because it may well be that if we do our job properly, government is going to be "County Judge Jones," the Commissioners' Court and its appointees who you know and probably see every day at coffee.
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with Karastan carpet

The ultimate in carpet for heavy traffic areas... Karastan carpet specified by Payne Associates, Inc., Lucile Ayres Payne, A.S.I.D., I.D.A. for Dallas' famous Highland Park Cafeteria.
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Three Sources on Land-Use

(1) *The Use of Land: A Citizen's Policy Guide to Urban Growth.* Sponsored by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, this is a comprehensive study of land-use problems and possible solutions on a national scale. Examines not only the problems themselves — technical, legal, administrative — but the attitudes of the various publics likely to be involved in solutions. Concludes, on the basis of hearings and analyses conducted nationwide, that public sympathies are swinging toward protection of resources over protection of 18th century "property rights". Further posits the need for a strong "grass-roots" input into the development of land-use management prerogatives. 318 pages. Published in 1973 by Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York. Available in most bookstores for $3.95.

(2) *Texas Land Use.* A factual analysis in eight sections commissioned in 1974 by the Governor's Division of Planning Coordination. The eight sub-volumes include "Historical Perspective", "Problems and Issues", "Needs for the Future", "An Informed Public". Should be available without charge from the Governor's Division of Planning Coordination, P.O. Box 12428, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas 78711.

(3) *Texas Land Resources: Problems and Possibilities.* "A Report to the 64th Legislature" by the Land Use Study Committee of the House of Representatives, chaired by Waco representative Lyndon Olson. Aimed at pointing out "major problem areas" which include: (a) problems of development of unincorporated areas; (b) loss of agricultural and open space land to development; (c) the role of the state in land-use management. Strongly favors legislation giving the state primarily an advisory role, while empowering county governments to regulate land-use on a local basis. Touches but lightly on problems of urban and regional planning. Includes a review of relevant federal legislation, as well as "position papers" by groups as diverse as the Dallas Board of Realtors, Texas League of Women Voters, Good Roads Association, Texas Catholic Conference, Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, and the Texas Society of Architects. Available without charge from the office of Rep. Lyndon Olson, P.O. Box 2910, Austin, Texas 78767.
By Dr. Pete Gunter

On October 11, 1974 President Ford signed a bill creating a Big Thicket Reserve in Southeast Texas. The president's signature ended a struggle that began in 1927, when the first Big Thicket Association was formed, and which reached a crescendo in the early 1970's. Early conservationists had asked for a 440,000-acre national park in the sprawling thicket wilderness; the national biological reserve, by contrast, contained 84,550 acres. Originally the park concept involved a large contiguous area, or at least a series of interrelated stream corridors; the biological reserve instead consisted of widely separated areas, some connected by stream corridors, some not. Still, conservationists and many others rejoiced. A portion of the legendary Big Thicket had been saved at last. Or had it?

Unfortunately, the bill signed by the president had two flaws. It appropriated no money, and it contained no legal machinery for taking over the land within the preserve boundaries. The verdant forests and deep swamps of the Big Thicket Reserve were thus left completely unprotected. Until the government could take possession, the reserve could be bulldozed, timbered, drained, or even subdivided. Those concerned with the reserve held their breaths, waiting. They had, as it turns out, not long to wait.

It is not accurate to say that the wilderness has been left completely unprotected. The large lumber companies (Southland; Time, Inc.; Kirby; Champion and others) have agreed to a cutting moratorium on the more than 40,000 acres which they jointly own within the Big Thicket Reserve. To date they have observed that moratorium with gratifying consistency. The problem now lies with the smaller landowners, many of whom fear (needlessly) that they will not be paid for their land, a few of whom claim that they will cut their timber for sheer spite. (There are few houses within the preserve; the struggle is over timberland, not homesites.) As much as half of the unique wilderness area could be lost, therefore, unless Congress moves quickly.

The ink was hardly dry on Big Thicket legislation before reports of destruction
began to come in. Each of the units in the preserve had been selected for its particular sort of plant life, in order to preserve a specimen of at least one of every kind of ecosystem out of the Thicket's incredible biological diversity. First to suffer from destruction was the Hickory Creek Savannah, an upland area containing many rare plants. A real estate promoter brush-hogged almost half its acreage to build a trailer park. Next came a region of virgin creekbottom hardwoods in the south end of the Turkey Creek Unit; its owner timbered the hardwoods, it was said, out of spite.

Similar destruction has occurred elsewhere. An oilwell road has been pushed into the recesses of the Lance Rosier Unit (Result: A dry hole). River frontage has been timbered along the Neches, whose corridor, from Dam B on the north clear down to the Beaumont city limits, was to be protected. Huge cypress and water oaks have toppled along the Pine Island Bayou corridor, west of the Neches. Meanwhile, rumors of new subdivisions and plans for drainage of the area drift across the southeast Texas woodlands. What next? Where next? What will be left?

The answer to all such questions, and the resolution of profound and justified anxieties over the future of the Big Thicket Reserve lies in the hands of Congress, in Washington. Congressmen Charles Wilson and Bob Eckhardt have introduced legislation to protect the endangered reserve by making it possible for the government to take possession. Legislation, however, moves slowly. Bulldozers, powersaws do not. The time for action dawns — again.

---

Dr. Gunter is chairman of the Big Thicket Coordinating Committee and professor of philosophy at North Texas State University in Denton.
"The proponents of cutting and draining say it is their American right to make a profit. Quite true, but . . ."

Dr. Pete Gunter's excellent article detailing the widespread and savage assaults by man on the small and fragile remnants of the thicket in the new national preserve (totaling only 84,500 acres out of a Big Thicket originally 3,500,000 acres in size, and still embracing 1,500,000 acres as late as the 1930's), tells it like it was a few weeks ago, but the situation is even worse on this March 31, 1975.

Unfortunately, all the major lumber companies and pulp pine pulverizers did not observe the tree-cutting moratorium, not even after President Ford signed The Big Thicket Bill last October. A case in point is widespread cutting by Champion Company in the Big Sandy Creek Preserve area late last year and this year; some reliable reports say 2,000 to 3,000 acres of it were criss-crossed by their new logging roads until it looked like a checkerboard on the land. Their excuse was "timber beetle infestation." You let conservationists or park authorities map out a park area and lumber companies can smell timber beetle infestation (an excuse for cutting destruction) further than a blue tick hound can smell a hot coon on a damp summer night in the Neches River bottoms.

But that isn't all; certain forces are trying to create the South Hardin County Drainage District No. 1 containing 345 square miles in the Southern Part of Hardin County (38 1/2% of Hardin County's total area of 897 square miles). This proposed Drainage District would include the preserve's Lance Rosier Unit, the Beaumont Unit, and the Little Pine Island Unit, a total of over 34,000 acres of the choicest parts remaining of the original Big Thicket, including Black Creek, Jackson Creek, several other creeks and ecological gems in these last Big Thicket remnants. If created, what the Drainage District would do to land, streams, trees and other plants would make the lumber companies look like patron saints of conservation. The Drainage District would vote some folding money out of the taxpayers' pockets into their contracts to scrape off, cut, ditch, drain and destroy the land. Of course if all the vegetation were cut off, they would need all those expensive ditches to handle the water.

The good people of Hardin County have rallied against this folly, and twice in March the Commissioners Court of Hardin County has turned down this scheme to use the Hardin County taxpayers' money to make money for a few.

But the promoters aren't through; they have their minions poised in the House and Senate of the Texas Legislature, waiting on their starting blocks like high school sprinters at a tryout trying to make the first team, to pump bills in the hopper to give the promoters first bulldozing rights at 345 square miles of Hardin County Territory. If they continue to fail to bulldoze their bulldozing plan through the Hardin County Commissioners Court, they plan to try it on the Texas Legislature.

Hardin County total area is 87.6% commercial forest, Tyler County—94%; Polk County—82.6%; Jasper County—90.2% (1974-75 Texas Almanac, page 123). These are the four counties in which nearly all of the Big Thicket Preserve is located.

The proponents of cutting and draining say that it is their American right to make a profit. Quite true, but in the four counties named, there are 2,174,180 acres in forested producing land now. Is it too much to ask the destroyers of the Thicket to cease and desist from their destruction of this pitiful 84,500-acre remnant of a once bountiful heritage, that the people of Texas and the nation want to save for this and all succeeding generations?

Let the destroyers of the past come forward and join hands with the conservationists to save this remnant, so that all together can say in the Centennial year of 1976: "America, we are grateful for the Country you gave us in 1776 — we will prove the Country of our gratitude by saving this symbolic little remnant of it for you to see in 2176 A.D."
And Now a Little Thicket

While sensitive people can only despair at the continued pillage of the Big Thicket, a proposal has surfaced for a "Little Thicket" virtually in the heart of the state capitol — 400 acres of unspoiled woods, creeks, limestone canyons and wildlife which can still be preserved if the citizens working on the project are given enough help, soon enough, by government agencies, private individuals and foundations.

The proposal, initiated by an Austin group called NOW OR NEVER, would create the Wild Basin Wilderness Park along the crooked bed of Bee Creek immediately west of metropolitan Austin. Having researched their territory, the organization posits five major arguments for establishing a public wilderness:

1. **Aesthetic:** In the rugged tree-covered slopes to the west of Lake Austin, steep-walled ravines lead into the bed of Bee Creek, a clear-running stream, sometimes dry in parched summer months. When the creek is running, waterfalls and clear deep pools dot its route into Lake Austin. Only one house, located on the outer rim of the potential park, intrudes into a true wilderness of trees, shrubs, wild flowers and abundant animal life.

2. **Environmental:** A 400 acre wilderness of trees and plants has a beneficial effect on the climate of the surrounding area, cleansing the air of pollutants and cooling the atmosphere as the winds blow across. It is believed that all wild animals native to Travis County can be found within the Basin, including some rare and endangered species, such as the Golden Cheeked Warbler, which nests in cedar brakes abundant in the hills. Plant life is also varied, abundant and interesting due to the merger of tropic and temperate zones along the Balcones Escarpment with a resultant mixture of plants indigenous to each. Wild Basin is rugged country, and the dense ground and tree cover on the slopes prevents erosion of what little soil there is, providing recharge areas for springs and aquifers, as well as preventing flooding and sedimentation in Lake Austin.

3. **Scientific:** With its varied plant and animal life, the Wild Basin is a valuable outdoor laboratory for the natural sciences, readily accessible to The University of Texas and to public and private schools in the area. It would supplement those environmental areas of the State already available for scientific investigation in the Coastal area, the Big Bend and the Big Thicket by providing a third, completely different composition of flora and fauna along the Balcones Escarpment.

4. **Economic:** Unless the Wild Basin is established as a wilderness park before completion of Loop 360 south and west of Austin, the area probably will be developed into small subdivisions, as indicated by present ownership of mostly 15- to 20-acre tracts. Yet development of subdivisions here would be expensive to builder and homeowner alike because of the engineering required to contend with the underlying rock structure, lack of topsoil and steep slope. It would also be expensive to the Austin taxpayer: sewer and water lines would have to be blasted through solid rock; control of high volume water runoff from steep slopes whose tree cover has been replaced by roads and houses, would require constant maintenance, as would upkeep of roads on those slopes, and increased sedimentation in Lake Austin (necessitating more frequent dredging and affecting the health of the lake).

5. **Recreational:** In addition to the value of Wild Basin as an outdoor laboratory for the natural sciences, a hiking trail along Bee Creek to Loop 360, then down the Loop to the Barton Creek Pathway planned as a part of Austin's Bi-centennial Celebration, would provide a link with the present pathway along Town Lake, so that a complete circle of more than ten miles through beautiful country, much of it untouched by development, would be possible.

The Clock is Ticking

Can the wilderness be saved? It is possible, according to our guide, Mrs. Janet Poage of NOW OR NEVER, but the first stages of the rescue will have to happen fast. There are twenty tracts of privately owned land involved, and, while most of the landowners have agreed to sell or donate their parcels to developers of the
park, three of them want their money right away. Otherwise, they plan to go ahead with construction of homes on the property. Something like $60,000 is needed to hold these parcels, and Mrs. Poage said that the Trust for Public Land, a San Francisco affiliate of the Ford Foundation, has tentatively agreed to supply the funds, provided they get a "firm commitment" from local and state authorities that the wilderness project will be carried to completion.

Such a commitment has not yet materialized, despite positive reactions by individual officials who recognize the value of the project. A recent attempt to persuade the Travis County Commissioners to help underwrite the park was met with the reaction that "people don't want a wilderness, they want recreation areas" — i.e. picnic tables and camp sites, motorbike trails, etc. They are reconsidering now, however, having been deluged with phone calls from people who emphatically do want a wilderness.

"We started out," said Mrs. Poage, "thinking this would be a simple thing — that all we would have to do was provide information to the city and county, with the Capitol Area Planning Council acting as coordinator, and they would pick it up and go with it." That has not proved the case. Mrs. Poage and her colleagues have become involved in a complicated struggle whose success will depend not only on their own continued zeal but on the support of other people who value the idea of 400 acres of "Little Thicket" — as opposed to houses, fences, roads, and sewers — literally within eyesight of the Texas State Capitol.

An excellent slide presentation on the Wild Basin has been assembled, and persons wishing to see it, or to learn more about the project, or to lend support, should contact Mrs. Ronald Hudson, president of NOW OR NEVER, at 2805 Hatley Drive, Austin, Texas 78746. Her phone is (512) 327-0657.

For the lands of the entire state, Rep. Agnich's H.B. 1148 covers substantially the same first two objectives as the Coastal Management Program. The bill would create a seven-person commission to prepare an inventory and plan for lands in this state. The commission would be composed of the Commissioner of Agriculture, Attorney General, Commissioner of the General Land Office, two appointees by the Governor, one appointee by the Lt. Governor, and one appointee by the Speaker.

**Inventory Not Enough**

Most environmental groups would like to see more than a mere inventory and plan. They believe that the state should also foster implementation of the plan. They favor funding assistance from the federal government because the state may otherwise prove too parsimonious to launch an implementation program, either coastal or statewide. Therefore, they support the approach in the Land Resources Planning Assistance Act, by Senator Henry M. Jackson, of Washington, and H.R. 3510, by Reps. Morris Udall, of Arizona, and Alan Steelman, of Texas.

Every year, we see prime agricultural land being consumed by urban sprawl, and floodplains best suited for forestry and recreation being intruded upon by commercial and housing developments, all because we have anarchy as to who builds what where. The only exception is within the boundaries of cities which exercise their existing rights to plan for development in an orderly fashion.

It is crucial that Texans at least establish a base which will enable conscientious developers and public officials to guide land development in the directions which are least damaging to the public interest, and most supportive of the public needs. H.B. 1148 would accomplish that step.

---

This summary of citizens' actions on behalf of rational land-use was written by Ned Fritz, chairman of the Texas Committee on Natural Resources, 4144 Cochran Road, Dallas, Texas 75209.
“regional planning” impetus creates new directions for architects

By Ray Reece

Land-use planning is not a new phenomenon. It has occurred for centuries in Europe and for millennia in parts of Asia and the Middle East. To a lesser extent, it has been happening in the U.S. and even in Texas — through grants of royal or public lands, homestead programs, government exercise of eminent domain, zoning laws and other means — since before the American Revolution. Still, until about a decade ago, the term “land-use” was as foreign to most Texans as the face of the Shah of Iran. Now it is being intensely discussed not only in the 64th Legislature but in corporate boardrooms, ranch headquarters, and drugstores on rural town squares. Indeed, those folks with their ears to the ground are definitely hearing some hoofbeats in the distance: land-use planning (or more politely, land resource management) is coming to us all, as surely as the storms of spring, and so are its corollaries, urban and regional design.

In and of themselves, land-use planning and urban/regional design (for convenience, we shall lump these into the single term “regional planning”) are neither good nor evil. That question depends on who is doing the planning on behalf of whom. What is clear is that there will be more planning, that in order to succeed it will have to be comprehensive and systematic, and that, therefore, it will increasingly be administered at one level or another of government — because (1) that is the only social entity we have which is neutral enough to carry out the planning on an equitable basis; and (2) only government will have the financial and administrative resources to study, initiate and manage the complex programs which successful regional planning will demand.

Of the myriad arts and professions destined to be influenced by the evolution of regional planning, architecture and the allied disciplines are very near the top. The logic of this arises in part from a unique parallel between the nature of what architects do and the nature of the regional planning process. Perhaps the one best term to apply to this parallel is systematic. Whether planning a city or designing a shopping center, “it’s the old idea of thinking through a problem,” says Waco architect Don Dillard, assistant to the city manager there in charge of planning. And “thinking through a problem,” in particular the utilization of physical space, is precisely what the architect has been trained to do. Tracy Watson, of the Austin Planning Department, elaborates: “The only difference between an architect and an urban planner is that the architect works in a microcosm, while the planner works in a macrocosm.”

The growth of regional planning, then, is certain to change the role of the architect in Texas, has begun already to change it, and the character of this change will obtain primarily from the broadening role of government referred to above. At the federal level, according to Don Dillard, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is presently administering a new “community development bill which transfers to cities a lot of responsibility not formerly theirs and sets up fairly strict guidelines for getting federal money.” These guidelines require a constant review and adjustment of urban projects, thus generating a variety of new roles for the architect both as designer and design-administrator. At the same time, says Dillard, there are recently hatched programs under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) whereby architects can train (or retrain) for specific design functions within public agencies.

Many of the new “public opportunities” for architects are emerging under the aegis of inevitable trends toward protection of the environment and conservation of resources. “Roles related to conserving energy in physical design and development are as yet virtually untapped,” says Dillard. There are scores of new agencies
and procedures: public housing authorities, urban renewal offices, planning divisions in state and local government, A-95 (environmental) reviews for funds disbursed through regional Councils of Government (COGS). One new bureau, the Community Development Agency, has sprung up only this year, "and every city in Texas will probably have one before long." This alone, says Dillard, "represents dozens of potential new clients or employers of architects, and their numbers will increase with the increased funding for administering and monitoring their projects. It's up to the architect to explore these new service needs and fill the gaps which they provide."

In addition to actual design work, there is a growing demand for investigators and writers of model development plans, impact statements, and technical critiques. An especially fertile area, says Dillard, is architectural and regional design research. Besides the challenges of incubating and applying alternative sources of energy and related structural theory, "much existing urban-design research has been done in other parts of the country and doesn't really apply to Texas. So right here is a tremendous potential for Texas architects to work with cities in exploring research areas. There is possibly a role for TSA in this, along with colleges and universities."

Students of architecture, too, stand to gain from the impetus toward public design. "These agencies," says Dillard, "provide new opportunities for students to experience 'real world situations' to complement their classroom work. They need to be made aware of the changes occurring in that world and to participate in those changes, with their own design ideas, while they're still in school."

Design Democracy

One of the changes to which Dillard refers is a tendency toward "citizen participation in planning. No longer can projects be designed in 'closed-door' situations. Now there are public hearing requirements and committee reviews. More and more the urban design and development of our communities will involve the citizens. The public is becoming the 'client,' and this means a whole new set of approaches and techniques which the architect has to put together."

A case in point is the urban planning program in Fort Worth. Since 1969, according to Patricia Lewis of the City Planning Department, Fort Worth has been committed to "planning for the people" through the logical means of involving the people in planning. Calling their program "sector planning," Ms. Lewis and her colleagues have divided the city into 13 essentially homogeneous planning zones, or sectors. Each sector constitutes a planning area in itself. It is large enough to allow complete facility planning," but small enough to enable citizens to help plan details like bikeways and restoration of historic buildings in their neighborhoods.

Sector Meetings

"At sector meetings," says Ms. Lewis, "we provide basic data to the citizens, educating them as to planning principles. We show them projections, give them examples of what is planned for other sectors, and show them what can happen to an unplanned neighborhood, such as one-family residences suddenly faced with heavy industry coming in. We point out the advantages of planning for buffer zones, traffic flow, green belts. Participation varies from sector to sector, but let me stress that those attending are elected representatives who furnish direct input from neighborhood organizations. All races participate."

With six years of experience behind her, Ms. Lewis is more persuaded than ever by
“Several sectors have told the engineers they want to put the emphasis on people, not cars.”

This “advocacy” approach to planning. “From what I have observed, a staff of professional planners who know how to utilize the experience, insight, and native intelligence of the average citizen should be able to produce a truly comprehensive general plan supported by the people.” Furthermore, “when the citizens become informed, they provide a countervailing power to the ‘old line’ policy-making agencies. Several sectors, for example, have told the engineers that they want to put emphasis on people, not cars. In other words, no more freeways — more pedestrian and bike trails and public transportation. They also expect the developers to provide a more responsible utilization of the land and higher quality development.”

Two other Texas cities employing “advocacy planning” are Austin — whose “Austin Tomorrow” program has just yielded a remarkable new “Goals Document” setting out in detail the results of two years’ work by nearly 3,000 “citizen planners” — and Don Dillard’s Waco. In addition to the “Waco Horizons 2000” program, which will maximize citizen input, Dillard cites a number of other projects in his domain exemplifying new opportunities in “public architecture.” A Model Cities Program several years ago “employed architects-in-training in various agency staff functions,” while “private architects produced a user-needs study in housing, as well as a body of urban design concepts for Waco.” The Model Cities operation spun off an Urban Design Center “headed by an architect-in-training with a private architect as consultant on an hourly basis.” A professional architect has also been retained by the local Housing Authority to help solicit and review bids from contractors for a “high-rise” for the elderly. In approaching the construction of the Waco Freedom Fountain, the city held a “design charrette where private architects brainstormed with citizens and staff members from city agencies.” A similar charrette in connection with a project on Lake Brazos was sponsored by the Waco Planning Department and the local Chapter of AIA.

Optimism

These and other instances of potential new directions for Texas architects — all in response to global imperatives for systematic regional planning — leave Don Dillard with a sense of optimism and a taste for confronting new frontiers. “The possibilities,” he says, “are more exciting than most people realize. And the whole thing is a two-way street. While we, as architects, learn more about our new roles in the public arena, we’ll also be having a tremendous influence, by performing these roles, on the attitudes of the public as to what the architect is and should be doing.”
The men on the wall know masonry works... they know it works because each hand held, hand assembled unit is a piece of precision. The contractor on the job knows masonry works because he's seen enough of the competing wall products. These men all know something you should... masonry is better. From the Texas clay pits to its final nitch in the wall... masonry undergoes a horror chamber of testing, checking and measuring, making it the world's toughest building product. As the walls go up... soft curves, and strong angles emerge in warm earth tones that can be load bearing... features that our competitors can't match. If you would like to learn why masonry is durable, energy conserving and less expensive without going to the construction site... you can find out from the Texas Masonry Institute, Post Office box 9391, Fort Worth, Texas, 76107... or you can learn the hard way and construct your next building out of something other than masonry.

Northeast Campus, Tarrant County Junior College
Owners: Tarrant County Junior College District
Architects: Preston M. Geren and Associates
General Contractor: Gilmore and Walker, Incorporated
Mason Contractors: Fenimore and Blythe, Incorporated
Gregory and Associates, Incorporated
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Using the Land for Fun

By Larry Paul Fuller

Will Rogers' old maxim about creation — the good Lord's makin' more people, but he ain't makin' no more land — also applies very well to the matter of recreation. For Texans, growing in number as we are, still cling by and large to the notion that fun — good clean fun — is best had out in God's country (or the "Big Country," or the "great outdoors," or the "wide open spaces") where the sun shines bright and the air is pure. We're outdoorsy folk, from way back. But of course more and more of the outdoors becomes indoors, with time and growth. Indeed we have no more land in the making, and what land we do have is, in a sense, "shrinking."

So the rising demand for outdoor recreation space becomes an important factor in land-use planning. And the matter is complicated further by the fact that "outdoor recreation" has different meanings, depending on who is having the fun. Hence we recognize the varied — and often conflicting — interests of doers and lookers, birdwatchers and deerslayers, hikers and bikers, boaters and fishers and swimmers. We have players of everything from hopscotch to polo. And when it comes to recreation areas, we all have different concepts of the ideal outdoor space.

Meeting Texas' outdoor recreation needs, then, becomes a matter of priorities, as in the case of all land-use planning. The man charged with assessing and monitoring Texans' outdoor recreation priorities is Ron Thuma, head of the Comprehensive Planning Branch of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. Thuma and his 37-person staff of recreation planners, geographers and resource economists now have in draft form the massive ten-volume Texas Outdoor Recreation Plan, a product of several years of extensive research into the recreation habits and needs of Texans. "There are two sides to our basic analysis," Thuma said. "One
is looking at demand — what the people actually want in the way of recreation, now and in the future — and the other is looking at supply — what is actually available. Then we compare the two to see if there is a deficit or surplus of facilities."

The plan includes a down-to-the-last-picnic table inventory of the state’s public and private recreation facilities and incorporates data from some 15,000 home interviews and 8,000 on-site interviews regarding outdoor recreation habits and preferences. Data were utilized in a highly sophisticated analytical forecasting model to predict needs of the state through the year 2000. The document received plaudits from the "Feds," qualifying Texas for funds under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, and will be the basis for decisions regarding state park development and administration of federal money for park projects at the federal, state and local levels.

"The plan is what we consider a very viable, flexible document," Thuma said. "It's going to change and be amended continually as things happen." With the document now in draft form, emphasis is shifting toward implementation or "rattling the bushes — going out to work with the various agencies (e.g., Corps of Engineers, Forest Service, COGs) to stimulate them to meet what we feel are the future needs."

In terms of land, "future needs" means "more of it." The Plan indicates some 220,000 additional acres of developed recreation lands are needed by 1980, either through acquiring new lands or developing lands already set aside for public uses. As for water acreage, which is involved in 43 percent of all recreation activity in Texas, requirements are expected to grow moderately through the year 2000.

The current situation in Texas finds us with less than one percent of the state's total acreage designated as recreation
land, of which 46 percent is located in one isolated 5-county region of West Texas. And more than 95 percent of the state’s recreational water is located in rural areas. However, the greatest recreational needs are in the eastern half of the state in urban areas and along the coast. Hence, despite Texas’ abundant supply of natural resources, there is an uneven distribution of recreation lands in relation to major population centers. Another complicating factor is that, with less than two percent of Texas’ land owned by the state, increasing the supply of state parklands usually entails the costly acquisition of privately-owned lands.

Responsibility for providing an adequate supply of developed recreation land has been apportioned among public entities — national, state, county, city — and the private sector in roughly a two-to-one ratio of public to private. The prevailing philosophy within the public sector, according to Thuma, has been that “the national parks people will supply the really big, unique, natural areas of national significance, such as Big Bend. The state parks system will be responsible for areas that have a state or at least multi-regional significance — with perhaps some picnic and camping facilities, or interpretative structures, but which are not as wild or undeveloped as a national park. Then at the next level are the cities and counties, which are responsible to the local people for tennis, basketball, golf, etc. — the day outing facilities.” (He adds that he feels this traditional breakdown of responsibilities is changing in that, as a result of the energy crisis, state parks may need to be located closer to urban areas, resulting in higher demand for day use facilities. In addition, some concepts call for an increase in the percentage of natural, open space within city and county parks.)

The Parks and Wildlife Department is the most significant public entity involved in the matter of Texas’ recreation lands, for although it is directly responsible for providing but a small percentage of the prescribed 1980 total of developed parkland, it has a powerful influence on virtually all recreation land development by the public sector. As a state agency, the department enjoys a reputation of being generally competent and progressive. And the federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has been consistently laudatory of Texas’ programs and generous in funding them. (Thuma reasons that people within the department do good work because “It’s easy to get turned on to this thing of outdoor recreation.” His own staff he terms the best of its kind in the nation.)

Thuma’s Comprehensive Planning Branch is merely one of eight sections comprising the Parks and Wildlife Department’s Park Division, which is under the direction of Paul Schlimper. Of these sections, Thuma works perhaps most directly with W. M. Gosdin’s Special Systems and Planning Branch. Gosdin’s responsibility is to evaluate potential state park sites and to make recommendations regarding acquisition (through outright purchases, leases, or acceptance of donations). His staff monitors state park acreage deficits in eight geographic planning regions and keeps acquisition and development programs on course in view of statewide supply and demand. This also involves keeping track of efforts to preserve certain unique areas — historically or archeologically significant sites, unusually scenic areas, or regions of ecological importance.

Once a tract of parkland is acquired (the actual “red tape” is handled by Lloyd Booth’s Park Acquisition Branch), the Master Planning Branch comes into play. Under the direction of Clarence Ham, this multi-discipline section undertakes an im-
pressively thorough analysis of the site in developing the park program. A team of planners — landscape architects and architects, with input from biologists, historians, archeologists and engineers — develops a concept for the park which is in accord with needs as specified in Thuma's Outdoor Recreation Plan. First, information is gathered on vegetation, wildlife, and aesthetic, archeological or historical values most worthy of conserving. Second, they consider soil characteristics, gradients, weather patterns, hydrography and existing culture. Then a systematic land-use concept can be developed which includes a scheme for all utility systems and an operations and maintenance program, as well as a general plan for recreational and interpretive facilities. In addition, there is a thorough cause-and-effect assessment of the expected environmental impact of the proposed park development which Ham says, "assures protection of the environment while developing the park."

When the proposed program has been approved by the Parks and Wildlife Commission, a private architectural firm is then called in to work with the Engineering Division toward design and completion of the park. Services may also be required of two other Park Division branches — Historic Sites and Restoration (Orion Knox) or Interpretations and Exhibits (F. E. Green).

In this fashion, Texas has steadily increased its state park acreage and continues to assist park development at the local level. Will recommendations of the Texas Outdoor Recreation Plan be implemented by 1980? Hardly anyone thinks so. In the first place, the plan admittedly reflects a pie-in-the-sky approach. "In some planning reports, recommendations are tempered by what the planners feel will be acceptable to decision-makers," says Thuma. "Our approach is to simply tell them what is called for to meet demands, then let them exercise their prerogative as to what is reasonable, or how much they can do."

Thuma says meeting recreation needs is largely a funding problem; adequate funds to develop the state's full recreation potential are simply not now available. And using the land for fun becomes even more expensive — more of a luxury — all the time. As population figures climb, and as open countryside gives way to the incessant sprawl of our cities, we are reminded of the need for carefully planned growth. Indeed, most everyone is greedy for more room. But they still ain't makin' more land.
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Above interpretive shelter design by Peters & Fields Architects, Austin and Odessa, for Somerville Trailway, Somerville State Park

Above interpretive shelter design by Peters & Fields Architects, Austin and Odessa, for Somerville Trailway, Somerville State Park
A New Carver Park
When the Texas City architectural firm of Hoover + Hamilton began conceptualizing the renewal of Carver Park, they were well aware of opposing concepts of what a park should be — a natural, undeveloped pastoral retreat on the one hand, or a leveled and drained plot of paved courts and playing fields on the other. The existing park, established as the "colored county park for Galveston County" in the late '30s, was neither.

Located on 20 acres in an economically depressed area, Carver Park was for 40 years little more than a couple of sand-lot baseball fields on a near-barren plot, dutifully supplied with a roadway. Then the county deeded it to the city for improvement. As the planning process began, it became clear that the sentiment of immediate local residents called for a sports-oriented park divided into playing areas — "basketball courts" at the expense of "bushes and shrubs." The architects, with ultimate support of city officials, wanted to hold out for due consideration of aesthetics and environmental amenities. But given the site, any natural element borrowed from the "pastoral retreat" concept would have to be designed into being.

The eventual solution, arrived at through a lot of give-and-take planning, made most everyone happy, athletes and nature-lovers alike. The focal point of the new park is a multi-purpose pavilion, open on three sides, housing a concrete slab lined off for basketball, rollerskating, badminton, tennis and small ball games. The structure adjoins a swimming pool and includes locker rooms and administrative office space.

The park site itself underwent an amazing transformation that complements the building design. To relate the man-made structure to natural environmental elements, the architects carved out near the pavilion a large lake which narrows, winds and then expands into a second lake. Over the narrow connecting channel is a bridge linking footpaths which meander through the rest of the park — unassigned open spaces, outdoor game fields and picnic areas.

A parking area was added, but interior roads and overhead wires were removed. And, improving further upon the natural setting, dirt from the man-made lake was formed into rolling earth berms which add interest to the flat terrain and screen the park from the densely populated neighborhood.

A sub-surface soil investigation indicated the water table was only eight feet below existing grade, requiring the swimming pool deck to be four feet above grade to allow for adequate pool depth. This situation prompted a two-level concept for the pavilion, with the pool support areas at pool deck level and the open pavilion floor at the lower level. The result was a softening of the usual harsh transition from a single story to the 20-foot clearance necessary for basketball. To further soften the transition, laminated timbers were designed as an arched roof over the playing area and were extended into wide overhangs. Timbers and wood deck were selected as the structural system for aesthetics and economy and for maintenance characteristics in the corrosive atmosphere of the Gulf Coast region. Other basic materials used were architectural concrete and concrete masonry.

Making most everyone happy was gratifying to the architects, particularly since they had to fight for standards of design quality. The majority of their clients, they maintain, want little more than a utilitarian solution to design problems. But Hoover + Hamilton believes that a good architectural environment shapes positive attitudes, and that good architecture requires thoughtful design. "Our conviction," they say, "is that it is the architect's personal responsibility and challenge to inject into each project the element of tasteful design, regardless of whether it is a governmental, private, low or high-budget project." (And even if it means trying to accomplish a little of what Mother Nature didn't.)
It appears more and more that a prime ingredient of continued corporate success in this country is a sense of responsibility — not only toward clients and customers but toward employees and the public as well, especially that public residing in the same vicinity in which a company facility is located. This is most evident in the public relations and advertising programs of large corporations (e.g. a full-page ad showing a telephone company employee helping a child recover a kitten from a house top). It is more subtly but perhaps more importantly evident in the siting and architectural design of corporate office buildings, commercial plazas, and manufacturing plants. When Forney Engineering Company, a Dallas-based designer and manufacturer of industrial safety control systems, began making plans for a new central facility northwest of Dallas, it chose to include this sense of responsibility in its design criteria, along with the standard requirements for efficient administrative and manufacturing plants. And when it selected the Dallas architectural firm of Beran and Shelmire, it did so at least partly on the basis of that firm's demonstrated ability to mesh such criteria into its design process.

Besides 180,000 square feet of usable space which could be expanded to meet future needs, the client wanted a building that was "people oriented and socially involved, that presented a favorable corpor-
Left to right: E. E. Beran, Overton Shelmire; Harry Shields, Associate in charge of Forney project.
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This translated into such particulars as a childcare center for the offspring of company employees, an employe cafeteria, a skylighted atrium, a dramatic exterior facade, and a large parking area camouflaged by landscaping from the view of passing motorists.

Perhaps the most remarkable of these features is the childcare center. "The architects were asked to incorporate the latest thinking for such facilities. A new concept for such a plant, it might be termed more appropriately an industry-provided learning center. It is located on the ground floor and provides for the feeding, learning, sleep and recreation of the preschool children of approximately 600 company employees. Having successfully withstood the test of two years of operation, it is being run under the auspices of a local college whose staff assisted in the planning."

Adjacent to the childcare center is a cafeteria which, besides offering food service to plant and office personnel during work hours, is available at off hours as an auditorium-type space for community activities. The cafeteria opens at one end onto a skylighted, landscaped atrium with seating and terraces where employees may relax, lunch, and enjoy. This atrium is surrounded on its remaining three sides, without walls, by two stories of office space which feature an open office environment to allow for maximum growth and flexibility among such various divisions as sales, personnel, R&D, computer facilities, and executive carrels.

Steel framing was used throughout the structure, with 20-foot square bays in the office area and 40-foot square bays in the manufacturing area. The principal exterior material is insulated steel paneling which can be removed and reused in an expansion program. These walls, enclosing most of the structure's 400 by 400 feet of floorspace, are set inside the concrete exterior columns to provide shade for the offices and to cover the docks at the rear. Surrounded by large areas of pristine ground cover (including live oak and elm trees), the front of the building combines light masonry, bronze colored glass and anodized aluminum. The plate glass is lighted from above at night, while by day there occurs a striking interplay of shadows.

All this, according to the architects, because of a client who "understood that a modern plant which is architecturally integrated as well as functionally planned can serve as the company's finest advertisement."
Eight Texas architects are among 61 AIA members to be installed in the Institute's College of Fellows during the national convention in Atlanta May 18-22.

Apart from the Gold Medal, which may be presented each year to one architect from any part of the world, Fellowship is the highest honor the Institute can bestow on its members. All AIA Fellows may use the initials FAIA following their names, symbolizing the high esteem in which they are held by the profession.

In offering the following personal sketches, Texas Architect pays tribute to these TSA members who have reached the pinnacle of their careers.

Eight Texas Fellows

Louis Daebule's parents encouraged him in his love for drawing, and his high school counselor advised him to pursue architecture. After 43 years in the profession, Daebule is thankful for what proved to be early nudges in the right direction. He also credits two of his mentors at Texas A&M — Ernest Langford and S.C.P. Vosper — with "enhancing and nurturing" his choice of architecture as a profession.

He feels that, over the years, his view of the profession has "not changed to a marked degree." Yet he notes there has been an inevitable increase in emphasis toward "performing as a business, or corporate practice" in addition to the traditional devotion to good design and creative solutions in a human scale. The challenge of the future, as he sees it, will be "to maintain, and in some ways to regain, a position of eminence in the field of creating buildings." This, he says, will involve consideration of the total human environment so that architecture has "aesthetic quality, in scale with human needs and aspirations."

Daebule was president of the El Paso Association of Architects back in 1947 before an AIA Charter was granted and has remained active in professional and civic activities. He has three children and three grandchildren and enjoys golf and art. Other of his leisure hours involve his pet project, La Villita, a quaint cluster of boutiques and restaurants which received a Texas Architecture 1972 Honor Award.

Brought up in a family which displayed high regard for art and architecture, Thomas E. Greacen II was introduced to several famous architects in the 1920's and "got the idea then that architecture was a great calling." He quickly adds that "Nothing I have learned since has changed my opinion of the profession or made me question my choice."

A native of Brooklyn, Greacen received his architectural training at Princeton, Columbia, New York University and the American School of Fine Arts in Fontainbleau, France. He has practiced architecture in Houston since 1945.

Thinking back to his early concepts of architecture, Greacen said, "H. Van Buren McGonigle, who wrote very persuasive articles in the architectural press, convinced me that architecture was primarily an art, and that its engineering and business aspects should receive secondary attention. In school and in the offices where I worked, my fellow students and fellow workers were very talented, and I felt quite humble in their company. I used to work long hours trying to be as good as they were. There were times later on when I questioned the preeminence of art in my profession; but I have come back to believing it. When I visited India not long ago and saw the Taj Mahal, my respect for the artist-architect was completely restored once and for all."

As for the future, Greacen says "over the years the big challenge I see will be to keep the architect the master builder and to resist the temptation to make him a lot of other things which aren't really as important as the master builder, and for which he isn't nearly as well-trained."
"Only as long as the profession can continue to produce sound, practical and beautiful structures will our respect within the community be maintained. Without this respect we are helpless to further any program for community action."

Thus the perspective of Arthur E. Jones, new AIA Fellow. A 1947 graduate of Rice University, Jones has served on a number of committees in national AIA. He is married with four children.

Jones' views regarding his profession have changed through the years. "A student's view is most naturally more idealistic than that of the acting practitioner. My views have become more realistic as experience has added to knowledge. This is a good and natural thing. It's nice to feel the comfort and confidence that time and experience can give."

He insists that "a high standard of excellence must be maintained toward the basic commitments of our profession." His own following of that maxim has resulted in his appointment to AIA Fellowship, which he has called a "nice, warm honor."

"As a youngster, my great interests centered around building things with my hands. Watching and helping my father build exquisite furniture and boats, carving with chisels, and painting . . ." These were the forces which propelled James R. Killebrew toward a career in architecture and engineering.

Now a Fellow in AIA, Killebrew believes that "we have entered a very critical period not only in American history but in international history. We are confronted with a revolution of technological and social problems. The policies which AIA establishes in the immediate future will have a profound effect on our viability in the long-range future."

Killebrew is in charge of engineering design and public relations in his firm in Wichita Falls. He graduated from the University of Texas at Austin, in 1949, following a four-year Navy stint in World War II. He has served on a number of committees in TSA, was president of his local chapter in 1965, is now a member of AIA's Environmental Education Committee. He was formerly president of the local chapter of Texas Society of Professional Engineers, as well as a member of the city's building code committee, and instructor at Midwestern University. Long active in civic affairs, Killebrew is a Director of the Rotary Club and elder in the First Christian Church. He and his wife Prebel have four children.

Has the new Fellow any advice for architects-to-be? "Long hard hours of applying the basic rule: Hard work, production, ingenuity, a good attitude about his profession — even in diverse, 'non-eating' situations."

Gunter W. Koetter, new Fellow from Houston, feels that during his career he has "witnessed a change in the architect's position." Back in 1941, when Koetter graduated from Texas A&M, "the design of buildings and the building of buildings was pretty much determined and controlled by the individual architect." But now, "more and more, we see the advent of developers, construction managers, financiers, and such assuming some responsibilities which the architect once demonstrated so forcefully. I am not sure that this is bad for the profession, particularly if the architect recognizes the changes and adjusts his aims and goals accordingly."

Koetter was a vice president of TSA in 1967, has chaired the Education Committee of TSA, in addition to holding other offices, and presently serves on the Task Force for Architectural Training of AIA. He is also a national member of the Commission on Church Architecture of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, and past president of the Houston School for Deaf Children. He and his wife Billie have three children.

Among the challenges which Koetter perceives confronting architects in the '70s is that of "maintaining leadership" in developing the built environment, especially in regard to aesthetic quality, while becoming "realistically acquainted with and attuned to the values of other professionals."
George H. Loving likes to say that the reason he went into architecture "must have been for love because it sure wasn't money." But, in the same breath, he's likely to extol the rewards of his chosen profession. And his appointment to AIA Fellowship he counts as his highest honor.

Loving is a 1957 graduate of the University of Oklahoma and a partner in the Abilene firm of Tittle, Luther, Loving. He has been active in AIA since 1963, when he served as secretary-treasurer of his local chapter (vice-president in 1964, president in 1965). He has occupied a variety of positions in the state society, including a vice-presidency in 1974 and chairmanship of the Commission on Public Affairs and the Architectural Registration Task Force. In 1971, he was a Director of the Southern Conference of NCARB, and served in 1972 as chairman of the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. He has been a member of the Long-Range Planning Committee and the Electrical Board of Examiners for the city of Abilene, as well as the Board of Directors of St. Paul Methodist Church.

Loving, his wife Barbara, and their three children are devotees of outdoor sports, particularly "sailing and beachcombing."

Regarding the future of his profession: "Diversification will be the name of the game."

Edward Mok sees AIA Fellowship as a uniquely significant honor, for it represents the high esteem of one's professional peers. Likewise, he sees architecture as a unique profession—"a learned discipline that truly combines arts and sciences. It offers gratification to my creative instinct in an art form," he says, "and allows my participation in a precise and demanding branch of applied science."

His view of the profession has not changed much during some 25 years of practice, but he says, "My view of the role architecture plays in today's society is one of disappointment. It will primarily fall upon the shoulders of architects to restore the preeminence of architecture in the framework of our cultural values."

Mok maintains an active pace in civic and professional affairs. He is a member of the Regional Development Review Committee, Alamo Council of Governments, and is a former director of San Antonio's Research and Planning Council. He has served in numerous capacities in TSA and AIA and is director of the Austin/San Antonio Section of the American Institute of Planners. When it's time for fun, he enjoys sailing.

Mok's education, including a B.S. degree from the University of Chung King and B. Architecture and M. Architecture degrees from the University of Texas at Austin, bears out his opinion that competence is all-important. Indeed, he feels that the greatest challenge facing architects is "to achieve high competence by each member of the profession in our service to the public."

Howard Parker has a vivid memory of how it all began: "The strength and simple elegance of the architecture I was introduced to through geography by my third grade teacher is a treasured memory. At that time I decided I wanted to be the guy that put everything in its proper place. But it was not until I began to understand that the practice of architecture also offered the opportunity of self-expression that I decided to 'be an architect.'"

And he has an equally vivid concept of his own student-to-professional transition; "As a student, I accepted the excuse of 'a poor client' for the many bad projects in the late 40's. I didn't understand the professional's responsibility to educate the public. I planned to graduate, serve my time in Korea, fulfill my internship requirement, get my license and then serve myself as both architect and client—a developer. I did not want any part of a 'poor client.' Korea was a maturing experience for me. I began to understand how dependent we are on each other, and how much more rewarding community service would be as opposed to self-service. I have accepted and embraced the awesome responsibility our profession has to the public as well as to our clients."

As for the future, he expressed this concern: "My professional experience has confirmed for me that professional service is personal service. I think a profession should offer opportunities and security for a small organization of professionals. The trend, however, is toward bigness and comprehensive service. In bigness alone I fear the erosion of professional service."

Parker is president of Youth at Work, and is active in other civic, church and professional affairs. He enjoys regular exercise, gardening and reading, and claims to be an "excellent" cook. Parker and his wife, Rosalyn, have two children.
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Endangered Species

One day 107 years ago ...

In 1868, a freed slave named Nicklous Crain and his wife Mary Ann commenced to build a home for themselves in the woods near Zavalla. They set a foundation of native stone and chopped, split, dried and finished their other materials by hand from long leaf pine and cypress trees. They put up a chimney of mud and straw and lived in their house and probably didn't know that a century later two of their grandchildren, now in their 70's, would sit on the porch of that same house with its new owners, Houston architect B. Carroll Tharp and his wife Mae.

Carroll and Mae discovered and bought the old cabin in 1971, dismantled it themselves, hauled it by truck to a new location in Conroe, then spent two-and-a-half years restoring the house in the manner of Nicklous and Mary Ann — with their hands, with brute strength and patience and determination.

Labor of Love

Mae has written an account of their work. Before disassembly, she says, "we photographed the house from all angles. We cross-measured every piece and made numbers with a dyno kit and nailed them to each log and part. All parts of the building were saved, even the slats to cover the logs on the inside face. Carroll made a complete drawing of the building."

Once at the new location "we examined the logs and began to treat and repair them" with Penta Chlorophenol, which "spattered badly and removed the skin every place it touched." The damaged roof was repaired with "an experimental mixture of epoxy and sawdust packed in the cavities. We had an allergic reaction to the epoxy and were treated for 'poison ivy' but it did repair our logs. After the foundation stones were placed and levelled, we raised the logs (44 of them) with a block and tackle until that became too difficult and then we constructed a gin pole and used a chain hoist. It took us a month (working on weekends) to complete the placement of the logs and the beam sills."

Additional labor was required on the shell, whereupon "we laid our floors, added the porches and began to work on the gables. One gable was gone and one was in bad disrepair. We bought lumber that had..."
been taken from very old houses in Houston to rebuild the gables. These thin bevelled boards had many coats of paint and had to be stripped with corn starch, lye and water.

When the house itself was finished, including restoration of the fireplace and chimney, "we spent two years searching for furniture. We found an old iron bed from Civil War days. Mrs. Lovelady had been a slave, and when she was freed, her mistress gave her this bed. We found a large old pine cupboard that had been constructed with square nails. To these were added a chest "painted on the inside with feather paint," several old chairs with rawhide bottoms, other vintage furnishings and a potpourri of "old hand-thrown crocks, iron pots, and hand-forged irons."

"We were tempted to put a refrigerator and hot plate in the primitive Texas cupboard, but we knew we'd ruin it if we did." There is no electricity in the house, no running water, no gas, and no telephone.

"We cook either in the fireplace or out back," said Mae, "and we get our water in a crock from a little stream down over the hill. Some of our friends think we're crazy. They say, 'With all the money you've spent on that old log house, you could have a nice mobile home.'"

In May, 1974, shortly after the renovation was completed, the Tharps invited two of the grandchildren of Nicklous and Mary Ann Crain to view the results. "We sat on the front porch," said Mae, "and drank coffee and our old guests reminisced. Each story unlocked another door to the past — it was thrilling to hear their tales of early Texas life."

This triumph of hard work and commitment to a vision is for the Tharps evidently just the beginning. They recently purchased "the old Kennan railroad station" and moved it onto their property near Conroe. They have also acquired a second log house dating from 1838. "We didn't plan it this way," said Mae, "but I think we'll end up with a whole pioneer village here."

---

**SPECIES BRIEFS**

**Legislature Considers Tax Relief for Historic Structures**

Hearings continue at the state Capitol on Austin Senator Lloyd Doggett's proposal (S.J.R. 27) to grant property tax relief to owners of sites designated for preservation as historically, culturally, or ecologically valuable. Witnesses testifying before the Senate Committee on the Texas Constitution have included Des Taylor, TSA Executive Director; Truett Latimer, State Historical Commissioner; and Beverly Blount, president of the San Antonio Conservation Society. Ms. Blount argued that the proposed tax-break, by encouraging private restoration of historic buildings, would help preserve the central areas of major cities which are being abandoned or allowed to deteriorate.

**Tips House To Survive**

A mediated swap between two local banks has bought survival for the century-old Walter Tips House in Austin. The present owner, Lamar Savings, which wants the site for a highrise development, has given the house to the Austin Heritage Society which in turn will give it to Franklin Savings, which will move the house and renovate it for use as a branch office. Lamar Savings has also awarded the Heritage Society $2500 to help defray the $11,000 cost of relocating utility lines in connection with the move.

A second threatened structure on Lamar Savings property, the all-masonry...
Palm-Goeth House, will hopefully be preserved through a similar arrangement, according to Lamar board chairman Stanley Adams. He has advised that interested parties contact him by June 1.

**Texans Save Mississippi Mansion**

The Austin Heritage Society has commended Mr. and Mrs. Kelly E. McAdams for saving "Longwood," an octagonal mansion in Natchez, Mississippi, which dates from the Civil War period. The Austin couple, both members of TSA, have deeded the mansion, largest of its kind in the U.S., to the Natchez Pilgrimage Garden Club.

---

**H.J. Bott**

1972-75

displacement of volume concept

APRIL 20 — MAY 18, 1975

BEAUMONT ART MUSEUM

JULY 11 — 28

BARNWELL ART CENTER SHREVEPORT

represented by

Vincent Mann Gallery

Loft-on-Strand
galveston island

new orleans
Alexander Contract Furnishings

Most of the time architects know what they need when it comes to furnishings and interiors — when they don’t is when our 18 years of experience in furnishing motels, apartments, nursing homes, etc. comes in handy.

Call Mickey Alexander
(713) 523-9105
2020 Southwest Freeway
Houston, Texas 77006

Texas Winner

The American Institute of Steel Construction has awarded its highest recognition to the Austin-based firm of Page Southerland Page architects and engineers for beautiful use of steel framing in creating its Austin headquarters building.

John K. Edmonds of New York City, executive vice president of AISC, presented metal plaques and certificates to participants in the project, noting that the Page Southerland Page award is one of only four in the South and among only 13 nationally.

In the News

The 18,705-square-foot structure, at 606 West Avenue near downtown Austin, was conceived as a glass and flat-black coated steel “envelope” in the International style. Major influences on its design were its location on Shoal Creek, the desire for maximum natural light and flexibility to expand with minimum remodeling cost.

AISC judges call the resulting building “an excellent example of exposed steel construction, carefully detailed and well executed. The use of steel as an architectural expression is reflected throughout the structure.”

AHA Workshop

In response to growing professional interest in providing office space for physicians adjacent to hospitals, the American Hospital Association will sponsor the last two one-day workshops in its “Hospital-Based Medical Office Buildings” series May 22 in Denver and May 23 in Phoenix.

The Institutes will examine assessment of need, physical and economic feasibility, programming and design, methods of financing, legal and regulatory questions, operating and maintenance costs, and physician-hospital relations.

For further information or a registration form, contact the program coordinator, Susanne Batko, Division of Design and Construction, American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60611. Telephone 312/645-9578.

Courthouse Plans

The State Bar of Texas Committee on Courtroom and Confinement Facilities has indicated it wishes to add courthouse plans and specifications to their information and reference center. These plans
would be placed on file in order that they could be more available to county groups to show what can and is being done in courthouse planning. Architects wishing to contribute plans for this purpose should contact Mr. Ernie Stromberger, P.O. Box 12487, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas 78711.

Registration Bill

Texas architects moved a step closer to their goal of attaining an effective Architects Registration Law April 7 as the House Committee on Business and Industry voted in unanimous support of House Bill 432. Now before the House for consideration, the bill strengthens the present law which, in effect, allows anyone, regardless of qualifications, to practice public architecture.

Speakers and panelists during the daily sessions included Chairperson Nancy Hanks, of the National Endowment for the Arts; Donald Conway, of the AIA Research Council; TSA President David Braden, FAIA; Nat Owings, FAIA, of the internationally-known architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill; Richard Lord, furniture designer for Thonet of Dallas; and others from outside and within the state.

The symposium, organized "to provide an informal learning atmosphere for students, citizens and professionals in the creative fields," was billed by SAA as an annual event.

A design project, the work of three architecture students, has been named regional winner of the 1974 annual Reynolds Aluminum Prize for architecture students at the University of Texas at Austin.

The award — and a check for $300 — went to Robert G. Ikel, of Dallas; Desmond W. Fletcher, of Hattiesburg, Mississippi; and Rahib Sarela, of Tempe, Arizona. All are students of Wolf Hilbertz, lecturer in architecture.

The way people talk about us.

They say we do a craftsman's job (in an era when most don't know how).

They say we deliver on time (when so few others do).

The way people talk about us—is worth considering next time you have a client worth pleasing! Call Coerver for

- Architectural Woodworking
- Elevator Cabs
- Wall Coverings

COERVER INDUSTRIES, INC.
3311 Elm Street • Dallas, Texas 75226 • (214) 744-5211
Texas WATS 1-800-492-4266

May/June 1975
Control your costs for construction projects. Establish budgets and compare systems at schematic, design development and final stages with complete cost estimates from:

**Quantity Survey Bureau, Inc.**

Eight student design projects from UT Austin and UT Arlington will be on display June 22-July 20 at the Fort Worth Art Center Museum.

The projects, done under the supervision of New York architect Martin Price while a visiting critic, are design solutions for a physics facility and an urban museum for contemporary art. Price said the parameters set for the project "comprise a protesting and a tempering of the aggressiveness of a formal system of architecture . . ." Early pioneer buildings in Central Texas served as "instructive examples of the geometry of form."

The exhibit, entitled "4 from Arlington — 4 from Austin," will be on display Tuesdays-Sundays, 10-5.

**Architects Directory**

The American Hospital Association has compiled a directory of Architects for health planning which is currently being printed. Texas Architects who have experience in health facilities design and who wish to be listed in a supplement to the directory should send a resume of their experience and a letter expressing their interest to the TSA Office. The AIA is currently compiling a similar directory and this information will be passed on to be included in their directory.

**Timely Book**

With recent disclosures of continued threats to the Big Thicket National Preserve (see pages 16 and 17), a book published in 1971 by Jenkins Publishing Company, of Austin, assumes new relevance. *The Big Thicket*, written by Pete Gunter with photos by Roy Hamric (many of which appear in this issue) is available in most bookstores. Hardcover $12.95. Softcover $6.50.

**News of Firms**

The Austin firm of Wayne Bell and Associates has announced the changing of its firm name to Bell, Klein & Hoffman, Architects & Restoration Consultants. Principals are Wayne Bell, John Klein and David Hoffman.

Parkhill, Smith & Cooper, Inc., of Lubbock and El Paso, has announced the formation of an affiliate: Atcheson, Cartwright & Associates, located at 1214 14th Street, Suite 106, in Lubbock.

The firm of Logsdon & Voelter, Architects, has announced the relocation of its offices to 3000 South 31st Street, Suite 502, Temple, 76501.

The Dallas firm of Jarvis Putty Jarvis has announced the appointment of William H. Workman and Frank E. Whitson, Jr. to senior associate architect and Raymond L. Beets, Jr. and Hollye C. Fisk to associate.

Edward L. Reichert has been named director of production for the Houston firm of Calhoun, Tungate and Jackson.
Two Dallas firms — Harper & Kemp Architects and Iconoplex, Inc. (formerly Cluts and Parker) — have merged to form Harper, Kemp, Cluts and Parker, Architecture/Planning, at 2020 Live Oak in Dallas.

Bud Hopkins, president of the Dallas firm Envirodynamics, Inc., has been elected secretary-treasurer of the American Society of Consulting Planners. Dan Brents, a senior associate in the firm, has been elected director of the North Central Texas Section of the American Institute of Planners.
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Letters

Editor: In the last session of the Legislature I was on the Natural Resources, Energy Crisis, and Transportation Committees. In the 64th Session I am Vice Chairman of the Energy Resources Committee and am on the Environmental Affairs Committee.

Very important legislation will come before both these committees this year. It is imperative that professionals, such as architects, who have unique knowledge and experience, accept the responsibility of influencing this legislation. The challenge of conserving energy while simultaneously protecting the environment must be met. Architects can be valuable advisors to the committees and to individual legislators, to ensure that we produce laws which aid rather than hinder the solution of problems. Whether the subject matter is a Housing Code, a Mass Transit Plan, Land Use or Oil Field Unitization, we need all the professional help we can get. Let us hear from you.

Representative Milton Fox
Houston

This letter was inadvertently omitted from the March/April issue on the 64th Legislature. — Editor

Editor: You are to be commended for your thoughtful and informative March/April issue of the Texas Architect. I thought you were able to focus attention on the pressing issues facing the Texas Legislature's 64th session. I would like to especially thank you for the excellent article you had on mass transit. This is an issue whose resolution or lack of resolution will largely determine the character of cities in Texas for decades to comes.

Thanks again for the issue.

Representative Tom Schieffer
Fort Worth

Editor: It is apparent from reading pages 12 and 13 of the March/April Texas Architect that we have a communications problem. Contrary to the inference in the article, we are actively supporting legislation to restructure the state government for effective administration of mass transportation programs, creation of a state mass transportation fund, and authorization for local mass transportation authorities.

Eugene W. Robbins
Texas Good Roads/Transportation Association
Austin
Nothing we say about our tile can tell you as much as this photo.

Take another photo in 10 years and it’ll be even more beautiful.

We could describe what goes into San Vallé genuine clay tile—the ingredients and the process—and explain how well it insulates and protects. But you choose a roofing material primarily on the basis of aesthetics. And that’s where San Vallé tile’s permanent beauty becomes a deciding factor.

You wouldn’t settle for a poor substitute. Would you?
Editor: We of French High School would like to thank you for the editions of the Texas Architect we have received. We have received this magazine for some time, and it is appreciated. Your issues of the magazine have aided me as a teacher in keeping up with the latest in Architecture and the students have found them informative. I am sure I have expressed the opinions of many of the teachers in this area, who received the issues.

The Architectural Graphic Standards we are using at present is quite old and battered (1956 edition). I am not certain there is another edition on the market, however, I thought you would know. Last year I was told by an architect friend that you could assist us in obtaining more recent copies at a monetary savings. This may not be correct. If you can be of any assistance it would be appreciated.

J. B. Roberts, Drafting Instructor
French High School
4514 Concord
Beaumont, Texas 77703

Perhaps some of our readers have an edition of Architectural Graphic Standards not now being used which Mr. Roberts could utilize in his classes. — Editor

Editor: Congratulations on an outstanding and timely March/April Texas Architect. The content which voices the concerns of TSA should make friends and influence people in decision-making positions in our state. The new business development article by Bill Knauer is also timely and helpful for Texas architects.

Harry A. Golemon, TSA Vice President
Commissioner, Professional Practice
Houston

Editor: I had a chance to look at your most recent issue. It’s comprehensive — a little bit of everything and all about Texas. Please place my name on your subscription list for Texas Architect.

John A. Schiffman
Fort Worth

IN TEXAS, PUT A PRO IN YOUR PLANS.

38 years in the business; and Texas Office Supply’s services to architects and interior designers take on new dimensions each year. Our own staff of order processors, verifiers and expediters; our own delivery, installation, and refinishing crews; our own professional contract representatives and wide choice of manufacturers make your job easy. As a member of The Contract Furnishings Council, we offer the following complete services:

- TOTAL COORDINATION RESPONSIBILITY
- COMPLETE SOURCE RESEARCH
- BUDGETARY CONSULTATION
- SPECIFICATION CONSULTATION
- PRODUCT & SHOWROOM DISPLAY
- WAREHOUSING, STAGING, DELIVERY
- LEASING
- FACTORY TRAINED INSTALLATION
- FREIGHT & DAMAGE ADJUSTING
- POST INSTALLATION SERVICE

Over 100 major furniture manufacturers represented.
For more information, please fill out the coupon below.

Attn: Jerry Axelrod
Texas Office Supply Company
6628 Gulf Freeway
Houston, Texas 77017 (713-644-6241)

We are interested in your professional services

Name
Company
Address
City, State, Zip

THE OFFICE FURNISHINGS PROFESSIONALS
STRONGWALL GRABS MORTAR AND HOLDS ON!

*MidSTATES* Ladder Type Strongwall masonry reinforcing provides three times the grab of ordinary masonry reinforcing. Here's how:

- Knurled side rods bite into mortar. 12 indentions per inch gives greater mortar to metal contact for sure bond.
- Ladder type Strongwall features ¾ inch extension of cross bar beyond the side bars. This slight, but important improvement causes stresses to be more evenly distributed.
- Strongwall's wire elements exceed 90,000 P.S.I. tensile strength. And that's guaranteed so you can use Strongwall with complete confidence.

Ladder Type Strongwall features completely galvanized side rods at no extra cost. And to save you time on the job and dollars in transit, Strongwall is palletized and packaged with patented corrugated "boots" that protect the Strongwall and your men, too.

Get complete specifications on both Truss and Ladder type reinforcing by writing today for your FREE copy of the Strongwall Brochure.

*MidSTATES WIRE*

*STRONGWALL*

MidSTATES STEEL & WIRE / Sherman, Texas 75091
Division of Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc.
One summer, after 30,000 or so miles on the highways of Texas, an 8.55 x 15 4-ply nylon cord tire went flat. His owner rolled him into a lake.

The tire determined he could begin life anew in the water. He swam about, looking for other abandoned tires who might have adapted to lake living. Alas, not knowing the territory, he swam too close to shore and got lodged in the mud.

An egret happened upon the scene. "What are you doing?" the bird inquired.

"I decided to become a fish," the tire answered. "But I am stuck in the shallows. And now the sun is blistering me. I do not think I was fully prepared for this experience."

The egret thought for a moment. "Neither," he mused. "was I."

MORAL: A worn-out tire cannot hope to start life over as a fish. Take it home and dispose of it properly. And didn't your mother ever tell you it's not nice to confuse egrets?

A fable for our time from the Texas Society of Architects