NPS Form 10-900-b
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

OMB No. 1024-0018

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (formerly 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information.

___x___ New Submission _____ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

United States Housing Authority (USHA)-funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-1950

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

History of Slum Clearance in the US, 1890-1940
Housing Reform in the United States, 1900-1940
Evolution of Local Housing Authorities in Louisiana, 1936-1941

C. Form Prepared by:

name/title Angelique Theriot/ Architectural Historian
organization R.C. Goodwin & Associates, Inc.
street & number 309 Jefferson Highway, Suite A
city or town New Orleans state LA zip code 70121
e-mail atheriot@rcgoodwin.com
telephone (504) 360-2724 date 6/18/2014

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.

Signature of certifying official

State Historic Preservation Officer
Title

11-18-14
Date

Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, & Tourism
State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper

1-5-2015
Date of Action

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Create a Table of Contents and list the page numbers for each of these sections in the space below.
Provide narrative explanations for each of these sections on continuation sheets. In the header of each section, cite the letter, page number, and name of the multiple property listing. Refer to *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* for additional guidance.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 1

Name of Property

County and State
United States Housing Authority (USHA)-funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-1950
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

E. Statement of Historic Context

Pre-World War II public housing developments in Louisiana constitute solid examples of cities' localized response to a national social movement. These developments displayed the flexibility of a national program when applied to meet the specific needs of low income residents across Louisiana. The variability of this loosely assembled program can be seen in the differing building types, site plans, and locations. The lessons learned by implementing these developments ultimately shaped the national public housing standards that guided public housing developments across the country for years following the completion of Louisiana's public housing developments.

History of Slum Clearance in the United States

The beginning of the Twentieth Century in the United States was a period of significant demographic change, and the pressure of these changes shaped housing conditions in both urban and rural areas throughout the first half of the century. Rural populations moved steadily toward urban centers, as the economy added jobs in industrial manufacturing and lost jobs in the agricultural sectors.[1] Between 1910 and 1940, the South experienced a movement of 1.5 million African-American people alone to Northern cities. Crop prices fell significantly in the South, as farmers were also directly subsidized to allow farmland to go fallow.[2] This movement away from a dependence on rural agriculture prompted smaller towns to grow in size.

Increased employment opportunities in the U.S. also attracted incredibly large populations of immigrants from both Europe and Asia in the first several decades of the Twentieth Century.[3] This nationwide immigration boom stressed underdeveloped or underfunded urban infrastructure, and prompted the newly-arrived working class to accept whatever housing was available to them. New Orleans' immigrant population in 1910 constituted nearly 10% of the total population, while rural Louisiana averaged less than 5%.[4] Gwendolyn Wright describes the kinds of housing conditions present in major American cities at the turn of the century and following decades. Many new arrivals to urban centers had extremely limited means, and a common method for stretching limited resources was to house several families in a single dwelling. People in the working class also often set up residences in buildings that were never originally intended to house them full-time. Wright describes this practice, saying:

> some habitations were adapted from existing warehouses, breweries, or residences; others were erected as multiple-unit dwellings on a site that had been razed or where earlier frame structures had been moved to the rear of the lot.[5]

This type of housing was much different from modern concepts of adaptive reuse in that infrastructural necessities like sewerage disposal and municipal sanitation most often were nonexistent at these sites. Converted buildings often had poor ventilation and no real private space. In New York, for example, 80% of the multi-

[1] Marks, Carole. "The Great Migration: African Americans Searching for the Promised Land, 1916-1930," accessed May 28, 2014, http://www.inmotionaame.org/texts/viewer.cfm?id=8_000T&page=1.
[2] Holt, Thomas C. "The Second Great Migration, 1940-70," accessed May 28, 2014, http://www.inmotionaame.org/texts/viewer.cfm?id=9_000T&page=1.
[3] Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press (1995), p.115.
[4] University of Virginia Library. "Historical Census, County-level Results for 1910," accessed May 28, 2014, http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/php/county.php.
[5] Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press (1995), p.114

family building stock consisted of tenements, housing over 1,000,000 people.[6] Tenements are dense substandard multifamily housing, and are usually located in urban areas.

In Louisiana, these intolerable conditions were intensified by soaring temperatures and high levels of humidity throughout most of the year. Nationwide urban-to-rural demographic shifts in the first decades of the 1900s held true for New Orleans as well. The agrarian economy that had supported much of the statewide economy had faltered after the Civil War, especially in the face of an unfamiliar wage labor system. The manufacturing and shipping economies grew in the port of New Orleans, and workers moved to the city from more rural areas to find work in these industries. The realities for available housing in the city, however, were somewhat different from those in other major American cities. Working class people in Northeastern cities often converted disused warehouses and other commercial buildings into residential units.[7] Urban New Orleans, however, had many large vacant homes left after the relocation of wealthy families to newer and trendier suburbs upriver.[8] These homes were then subdivided into units to accommodate several renters or families. Groups of dense multifamily dwellings, referred to by the Times-Picayune as tenement blocks, were also common developments in New Orleans, and row-like homes with several units can still be found in uptown and downtown neighborhoods. Sanborn maps from the early Twentieth Century often clearly label tenements as such. The most common building type in New Orleans, the shotgun and shotgun double home, also lends itself to easy subdivision to meet increased housing needs.

Community response to the increasingly desperate housing conditions grew over the course of several decades. Urban populations increased in the decades preceding the Depression, as industrial economies in the late-Nineteenth and early-Twentieth Centuries experienced growth. City services were typically unable to keep up with rapid population growth. Nationally, communities began to question the inevitability of poor housing conditions. Cities identified dense urban neighborhoods as “slums” based on a loose criterion of identifying characteristics. Communal living spaces, lack of outdoor space, multi-generational households, income brackets, and often race or ethnicity contributed to an area’s reputation as a “slum.”[9]

In New Orleans, as in other urban areas, poor sanitation led to disease at near epidemic levels. The city’s climate combined with the topography’s inability to drain standing water and sewerage promoted diseases such as yellow fever and influenza. Standing water and dense communal living arrangements created ideal conditions for the spread of highly communicable diseases.

Another problem for tenement residents both nationally and locally was the easy transmission of tuberculosis. Under these conditions, working class residents would often fill substandard buildings by the hundreds. Without any sort of formalized building codes in place, tenements were constructed in close proximity to each other, which created a lack of ventilation and forced residents into very close contact with each other.[10]

The *Times-Picayune* offers insight into New Orleans’ housing situation at the height of tenement occupation.

---

[6] Ibid., p.123
[7] Ibid., p.115
[8] Campanella, Richard. *Geographies of New Orleans: Urban Fabrics Before the Storm*. Lafayette, Louisiana: Center for Louisiana Studies (2006), p.328
[9] Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press (1995), p. 118
[10] Ibid., p. 117

Health and housing inspections of the type described in a January 2, 1910, article had begun in other American cities decades before. New Orleans inspectors identified 267 city squares as tenement locations, and designated a large part of the city's footprint at the time as a tenement zone. Inspectors drew these boundaries at "Johnson Street to the river and from Press Street to Louisiana Avenue."[11] They called out specific pockets of concentrated tenement development in both uptown and downtown New Orleans close to where future urban planners ultimately situated public housing developments. Densities in these areas were calculated by the inspection of 284 buildings. These homes housed over 8,000 people in 1910, which put the average occupancy at nearly 30 people per house.[12] True to the historical composition of typical New Orleans neighborhoods, residents usually lived in ethnically and racially mixed groups. Inspectors specifically mention tenements in the French Quarter where both black and white residents occupied the same units. This level of integration changed radically in working class housing in following decades. Codified racial segregation in public housing eventually divided working class families along racially segregated lines.

Housing conditions for working class and poor families in rural Louisiana developed along different models than in New Orleans. Residents were less crowded, given larger tracts of land available for development. Crowding in rural housing also was less severe given the large-scale relocation of former sharecroppers to city centers in the early Twentieth Century. This vacated both land and the existing housing stock in many farming areas. By the 1920s and 1930s, however, economic hardships in rural Louisiana had reduced families' ability to maintain aging homes. Surveyors sent by the federal government in the 1930s to inspect housing did find rural areas "badly in need of decent, safe and sanitary housing for hundreds of low income families."[13] Whereas communicable disease was a primary risk in low-income urban areas, those in rural regions faced different challenges. Isolation often compounded problems created by a lack of access to public services. Health care, employment and education were much harder to obtain for families located far away from urban centers. These limitations often further negatively impacted income, and diminished overall standard of living. As the Twentieth Century moved into the Great Depression of the 1930s, resources for rural families stretched thinner and thinner.

Philanthropic Responses to Conditions of Poverty

Communities began to link substandard housing with disease and crime before the 1920s, but largely the response was limited to local and small-scale efforts. Early housing reform typically focused on the existing conditions of urban poverty rather than on the greater systemic causes. Philanthropic organizations and nascent social work groups zeroed in on substandard housing as a cause that would benefit from private capital investments. These early efforts, however, did little to improve the quality of life of the growing working class. Reformers incorrectly identified the cause of poverty as overcrowded tenement conditions, rather than the reverse.[14] Early reformers also focused less on economic improvement than on trying to elevate tenement residents' moral character. Then, as now, the working class members of an urban population often received criticisms tied to economic class. Many reformers before the Depression closely linked poverty and morality.[15] The New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor stated that tenement residents "suffered from sickness and premature morality; their ability for self-maintenance is thereby destroyed; social habits and morals

[11] "Tenement House Commission Year," *The Times-Picayune*, 2 January 1910.
[12] "Tenement House Commission Year," *The Times-Picayune*, 2 January 1910.
[13] "Nathan Strauss to Inspect Housing Conditions Here," The Times-Picayune, 10 December 1939.
[14] Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press (1995), p. 117
[15] Ibid., p.118

are debased, and a vast amount of wretchedness, pauperism, and crime is produced."[16]

Housing Reform in the United States

In 1920, the Times-Picayune described tenement housing in highly romanticized terms. The author recounted a trip to a French Quarter tenement, saying "What strange, wonderful doom!"[17] This report only scratched the surface of the complicated attitudes toward low-income housing in New Orleans. Elsewhere in the country during this period, many municipalities struggled with the issue of how best to address substandard housing. The earliest solutions were largely philanthropic or capitalistic, and did not involve the subsidies that eventually became the hotly-debated hallmark of American public housing. Private developers built model homes that re-housed a few tenement residents, but these multifamily homes typically returned profits for the private investors backing these developments.[18] These model homes helped improve living conditions for very few, and failed to convince developers to independently create minimum building standards for multi-unit construction.

One product of housing reform was a definitive change in public opinion regarding the way of life of tenant residents themselves. This change ultimately came to inform local and federal housing policy. In 1910 roughly 10% of New Orleans' urban working class were immigrants to the United States.[19] These new immigrants brought with them cultural mores and traditions that were deemed counterproductive to healthy urban life to others in their neighborhoods. For example, many immigrants pooled limited space and resources to help their families succeed, resulting in high density living conditions. Housing reformers questioned the suitability of what they considered private activities – laundry, bathing, cooking – conducted in communal spaces.[20] Reformers promoted units with separate rooms specifically designated for each domestic use. They argued kitchens should be located indoors and used only for meals, and residents should only sleep in designated bedrooms. In theory, smaller units could also promote limitations on the size of families, since these units typically came with resident number caps.

The promotion of middle class values became a key element of housing reform. These arguments carried through into the pre-World War II public housing debates, and ideas about the organization and allocation of space in public housing units informed early developments.

Housing reformers eventually shifted their focus from addressing localized need to promoting national change through legislation. These efforts would eventually inform Roosevelt's New Deal program. One of the most influential housing advocates, and one whose life work had a significant impact on housing policy, was Edith Elmer Wood. Wood's experience included work with other notable reformers in Washington, D.C., such as Helen Alfred, and Mary Simkhovitch. Early in her career, Wood drafted the first ever proposal for legislation allowing for government-subsidized housing in Washington, D.C. This bill never successfully passed, but established a precedent for legislation like the Wagner-Steagall Act and brought broader attention to the issue. Previous housing theories promoted development from the private sector for profit as the most acceptable way of

[16] Von Hoffman, Alexander. "The Origins of American Housing Reform," accessed May 29, 2014, http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/jchs.harvard.edu/files/von_hoffman_w98-2.pdf
[17] Saxon, Lyle. "Old New Orleans Fades with Years," *The Times-Picayune*, 8 November 1920.
[18] Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press (1995), p. 123
[19] University of Virginia Library. "Historical Census, County-level Results for 1910," accessed May 28, 2014, http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/php/county.php.
[20] Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press (1995), p. 125

meeting public need. Wood disagreed with these commonly-held opinions based on her time spent working in D.C. "slums," and was vocal in her opposition. She believed that the private sector would never create acceptable housing for altruistic purposes.

She was also aware that limited working class incomes could spare little for housing costs. Knowing these urban realities, Wood voiced her concern that a private sector solution would leave the poorest families in tenements even further behind.[21] She also criticized the reliance on private charities to meet social need, stating "private philanthropy has had from the beginning of time until now to solve the problem of housing the poor and it has never done so in any place at any time."[22]

Edith Elmer Wood later conducted research and published her findings for the Housing Division of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works. The division's first publication, released in 1935 during the height of the Depression, references her findings in New Orleans. Little reform had taken place in the city after researchers completed surveys of tenement blocks decades before. Wood explained that "comparatively little is known about housing conditions in New Orleans except that the amount of bad housing there is considerable, and that the general death rate, tuberculosis rate, and infant mortality rate have been uniformly high."[23] She offers concrete housing figures in this publication as well, saying a survey of "selected blighted areas containing 507 buildings…found 7% of these buildings in good condition, 45% in fair condition, 33% in poor condition, and 15% dilapidated."[24]

The housing advocate who had the greatest impact nationally after Wood was certainly Catherine Bauer in the 1920s and 1930s. While Wood's work impacted sources of funding for public housing, Bauer's work influenced the appearance and organization of construction itself. Early in her career, Bauer studied European architecture, which at the time heralded revolutionary advances in modern building materials such as steel girding and concrete. Her focus on construction, aesthetics, and the impact of modern design eventually evolved into a focus on the way in which modern design philosophy could restructure American housing theory overall.

She viewed improved construction technology in the 1920s as a means to improve working class standards of living through thoughtful public and private housing development. Bauer drew much of her early influence from her involvement with the Regional Planning Association of America. The RPAA was a New York think tank founded in the early 1920s by many of the major American planners, engineers, architects of the time. The group mostly focused on the regulation of Garden City-based suburban and exurban development, but also addressed elements of urban housing need. Members of the RPAA "were sharply critical of the results of lightly regulated profit-driven development characteristic of American urban area."[25] The RPAA argued that speculative private development encouraged the loss of housing, and decreased decent affordable housing options for low-wage earners. Although Bauer and the RPAA did not immediately make the leap to publically-subsidized public developments, they eventually were involved with landmark federal housing bills in the 1930s that resulted in

[21] Radford, Gail. *Modern Housing for America: Policy Struggles in the New Deal Era*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press (1996), p. 87
[22] Ibid., p.36
[23] Wood, Edith Elmer. *Slums and Blighted Areas in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office (1935), p.12
[24] Ibid., p. 12
[25] Radford, Gail. *Modern Housing for America: Policy Struggles in the New Deal Era*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press (1996), p. 67

just that solution. Bauer also encountered Zeilenbau-era housing in Europe, the design of which directly informed American public housing in the late 1930s and 1940s.

The Depression in the 1930s changed opinions in the United States about a large number of social problems, including housing, working-class morality, and public funding of social reform. Subsidized public housing prior to this point faced strong opposition from lobbyists financed by such groups as the National Association of Home Builders and American Bankers Association.[26] At the local level, private developers resisted subsidized mortgages and public projects. Reformers like Catherine Bauer, whose experience with public housing rested primarily on European conditions, were unfamiliar with such well-financed opposition. The Depression not only gutted the lobbyists' capital, it created a demand for affordable housing on an unprecedented scale. Homeowners who quickly lost their incomes and investments were forced to default on their mortgages. Landowners in more rural areas lost mortgaged farms.[27] The United States, already struggling with an existing affordable housing shortage, suddenly faced skyrocketing demand from scores of newly-homeless families from all social brackets.

Governmental response to widespread Depression-era needs came in the form of New Deal Legislation, which President Roosevelt proposed and Congress passed in 1933. This legislation created the Public Works Administration, and PWA's Housing Division was dedicated to the issues of homelessness, mortgage default, and substandard living conditions for the poor and unemployed.[28] The main goal of the PWA was to jumpstart the failing national economy in the 1930s. A portion of PWA legislation devoted funding to "a comprehensive program of public works," and it defined this work as "construction, reconstruction, alteration, or repair under public regulation or control of low-cost housing and slum-clearance projects."[29] This program, through the Housing Division, had a threefold effect: job creation, housing provision for the homeless, and civic improvement through slum clearance.

In 1936, the PWA released brief guidelines on how to identify a "slum."[30] These were nonbinding, and focused on unit density and volume in units. The guidelines, for example, required 500 cubic feet per adult in a unit, and building depths of no more than two rooms. The PWA cited health concerns as a basis for these guidelines.[31]

The applicability of these guidelines was problematic in some circumstances. They did not allow for regional norms, and qualified many otherwise functional areas as slums based on subjective evaluation. Most of downtown New Orleans was ruled a slum, and one of the most vulnerable areas was targeted first for redevelopment. The site now occupied by the Iberville housing development was one the first such federally-funded slum clearance project in the United States. The Housing Authority of New Orleans appointed Colonel L. Kemper Williams as its first chairman after its foundation in 1936. His previous work in lumber sale and land investment gave him experience in the housing and real estate fields. In 1937 he petitioned the Housing Division

[26] Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press (1995), p. 220
[27] Ibid., p.223
[28] Radford, Gail. *Modern Housing for America: Policy Struggles in the New Deal Era*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press (1996), p. 85
[29] Ibid., p. 89
[30] Record Group 207. Records of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1935-1942. U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, Washington D.C. and College Park, MD
[31] Ibid.

of the PWA for funds to begin construction on Iberville even before the passage of the Wagner-Steagall Bill, and this application was the first of its kind in New Orleans. He was informed that no federal funds were yet available, but received encouragement from the PWA to submit an application anyway.[32] Although HANO submitted the application to fund Iberville first, the St. Thomas and Magnolia public housing developments were eventually constructed before it.

H.T. Underwood, a well-known New Orleans architect who had been involved in earlier housing reform initiatives, prepared the application for the future Iberville housing development. The HANO report specifically stated the intention to create segregated public housing, saying "Underwood… was engaged to prepare application for the proposed white project and Mr. Moise Goldstein, architect, was engaged to prepare application for the proposed negro project."[33] In the years that followed the application, an idea of the ideal resident in public housing crystallized, both in New Orleans and nationally. Although slum clearance most often targeted the poorest in a community, displaced residents relocated by a public housing plan typically did not occupy the new units. The former residents of a site targeted for slum clearance were also often referred to in damaging terms. Former residents became undesirable in comparison to the newly-arrived "deserving poor" at a site. As plans for Iberville moved ahead after the allocation of funds, the Times-Picayune reported on changes at the site: "A migration of streetwalkers, operators of houses of prostitution, and other underworld characteristics from the edges of the Vieux Carre'…was reported last night." The report continued, saying "numerous negro tenement residents in a 'back of town' area above Canal Street…have been ordered to move and landlords are planning renovations of the places."[34]

The families targeted as residents for these new public housing developments often were referred to in local publications as the "deserving poor." Public housing developments were "designed to serve the need of the submerged middle class, who were temporarily outside of the labor market during the Depression."[35] The demolition and construction itself was intended to create jobs for local unemployed laborers. Developers in the 1930s focused on urban sites, and argued that suburban sites would physically remove residents from what available job market remained.[36] Social workers also worked with "deserving poor" families to improve maintenance, job and housekeeping skills with the intention of eventually propelling these families out of poverty.

Acceptance into public housing required an application and screening process. There were never any explicit requirements in place, however, to ensure families relocated due to slum clearance be re-housed on site. Moreover, as Wright mentions, "the overwhelming majority of these people could not afford rents set by the PWA."[37] The United States Housing Authority (USHA), in partnership with the Housing Authority of New Orleans, did adhere to a 1:1 unit replacement at the site. Re-housing former residents displaced by slum clearance preceding the development was discouraged, however, given the area's prior history as a red light district.

---

[32] Williams, L. Kemper. *Annual Report 1937-1938*. New Orleans, Louisiana: Housing Authority of New Orleans, 1938.
[33] Ibid., p.3
[34] "'District' Personnel Taking Up Residence in 'Back of Town' Area After Quarter Clean Up," *New Orleans Item-Tribune,* 29 September 1940
[35] Stoloff, J.A. *A Brief History of Public Housing*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (Undated) p. 1
[36] Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press (1995), p. 225
[37] Ibid., p. 226

The federal government only loosely regulated design standards for USHA-funded housing. The PWA gave both urban and rural housing authorities the ability to appoint local architects to design a development in the way a city saw fit. This local control extended not only to the buildings themselves, but also to the site selection, site plans, building orientations, and landscaping. Several suits in the Louisiana Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of this local control. New Orleans architects in the 1930s visited non-USHA funded developments in Tennessee and Alabama to research the suitability of certain materials and construction methods for Southern climates.[38] The resulting urban developments came under more criticism than their rural counterparts for what residents and planners eventually identified as shortcomings. However, through both design successes and shortcomings, the process of funding, locating, and constructing these early housing developments shaped federal design standards and regulation for federal housing developments for decades to follow.

Housing Reform in the Great Depression

During the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries, advocates made introductory investigations into the problems of city slums in an attempt to seek reform solutions. Individual advocates and local or state authorities were the primary forces behind these early endeavors. Later, federal measures were taken to construct housing for shipyard workers and war workers during World War I. Despite these early efforts, it wasn't until the Great Depression era that activism regarding public housing construction began to coalesce nationwide.[39]

Following the October 1929 crash of the stock market and with the growing realization that the country was entangled in a ruinous long-term depression, certain legislators began advocacy efforts to create a nationwide public works program. They introduced various bills in Congress, but failed to pass any until July 31, 1932, when Herbert Hoover signed into law the Emergency Relief and Construction Act.[40] This compromise measure "authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to corporations established to provide housing for low income families or to reconstruct slum areas."[41] Although this Act marked a beginning for federal action involving public housing, it produced little effect – the appropriation sum was too small for the mammoth task at hand and too few public works projects were authorized.[42]

By the spring of 1933, thirteen to fifteen million Americans were unemployed, and over 270,000 families had lost their homes due to mortgage foreclosure. Many of these unfortunates were people of what has been termed "the submerged middle class" – former members of the middle class who found themselves temporarily mired in poverty during the Great Depression. Congestion in the nation's city slums increased as the unemployed

---

[38] Williams, L. Kemper. *Annual Report 1937-1938*. New Orleans, Louisiana: Housing Authority of New Orleans, 1938.
[39] Congressional Research Service, *A Chronology of Housing Legislation and Selected Executive Actions, 1892-2003* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004), 1-3, http://financialservices.house.gov/media/pdf/108-d.pdf; Paul R. Lusignan, Judith Robinson, Laura Bobeczo, and Jeremy Shrimpton, *National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form: Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949* (Washington, D.C., National Park Service, 2004), Section E, 4-16.
[40] Congressional Research Service, *Chronology*, 3; Division of Information, *America Builds: The Record of PWA, Public Works Administration* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939), 4-6, https://ia600300.us.archive.org/27/items/americabuilds00unitrich/americabuilds00unitrich.pdf.
[41] Congressional Research Service, *Chronology*, 3.
[42] Division of Information, *America Builds*, 6.

relocated from more prosperous situations into low-rent housing. Further overcrowding occurred as migrant workers moved into the cities – more likely places to seek employment than farms and rural settings.[43]

On March 4, 1933, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt replaced President Hoover in the White House. Roosevelt immediately went to work with the largely-Democratic Congress to activate his New Deal – "a sweeping program to bring recovery to business and agriculture, relief to the unemployed and to those in danger of losing farms and homes, and reform."[44] Roosevelt's New Deal initiatives produced "five major effects on the country: stimulating economic recovery, creating jobs for the unemployed, building public works across every state, investing in public education and civic culture, and transforming the American federal system."[45]

The National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) was among the New Deal measures passed through Congress during Roosevelt's first 100 days in office. Signed into law on June 16, 1933, NIRA contained a number of measures, including the creation of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, commonly called the Public Works Administration, or PWA.[46] The PWA Housing Division "Authorized the use of Federal funds to finance low-cost and slum clearance housing and subsistence homesteads, as a means of providing employment."[47] Results of this initiative included the "construction of 50 low-rent public housing projects, containing 21,600 units, in 37 cities, and 15,000 units … provided in resettlement projects and Greenbelt towns [planned communities incorporating rural-inspired green spaces into urban settings]."[48]

A year following the passage of NIRA, the National Housing Act passed through Congress, and became public law on June 27, 1934. Most importantly, this Act established the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), and, among its numerous articles, it authorized low-cost housing insurance, i.e., "insurance of mortgages covering property held by Federal or State instrumentalities, private limited dividend corporations, or municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, formed for the purpose of providing housing for persons of low incomes."[49] In addition, the National Housing Act amended the Interstate Commerce Commission Act in order to reduce carrier rates "for the transportation of commodities to be specified by the Commission with the object of improving nationwide housing standards and providing employment and stimulating industry."[50]

The United States Housing Act of 1937

The legislative measures and subsequent amendments passed during the early years of the New Deal era certainly made strides toward public housing construction and reform; however, as admitted by the PWA Housing

---

[43] Lawrence M. Friedman, "Public Housing and the Poor: An Overview," *California Law Review* 54, no. 2 (May 1966): 645-646, http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview/vol54/iss2/12; Lusignan et al., *National Register of Historic Places*, Section E, 16-17.
[44] White House Historical Association, "Franklin D. Roosevelt," accessed May 22, 2014, http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents/franklindroosevelt.
[45] Richard Walker, "The New Deal in Brief," accessed May 22, 2014, http://livingnewdeal.berkeley.edu/Indp-content/uploads/2012/01/New-Deal-in-Brief.pdf.
[46] Division of Information, *America Builds*, 1-2, 41, 209; Lusignan et al., *National Register of Historic Places*, Section E, 17-18.
[47] Congressional Research Service, *Chronology*, 5.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Congressional Research Service, *Chronology*, 6-7.
[50] Ibid, 9.

Division, these programs basically served "as 'demonstration projects,' proving the essential feasibility of federal involvement in public housing reform."[51] As the decade passed, various organizations advocated increased federal efforts to improve public housing. These groups included the National Association of Housing Officials, the National Public Housing Conference, the Labor Housing Conference, and the American Federation of Labor. Legislators took notice and campaigned Congress for stronger housing legislation.[52] President Roosevelt emphasized his support following his re-election to a second term. In his January 6, 1937, State of the Union Message to Congress, he stated:

> There are far-reaching problems still with us for which democracy must find solutions if it is to consider itself successful. For example, many millions of Americans still live in habitations which not only fail to provide the physical benefits of modern civilization but [also] breed disease and impair the health of future generations. The menace exists not only in the slum areas of the very large cities, but in many smaller cities as well. It exists on tens of thousands of farms, in varying degrees, in every part of the country.[53]

A few weeks later, Roosevelt extended his voice beyond Congress, noting the housing problem during his Second Inaugural Address on January 20, 1937, when he said:

> "I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished. …. The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."[54]

Several months later, Congress passed the United States Housing Act of 1937, signed into law by Roosevelt on September 1, 1937. This landmark legislation commonly has been called the Wagner-Steagall Act, named for the congressmen who co-sponsored the housing bill introduced to Congress earlier that summer. Senator Robert F. Wagner, a New York Democrat whose childhood had been spent in the Manhattan slums, was a longtime advocate for public housing, while Representative Henry Steagall of Alabama vehemently opposed the movement.[55] "Steagall reportedly explained his conversion [to support the bill] as a simple matter of party loyalty: 'I'm against it, it's socialism, it's Bolshevist, it will bankrupt the country, but the leader wants it.'"[56] Other Congressmen echoed both Wagner's support and Steagall's initial opposition, but, following various amendments, the Wagner-Steagall Bill passed both Houses of Congress in August 1937, and it was signed into law shortly thereafter.[57]

In summary, the Wagner-Steagall Act authorized an expanded public housing program that was to be managed by the United States Housing Authority (USHA), a new federal agency overseen by the U.S. Department of the Interior. Among its measures, the Act authorized the USHA "to make loans to local public housing agencies to assist the development, acquisition, or administration of low-rent housing or slum clearance projects by those

[51] Lusignan et al., *National Register of Historic Places*, Section E, 41.
[52] Ibid, Section E, 37-41.
[53] Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum, "FDR and Housing Legislation: 75th Anniversary of the Wagner-Steagall Housing Act of 1937," accessed May 21, 2014, http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/aboutfdr/housing.html.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid; Lusignan et al., *National Register of Historic Places*, Section E, 17, 38-44.
[56] Lusignan et al., *National Register of Historic Places*, Section E, 17, 42.
[57] Ibid, Section E, 42-44.

agencies." In addition, the USHA was authorized "to make annual contributions to the agencies to assist in achieving and maintaining the low-rent character of the housing projects." Furthermore, the Act "Required the annual contributions contracts to make provisions with respect to maximum income limits of the tenants of the housing and tenant admission policies."[58]

Unlike the federally-centralized PWA, the USHA "could not directly build or manage public housing." The Wagner-Steagall Act gave that function, instead, to "local public housing authorities (PHAs) established under state enabling legislation."[59] More plainly stated, the USHA provided federal "direction, financial support and technical design assistance with local housing authorities having some decision-making ability for local community conditions" – the genesis of "the federally-funded, locally-operated public housing program that exists today."[60]

An important caveat of the Wagner-Steagall Act was that no housing units "were to be built without destroying 'dwellings … substantially equal in number to the number of newly constructed dwellings provided by the projects." This provision of "equivalent elimination" was a peace-making measure that legalized slum clearance, but also appeased "landlords and the housing industry by removing the danger of oversupply." In other words, the Wagner-Steagall Act produced "a program geared to the needs of the submerged middle class, tied to slum clearance, and purged of any element of possible competition with business."[61]

End of the New Deal Era

Less than six months following passage of the Wagner-Steagall Act, amendments to the earlier National Housing Act were signed into law on February 3, 1938, enacting a number of changes to the FHA housing insurance programs that had been in place since the mid-1930s. Among the many provisions of the 1938 amendments was the alteration of "the original Section 207 mortgage insurance program for low-cost housing to a new rental housing mortgage insurance program." Under the terms of this new Section 207 program, "mortgagers could be Federal, State or local instrumentalities, limited dividend corporations, private corporations, associations, cooperative societies, or trusts formed or created for the purpose of rehabilitating slum or blighted areas, or providing housing for rent or sale," with private mortgagors regulated by the FHA.[62]

In mid-1939, the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 – signed into law on June 7 and effective as of July 1 – restructured the federal housing agencies. This legislative measure "established the Federal Loan Agency and Federal Works Agency to coordinate and supervise various agencies, including those with housing functions." Under the reorganization arrangement, the FHA was placed under the Federal Loan Agency, and the USHA was transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Federal Works Agency.[63]

In 1940, as U.S. involvement in World War II became imminent, federally-funded housing priorities were transferred from public housing to defense housing. From the early to mid-1940s, a number of legislative

[58] Congressional Research Service, *Chronology*, 11.
[59] Lusignan et al., *National Register of Historic Places*, Section E, 45.
[60] Judith Owens-Manley, "The Emergence of Public Housing," accessed May 22, 2014, http://www.hamilton.edu/cache/the-emergence-of-public-housing.
[61] Friedman, "Public Housing and the Poor," 647.
[62] Congressional Research Service, *Chronology*, 12-13.
[63] Ibid, 15.

measures and amendments to the existing housing acts were passed that provided housing, mortgage relief, and other housing assistance to defense and war workers and, later, veterans. At war's end, many of the defense housing units were transferred or re-conveyed into the public housing program.[64]

President Roosevelt's decade-long New Deal program came to an end in 1943 in the midst of World War II. The prosperity of wartime negated the need for many of the relief programs created during the Depression years. Some New Deal agencies, like the PWA, were phased out, while others, like the FHA, continue to operate to the present day.[65]

Despite more prosperous times, President Roosevelt maintained his drive toward better circumstances for all Americans. On January 11, 1944, he delivered his State of the Union Message to a nationwide audience as one of his radio broadcast Fireside Chats, rather than directly to Congress. In his address, he declared the need for "a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all – regardless of station, race or creed." Among the listed points was "The right of every family to a decent home" – an objective that public housing advocates and activists continue to promote today.[66]

Lack of Early Formalized Architectural Standards

Flush with funding from the passage of the Wagner-Steagall Bill, local authorities could now build their new facilities. However, exactly what to build was unclear. The U.S. Housing Authority (USHA) refused to participate in the discussion, categorically denying any interest "to proscribe or specify construction materials, methods, or designs" for the new housing developments.[67] Publications circulated regarding the experiences at existing low-income housing developments, but these documents tended to focus on the minutiae of maintenance and management along with general recommendations regarding division of interior space. USHA published a series of bulletins to guide local authorities through steps such as site selection, but by its own admission the recommendations were "not intended as regulations or arbitrary requirements."[68] The newly created Construction Review Division of the USHA focused on the structural and economic feasibility of the design, leaving aesthetics in the hands of the local authorities.[69] Given the lack of a single overarching design approach, cities cobbled together a rough framework based on the past experience of others, existing building codes, and general

[64] Ibid, 17-20; Friedman, "Public Housing and the Poor," 649-650; Owens-Manley, "The Emergence of Public Housing."
[65] Living New Deal, "New Deal Programs & Timeline," accessed May 22, 2014, http://livingnewdeal.berkeley.edu/resources/timeline/; U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, "Records of the Federal Housing Administration [FHA] (Record Group 31)" and "Records of the Public Works Administration [PWA] (Record Group 135)," accessed May 22, 2014, http://www.archives.gov/research/guide-fed-records/groups/031.html and http://www.archives.gov/research/guide-fed-records/groups/135.html, respectively.
[66] Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum, "1944 State of the Union Address: FDR's Second Bill of Rights or Economic Bill of Rights Speech," accessed May 22, 2014, http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/archives/stateoftheunion.html.
[67] Department of the Interior, United States Housing Authority, "Deputy Administrator Order No. 16," 24 August 1939, Record Group 196, National Archives, Washington, D.C.
[68] Department of the Interior, United States Housing Authority, *Bulletin No. 11 On Policy and Procedure: Site Planning*, 15 August 1938, Record Group 196, National Archives, Washington, D.C.
[69] Department of the Interior, United States Housing Authority, "Order No. 32," 22 December 1937, Record Group 196, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

construction guidelines.

Architects in private practice often were responsible for the designs of these early USHA-funded housing developments. In New Orleans, two architects were heavily involved in the design of the first public housing developments in the city: Moise H. Goldstein and Herbert A. Benson. Born and raised in New Orleans, Goldstein studied at Tulane University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the American Academy of Rome. After forming his own architectural firm in 1914, Goldstein designed one of New Orleans' first skyscrapers, the American Bank Building. Louisiana Governor John M. Parker named Goldstein to the State Housing Commission, leading to his design of the Magnolia Street housing development.[70] Benson was also a New Orleans native, but he started his architectural education at age 12 by working for architect Emile Weil. In 1934, he started his own architectural firm. After commissions for Pontchartrain Beach and a private estate for politician and businessman Abraham Shushan, Benson teamed up with fellow architects George Christy and William Spink to design the Iberville Street and St. Bernard Avenue Housing Projects.[71]

In Lake Charles, the architecture firm Dunn & Quinn was responsible for the design of low-income housing for the city. G. Lewis Dunn and Gustave G. Quinn formed their partnership in 1935 and designed numerous buildings in Southwest Louisiana, including the Lake Charles Pioneer Building and Magnolia Life Building, as well as several buildings for McNeese State University. Dunn & Quinn designed the Booker T. Washington Courts and High School Homes for the Housing Authority of Lake Charles. The firm's involvement with federally-funded public housing continued in 1957 with the design and construction of temporary housing for Cameron Parish residents following Hurricane Audrey; the project was executed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the predecessor of the U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development.[72]

Despite different architects and public needs nationwide, some commonalities of construction had already arisen; in 1941 USHA released details on their first 244 funded projects nationwide, which revealed the majority of local housing authorities chose brick construction. Poured concrete and hollow tile were also popular choices. For floor construction, concrete was by far the most popular choice, used by 208, or approximately 85%, of the housing developments.[73]

In 1946, after years of trial and error embodied in brick and mortar, the successor to the USHA, the Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA), published design guidelines. These new guidelines sought to share "our

[70] Milton G. Scheuermann, Jr., "Moise H. Goldstein," In *KnowLA Encyclopedia of Louisiana*, ed. David Johnson. Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities, 2010. Article published 12 January 2011. Available online at http://www.knowla.org/entry/874 (accessed 21 May 2014).

[71] Finding Aid, Benson and Riehl Office Records, Southeastern Architectural Archive, Special Collections Division, Tulane University Libraries, [May 2014], Available online at http://seaa.tulane.edu/sites/all/themes/Howard_Tilton/docs/finding_aids/Benson%20and%20Riehl%20Office%20Records.pdf (accessed 21 May 2014).

[72] Finding Aid, Dunn & Quinn Architectural Records, Collection 135, Archives and Special Collections Department, Frazar Memorial Library, McNeese State University, March 2010. Available online at http://ereserves.mcneese.edu/depts/archive/dunnquinn135.htm (accessed 21 May 2014); Pati Threatt, "Spotlight on the Dunn and Quinn Architectural Records, 1936-1996," *Southwestern Archivist*, Volume 33, Issue 4 (November 2010): 1.

[73] "Brick and Tile Walls Lead in USHA Low-Rent Projects," *New Orleans Sentinel*, 18 January 1941.

experiences both good and bad in a decade of public housing endeavor."[74] The FPHA utilized reports from housing authorities across the United States, as well as architects, local observations, managers, low-rent housing specialists, and regional offices in crafting the guidelines. The local housing authorities drew on comments provided by the residents living within the new developments, thus giving the recommendations the weight of the opinion of the people that used the buildings the most.[75]

The purpose of these guidelines was to prevent inferior solutions from perpetuating and to codify the successful ones. The guidelines did not stress exterior appearance, finding that no distinctive architectural style had arisen as architects tended to "give the buildings something of the local flavor."[76] Instead, the FPHA provided a general framework that addressed the programmatic needs of low-income housing from the macro to the micro. The guidelines recommended a site assimilated into the larger urban fabric to ensure residents had access to public transportation, schools, hospitals, and other services, but not adjacent to potential nuisances, such as oil refineries or the city dump. Superblocks were ideal according to these guidelines, but they reminded local housing authorities that scattered sites may be useful to simplify access to utilities and services. Creating an arrangement that allowed individual buildings to front the surrounding streets and some degree of privacy for backyards were preferable to plans resulting in "inconvenient" courtyards. Along with larger site issues, the guidelines addressed minutiae viewed as key for tenant satisfaction, such as sturdy screen doors, the correct spatial relationship for furniture and closet doors, and an outdoor water fountain design that can withstand abuse from children. In addition, plastered interiors were preferable, as "the so-called 'dry wall' materials" developed during the war effort "have not been used long enough to determine their real qualities."[77]

No single type of building was identified as the best solution for publically funded housing; instead, FPHA identified the pros and cons of each potential building type, such as low-rise single family homes, row houses, and apartment buildings. High density developments consisting of upwards of twelve to fourteen units were found to be the least effective. Regional variations often influenced the type and design of the final buildings. Row houses consistent with the surrounding housing stock were popular in the Mid-Atlantic. Southern housing authorities viewed porches as highly desirable features, but housing developments farther north had little use for the design element. Areas subject to high rainfall required sufficient canopies to prevent driving rain from reaching the interior. Design features also addressed regional aesthetic concerns; according to officials in North Carolina, public housing buildings without porches or canopies looked "a little shacky."[78]

The final FPHA guidelines reflected what had been learned at low-income housing developments nationwide, including Louisiana. The initial Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO) housing developments had been open for several years at that point; the internal reviews of these initial endeavors likely informed reports supplied to FPHA by Louisiana. For its new developments, HANO's final designs called for buildings to cover about 25 percent of the property in order to leave plenty of open space for an "abundance of sunshine and fresh air" that will "contribute materially to the physical and moral well-being of the tenants."[79] The sturdy brick construction would house apartments with one to three bedrooms and the most current amenities, including a gas

[74] National Housing Agency, Federal Public Housing Authority. *Public Housing Design: A Review of Experienced in Low-Rent Housing*. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1946), iv.
[75] Ibid., p. vi, 96.
[76] Ibid., p. 112.
[77] Ibid., p. 9, 12, 15, 30, 70, 106, 206, 209.
[78] Ibid., p. 77-80, 81, 115-116.
[79] Ibid., p. 28.

range, electric refrigerator, and built-in bath tub. Above all, the tenants would be "assured peace, quiet, and safety."[80] HANO sought to improve the design of the housing developments as new facilities were constructed; these changes often brought the newer developments more in line with the later FPHA guidelines. For example, initial plans for the St. Thomas Street Project and Magnolia Street Project called for coal or wood burning fireplaces and stoves while later designs utilized modern gas heaters.[81] The emphasis on easy access to recreational facilities, modern conveniences, and serene surroundings were later reflected in the FPHA guidelines.

For the most part, HANO's low-income housing developments complied with the newly minted FPHA guidelines. However, at a housing development such as Iberville, several characteristics FPHA thought best avoided in future low-income developments were present. A site hemmed in by two cemeteries would likely have not been viewed as ideal by FPHA, but the siting was likely of little consequence to New Orleanians accustomed to neighboring cities of the dead. The building configuration created the undesirable courtyards, credited with inefficient circulation patterns for pedestrian and automobile traffic through the development. The dearth of parking spaces proved to be another problem; per the FPHA guidelines, "Failure to anticipate the need for parking and to meet it as part of the project design would not be good planning."[82] Despite the limitations of the site planning, Iberville's sturdy brick construction, porches, and ample recreation facilities more closely adhered to FPHA's ideal low-income housing development.

Evolution of Local Housing Authority in Louisiana, 1936-1941

In 1936, Louisiana passed the "Housing Act," also known as the "Slum Clearance Act;" the act predated the passage of the federal Wagner-Steagall Act. The legislation provided for the creation of local housing authorities in Louisiana towns with populations over 20,000.[83] The legislation was amended in 1940 to lower the required population to only 5,000 residents and to allow for partnerships between towns and parishes to create regional housing authorities that could more effectively serve rural populations. Additional measures provided for low-income residential developments in rural areas and the creation of a State Housing Co-ordinator.[84] The cities of Baton Rouge, Lafayette, Shreveport, and Lake Charles along with the parishes of East Baton Rouge, St. James, and Iberia quickly expressed interest in creating local housing authorities.[85]

New Orleans had already jumped into low-income housing developments via the creation of the Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO) on September 18, 1936. The first five members of HANO were appointed in early 1937: Colonel L. Kemper Williams (Chairman), Mr. B. C. Casanas, Mr. William J. Guste, Mr. Richard R. Foster, and Mr. Hampton Reynolds. The organization did not waste any time; by the end of 1937, temporary offices had been acquired in the Canal Bank Building, the architectural services of Allison Owen & Associates and Moise H. Goldstein & Associates were secured, and Colonel Williams had traveled to Washington, D.C. to discuss proposed projects with the PWA. More significantly, HANO signed a loan agreement with the USHA for

[80] Ibid., p. 28.
[81] Housing Authority of New Orleans, *Report of the Housing Authority of New Orleans For the Year Ending December 31, 1939*, p. 2 Reproduction, Archives, Housing Authority of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana.
[82] *Public Housing Standards*, p. 38.
[83] F.S., *Constitutional Law – Eminent Domain – State Slum Clearance Housing Projects*, 1 La. L. Rev. (1938): 221. Available online at http://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/lalrev/vol1/iss1/28 (Accessed 16 October 2013).
[84] Act 208, House Bill 303, 12 July 1940; Printed in *States-Times* (Baton Rouge, LA), 20 July 1940.
[85] Act 407, House Concurrent Resolution No. 16, Adopted 1940; Printed in *States-Times* (Baton Rouge, LA), 27 July 1940; "Louisiana Plans to Enlist Help in Slum Clearance," *The Times-Picayune*, 9 August 1940.

$8,411,000 for the construction of its first developments; this was the first contract signed by the President of the United States under the new program.[86]

HANO planned initially for two new housing developments, one for white low-income residents and one for African-American low-income residents. HANO selected the sites for the new developments based on areas of substandard housing stock with proximity to services, such as schools and hospitals, which also had high demand for suitable housing. The first development, LA-1-1 or St. Thomas Street Project, resulted in HANO acquiring 237 parcels at a little over $1,000,000. The second development, LA-1-2 or the Magnolia Street Project, was slightly smaller, necessitating only 152 parcels acquired at a cost of slightly over $880,000. [87]
To address any legal concerns regarding the new act and subsequent local housing authorities, the Louisiana attorney general filed a friendly action lawsuit against HANO. The lawsuit, filed on May 13, 1938, claimed the transfer of eminent domain to the City violated the state constitution, challenged the powers of HANO to determine who qualified for the low-income housing, and maintained the City and Council did not follow the Act when creating HANO. The lawsuit halted temporarily any progress on the above developments.[88] A scant few days later, Judge Walter Gleason ruled in favor of HANO and rejected the injunction set forward by the state.[89]

With the expropriation authority secured, HANO proceeded with obtaining land for the St. Thomas and Magnolia Street Projects. Originally, the original design for the Magnolia Street Project called for using land occupied by the Thomy Lafon Colored School and the Lincoln Theatre; both parcels proved to be too expensive and plans were revised to exclude these properties.[90] Simultaneously, HANO began planning for an additional four developments, two for white tenants (Iberville Street and St. Bernard Avenue Projects) and two for African-American residents (Lafitte Street and Calliope Street Projects). These six housing developments would result in 4,881 new units built at a total cost of $29,953,000.[91]

Another urban area in Louisiana to embrace low-income development was Lake Charles. In 1940, the City of Lake Charles signed a cooperative agreement with the newly formed local housing authority. The agreement, and its subsequent supplement, called for the City to obtain, via condemnation, demolition, or other delineated means, suitable property for the purposes of constructing new low-income housing units. The City also would be responsible for providing access to the sewerage system, fire hydrants, street lighting, and other basic services.[92] By November 1940, Lake Charles had identified 1,657 families living in substandard housing. To alleviate some of these conditions, the Lake Charles Housing Authority sought to build 80 one-story duplexes of masonry construction after rejecting initial plans for barracks-type housing.[93] In early May 1941, Lake Charles received $253,000 to build 73 units.[94]

---

[86] Housing Authority of New Orleans, *Report of the Housing Authority of New Orleans, For the Period March 1, 1937 to December 31, 1938*. (New Orleans: n.p., 1938): 5-6, 10, 17.
[87] Ibid., [20];
[88] "State Files Suit Against Housing Authority Here," *The Times-Picayune*, 14 May 1938.
[89] "Gleason Upholds City Housing Act for Big Projects," *The Times-Picayune*, 19 May 1938.
[90] *Report of the Housing Authority of New Orleans, 1938*, p. 12.
[91] Ibid., p. 17.
[92] Cooperative Agreement between City of Lake Charles and Lake Charles Housing Authority, 25 June 1940, as supplemented, 9 September 1941.
[93] "Shreveport and Lake Charles in Housing Program," *The Times-Picayune*, 3 November 1940; "Housing Group at Lake Charles Lets Contract," *The Times Picayune*, 9 November 1940.
[94] "$253,000 Allotted to Lake Charles for Housing Plan," *The Advocate*, 3 May 1941.

Rural areas in Louisiana were not left out of new low-income housing developments. Regional housing authorities were responsible for the majority of the construction in these areas. An initial estimate of 75,000 "ramshackle farm houses and shacks" were identified for replacement under the slum clearance project.[95] In December 1940, Louisiana requested $2,500,000 under the new housing program to fund construction of 1,300 houses on farms damaged by recent flooding.[96] In March 1941, the federal government allocated $2,000,000 to Louisiana in response to the state application; the funds were divided among regional housing authorities. The resulting buildings would be four or five room units. If cheap electricity was readily available at the property it would be added to the new building.[97]

These new local and regional housing authorities allowed for funds from the Wagner-Steagall Act to percolate across the state of Louisiana as well as concentrate in the larger urban areas. The distribution of smaller housing authorities, each with a tight focus, resulted in crafting of intensely local solutions that varied across the state.

[95] "Louisiana Plans to Enlist Help in Slum Clearance," *The Times-Picayune*, 9 August 1940.
[96] "Housing Unit to Ask $2,500,000," *The Advocate*, 6 December 1940.
[97] "Funds for Rural Housing Setup is Given Approval," *The Times-Picayune*, 13 March 1941.

F. Associated Property Types
Regardless of whether they are high-density or low-density housing developments, this United States Housing Authority (USHA)-funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-1950 Multiple Property Submission could include two different property types: historic districts or individual buildings.

Property Type Description—Historic Districts
The National Park Service, in their Public Housing in the United States Multiple Property Submission, asserts that "the typical public housing project of the period consisted of a formal assemblage of residential buildings, community structures, and landscape elements such as open recreational spaces and circulation networks designed to operate as an integrated system" (NPS 2004:69). Historic districts associated with USHA-funded Public Housing in Louisiana will include some, but not all, of those elements. These are discussed in more detail below.

The USHA-funded public housing developments in Louisiana are those built between 1935 and 1950 as part of the federal subsidy program. They initially were constructed as part of a job creation initiative. They also housed those made homeless by the Depression, as well as those relocated due to slum clearance. During the 1940s, USHA-funded developments often temporarily housed military families as part of the war effort. After World War II, they returned to use by working class and low-income residents. These statewide developments can be broken out into two subtypes: high-density urban developments and low-density rural developments. The high-density urban subtype is characteristic of New Orleans, however, and is only found in this city. The low-density rural subtype is found adjacent to smaller cities in Louisiana, but this fact is due to the growth of those cities in recent decades. Low-density rural housing was initially constructed outside of urban centers, and often located on vacant land. The slums that these low-density rural developments cleared were even less defined than those in New Orleans. Although designed by many different architects, the two subtypes do adhere largely to their regional models. Most developments have undergone some degree of modernization, and there is significant variability in integrity. They are significant as a group, however, since they provide an example of a statewide response to federally-recognized public need.

Property Subtype—High-Density Urban Housing Developments

High-density urban developments are all located in New Orleans, and developers constructed them all as large groupings of apartment buildings. These high-density developments universally feature buildings of varying lengths and widths, but developers constructed all residential buildings as two to three stories in height. Developers situated these buildings around a common area, referred to as a "court plan," with building clusters situated along a public green space corridor. Young residents used public space as dedicated play places in these high-density urban developments. Space was often set aside for laundry lines, in an era before modern laundry equipment. The arrangement of buildings around a court plan was a direct response to slum and tenement conditions, which failed to provide off-street recreational space or ventilation.[98] The footprints of individual developments can vary greatly, as can the overall size. In New Orleans, developments ranged from 48 to 121 residential buildings. Developments often contained nearly a dozen different building types, although typically only a very limited number remain. Individual units on the sites could also range from 690 to 970. The current conditions of extant buildings reflect historic floor plans. Buildings have three to fourteen entrances, with each

[98] Klutznick, Philip M. *Public Housing Design: A Review of Experience in Low-Rent Housing*. Washington D.C.: National Housing Agency (1946), p.28

unit having its own direct front door. First-floor units have a rear exit as well. Windows are located on both the front and rear facades of units. Buildings typically feature roofs with side gables. The piers that form building foundations are enclosed.

The high density of these urban building types are what made them unique among USHA-funded public housing developments in Louisiana. Individual buildings in New Orleans had as many as 14 units in one single multi-family dwelling. This density reflects the high level of need for affordable housing in the city in the 1930s and 1940s. These building typically had a rectangular footprint, but did often feature units housed in a central block and flanked by one or two side wings.

Sites had separate administration buildings, which housing authorities designated for multiple purposes. Housing administrators located their offices in these buildings, and entrances typically faced a major roadway. In the years soon after construction, social workers would work on site as well. Residents met for classes on crafts, work training, and home economics.[99] These activities intended to build community atmosphere for tenants, and residents of different developments citywide would often join together for social activities. Not all administration buildings on sites in New Orleans are still extant.

The architectural style of USHA-funded developments in New Orleans is utilitarian with Creole- and Depression Era-influences. Architects focused on function and affordability in their designs. They also drew influence from the stripped-down style of European public housing in the 1920s and 1930s, referred to in Germany as Zeilenbau architecture.[100] Creole elements are found in the ornamental ironwork galleries found at public housing sites. These served a practical purpose as well, as they provided shaded outdoor space for residents in an era before air conditioning. A union between indoor and outdoor living space also mirrored traditional floor plans for homes in hot, humid New Orleans. The buildings are clad in brick with concrete elements. This material was the most common cladding used for USHA-funded projects nationwide. Roofs were historically clad in terra cotta and asbestos, but most have been replaced with modern asphalt shingles.

Property Subtype—Low-density Rural Housing Developments
Low-density rural public housing developments in Louisiana included housing projects in smaller urban areas as well as in rural areas. Developers constructed buildings of varying lengths and widths, but limited all residential buildings to one-story in height with a maximum of two units in each. Each two-unit building is detached from others surrounding it. These buildings are situated either on enclosed pier foundations or placed directly on slabs. These buildings typically face a public street or a small yard located off a private housing development driveway. Buildings are also sometimes located around a cul-de-sac. Low-density rural site planning was shaped by the increased car dependence in many rural areas. Low-density rural developments usually follow urban construction dates by several years, and residents in high-density developments had begun to criticize the practicality of closed court plans. Low-density rural developments often include fenced rear yards, and have a small service alley running behind buildings. Yards often include clotheslines for laundry, as well as small utility sheds for each unit. The size of rural developments can range from 25 to 50 buildings. Units can range in number from 48 to

[99] Brodtmann, James P. *Report of the Housing Authority of New Orleans For the Year Ending December 31, 1941*. New Orleans, Louisiana: Housing Authority of New Orleans (1942), p.33

[100] Radford, Gail. *Modern Housing for America: Policy Struggles in the New Deal Era*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press (1996), p.130

100.

Buildings in these low-density developments differ significantly from the large apartment buildings found in urban areas. These developments are characteristically Ranch-like "twin houses." Residents generally favored these designs more than their dense urban counterparts. Design guidelines published in 1946 state this subtype was "liked by most tenants because of light and air on three sides, the feeling of individual possession, and the use of relatively large yards." Housing authorities favored this subtype because they were "adaptable to inexpensive construction and materials." Buildings have paired doors on their facades to serve double units. This saved expense on sidewalk pavement. Buildings also often have hipped or side-gabled roofs, and aluminum 2/2 windows, which follow post-war building trends in federally-funded barracks-like construction. Like their urban equivalents, rural public housing developments also had administration and infrastructural buildings located on site. They served the same function: providing space for offices, community enrichment classes, and general maintenance needs.

The architectural style of USHA-funded developments in rural Louisiana is utilitarian, with very minimal ornamentation. As elsewhere during the period, architects designing these developments focused on keeping costs low while providing quality housing to low-income and working class residents. Buildings typically do not have porches, but do have small overhangs over entrances. These provided rain protection to residents, and kept water from entering the interior. Developers clad buildings in brick and asbestos siding, and clad roofs in asbestos as well. In almost all cases, the asbestos has been replaced with modern materials.

Contributing Elements to Historic Districts
A variety of resources generally were constructed during the period of USHA-funded Housing Developments. Large scale elements of these districts will include residential housing and administration buildings. Small scale contributing elements will include utilities, parking lots, garages, as well as outdoor common space, managed landscaping elements and playgrounds. Their inclusion as contributing elements will be identified by their relationship to one another and their function historically. For example, a grouping of several residential structures dating from this period stand out in either a high or low-density setting; however, a collection of only a few residential buildings together with intact original backyards, laundry facilities and utility shed could also be considered an historic district, if their relationship to each other retains integrity.

Generally, a historic district would necessarily have to contain at least a few residential buildings from this period. For example, an administration building isolated from all residential housing units, with landscape, engineering, and recreation elements would lack the unifying element that makes it a residential housing development. Conversely, a small grouping of residential units, with clear special relationship to one another, and integrity of feeling and association, could constitute a district together with some administrative, landscape, recreational or engineering contributing elements.

Because of changes in the function and density of most of the housing projects over time, none retain the full complement of original contributing elements. Sidewalks, parking lots, driveways, court plans, landscapes and administrative buildings have changed to varying degrees across the developments. Virtually no historic districts will have all of the possible contributing elements listed below. However, several of these elements remain extant, and could contribute to Louisiana public housing districts.

High-density Developments Possible Contributing Elements

Engineering resources
Concrete parking areas
Concrete service drives
"Concrete walk" surrounding sites
Sidewalks from yard/play areas which led directly to main unit entrances
Octagonal court plans

Mechanical resources
Yard stations (small, utilitarian, same brick exterior as buildings, often side gable with tile roofs)
Gas meter house (small, utilitarian, same brick exterior as buildings, often hipped tile roof, metal louvered vents)

Recreational resources
Skating and shower area (octagonal court plan)
Yard/lawn & play area (green space)

Designed and managed landscapes
Trees, shrubs, vines
Live oaks usually planted around lawn areas
Flagpole

Low-density Developments Possible Contributing Elements
Engineering Resources
Off-street parking
Paved service alleys
Paved general sidewalks leading to each unit's paved entrance walkways
Communal mailbox stations

Mechanical Resources
Utility sheds- small brick sheds with single door for each unit's storage needs

Recreational Resources
Designated play area in central part of development, typically including stationary playground equipment
Shared front and rear yards between units, either fenced or unfenced
Clotheslines installed in rear yards for residents' use

Designed and managed landscapes
Trees and shrubs, which are often quite mature

Property Type Significance—Historic Districts
Historic Districts in Louisiana USHA-funded Housing Developments, 1935-1950 are eligible for the National Register under Criterion A. They provide an example of a statewide response to federally-recognized public need. As such, these resources are significant at the state level. Some of these resources might also be eligible under Criterion C, for their distinctive, though utilitarian, architecture. In the high-density housing developments, original architects encompassed elements of traditional New Orleans' architecture, such as local gallery design and ornamental ironwork. In most cases, because the elements included were reflective of local architectural trends and styles, under Criterion C, the level of significance is local.

Property Type Registration Requirements—Historic Districts

Historic districts in high-density urban developments should retain, at a minimum, integrity of location, association, design, and feeling to be eligible. Essentially, recognition of these districts as being associated with the public housing movement between 1935 and 1950 is key to maintaining the integrity of the district as a whole. These elements include siting, building relationships to each other (grouping), and recognizable historic form. For public housing developments, integrity of feeling and association can be very important. According to the National Park Service historic context on Public Housing in the US, 1933-1949, "public housing projects will retain integrity of association if they are the direct manifestations of important local, regional, or national events or activities."[101] Both the high-density and the low-density historic districts were direct manifestations of the Louisiana response to the federally-funded housing initiative. Similarly, integrity of feeling of a public housing district can be demonstrated by the substantial grouping of cultural and physical qualities that made up the housing development.

However, maintaining integrity of materials and workmanship is important to preserving the characteristic architectural features of these districts. For example, original brick cladding, central and side gable chimneys, ironwork galleries, and awnings over entrances are defining characteristics of these public housing developments. These developments have been occupied continuously since construction and frequently have been altered to maintain a shifting standard of living. These common alterations at sites citywide include:

- Replacement of Windows
- Replacement of tile roofing shingles
- Removal of original railings
- Addition of handicap accessibility ramps
- Addition of exterior fire escapes
- Alteration of interior spaces
- Removal of galleries

Alterations to interior spaces are common at public housing sites in New Orleans. Design guidelines published by the National Housing Agency in 1946 evidence tenant dissatisfaction with original unit plans. Alterations often corrected what tenants came to see as shortcomings by the first generation of residents.[102] Modernization or alteration of interior spaces made during the period of significance do not detract from a building's integrity, and as a result these types of alterations of individual buildings wouldn't necessarily obviate eligibility of a district. Rather, the district must be evaluated as a whole.

Demolition of historic buildings and replacement with new construction is present at all high-density housing developments. These include the St. Thomas, C.J. Peete, Iberville, Lafitte, B.W. Cooper, and St. Bernard public housing developments. At most sites, very little of the historic building stock remains. This places increased importance on sites where a larger cohesive building stock does remain, such as at Iberville and St. Thomas. New construction should be sensitive to the historic buildings at a site. They should be of an appropriate scale and appearance and shall avoid mimicking the historic buildings that remain.

The integrity of feeling at USHA-funded public housing sites in urban areas are linked to the sites' association with Depression and Pre-War Era public works. These sites continue to offer housing to low-income and working

[101] National Park Service, 2004:87.
[102] Klutznick, Philip M. *Public Housing Design: A Review of Experience in Low-Rent Housing*. Washington D.C.: National Housing Agency (1946), p.104

class families, which fulfills their initial purpose. The sites retain feeling integrity by continuing to provide affordable housing to urban residents in need.

Low-density rural districts should, at a minimum, retain association, feeling, materials, location and workmanship integrity to be eligible. Oftentimes, the geographic spread of these residential buildings across the landscape make integrity of association and feeling less obvious than in their high-density counterparts. These elements include siting, building relationships to each other (grouping), and recognizable residential form. Form in low-density developments can be identified by the relationship of residential structures to one another, as well as notable patterns, including low-profile buildings, gabled rooflines, paired entrances, brick cladding, and private or shared yards. Like in urban areas, these developments also have housed residents continuously, and have been modernized as needed. Common alterations in rural USHA-funded public housing sites include:

- Replacement of windows and doors
- Replacement of asbestos roof shingles
- Addition of handicap accessibility ramps
- Replacement of asbestos cladding
- Removal of historic clothes lines
- Addition of small outdoor utility buildings
- Alterations to interior space

Alterations to interiors are less common since low-density rural subtypes more closely fit the model of single- and double-family homes. Residents of the era seem to have preferred barracks-style twin houses on low-density footprints. Historic alterations that date from the period of significance should still be considered eligible; significant alterations from later periods should be evaluated for loss of integrity. These types of alterations of individual buildings wouldn't necessarily obviate eligibility of a district. Rather, the district must be evaluated as a whole.

Demolition and new construction is not prevalent on rural sites. Where demolition has taken place – such as Baton Rouge's Monte Sano Village and Lake Charles' Booker T. Washington Courts—nothing at all remains at the site. Other low-density rural sites in Louisiana include Carver Village and Fairway Terrace in Alexandria, Clarksdale in Baton Rouge, and the High School Park Homes in Lake Charles. Any new construction at these sites should be of appropriate scale and comparable building materials, and not interrupt the integrity of association. They should also be simple and unadorned in appearance.

Low-density rural public housing also draws integrity of feeling from pre-War and World War II-era public works, since these sites were constructed between 1941 through 1944. On a whole, these sites follow high-density urban construction by a few years. These sites also continue to house those in need of public housing assistance. This is in line with their original purpose and design. Integrity of feeling is also linked to sites' car-dependent layout, which offers access to public streets and provides off-street parking. This reflects the nationwide cultural shifts that occurred during the 1940s.

Property Type Description – Buildings
In addition to contributing resources to a historic district, some USHA-funded public housing buildings may be individually eligible for the National Register under this historic context. Some USHA-funded buildings located on both high-density urban and low density-rural public housing developments may be individually eligible on a state and local level. These types are largely divided up by relevant subtype. These are discussed in further detail by subtype in the following paragraphs.

Property Subtype—High-Density Urban
The high-density urban subtype is only found in New Orleans, and buildings found at these sites break into two distinct categories: residential and administrative. Residential buildings describe only those buildings on site directly used as tenant housing. Administrative buildings include a variety of buildings related to a site's physical and social infrastructure.

Administrative buildings themselves can be further separated into two subcategories, based on criteria for individual eligibility. The first subcategory includes administration buildings and community centers which served in social and managerial functions, while the second subcategory includes smaller ancillary buildings, such as meter houses and yard stations.

Residential
The two- and three-story residential buildings are often divided into different building types of varying lengths and widths. However, the different types are generally hip- and side-gabled buildings with rectangular footprints. Often court-yard oriented, the residential buildings featured common characteristics, such as brick exteriors, central and side gable chimneys, parapets, and first floor stoops. The high-density urban subtype originally featured Creole elements which are found in the ornamental ironwork galleries and porches. Roofs historically were clad in terra cotta and asbestos, but most have been replaced with modern asphalt shingles. Foundations of residential buildings are typically enclosed. Buildings that exhibited these defining characteristics, which mark them as federally-funded building stock, even to an untrained eye, could rise to the level of individual eligibility, given their direct historical relevance to USHA-funded public housing construction between 1935 and 1950. A singular residential structure that remains from this period could rise to the level of individual eligibility for its architecture (Criterion C), if it "embod[ies] the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction," related to the USHA program. Such an individually eligible building would need at a minimum, integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship; it is likely that integrity of feeling and association would not be present in such a circumstance. For the same reason, absent the context of a collection of such buildings, it is unlikely that a singular building remaining from a larger housing development could retain enough integrity of feeling or association to be individually eligible under Criterion A.

Administrative
Housing development sites had administration buildings and community centers, which were designated for multiple purposes and were constructed separately from the residential buildings. Administration buildings typically had a T-plan footprint and faced a major roadway; often they were seen as the "entrance" to the development. These separate buildings were clad in the same brick exterior as the residential buildings. Not all administration buildings in New Orleans public housing developments are still extant. Administration buildings such as these also supported the social function of public housing sites, and relate to a site's overall social history in a significant way, thus giving these buildings the potential for individual eligibility under Criterion C, as well. These buildings frequently were more ornate than residential buildings, and details that may qualify administration buildings and community centers for individual eligibility include:

- quoins
- pediments
- porticos
- cupolas

In order for these administrative buildings to be individually eligible under Criterion C, they would need to possess the majority of those characteristics listed above, which mark them as originating from the federally-

funded housing program in Louisiana. As is the case with residential structures, administrative buildings could not to rise to the level of individual eligibility under Criterion A absent a larger social context; however, they could represent the distinctive qualities of the USHA residential construction program under Criterion C, if those architecturally distinct characteristics listed above were retained. For these buildings to possess the qualities of significance for individual eligibility under Criterion C they would need to retain integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and location.

For individually eligible Administrative buildings, however, some interior integrity would need to be intact from the period of use. At a minimum, the main entryway should still be the central entrance, which in high-density developments usually opened onto a large room that served as a designated "public space" meant to serve a variety of community needs, such as classes and training sessions. Adjacent to these public spaces were large conference rooms which served nearby administrative offices. A corridor usually led from the initial public space to the rear of administrative buildings, where management offices were usually located. Large rooms at the rear of administration buildings linked by these corridors were often used for stock rooms and storage. Like the residences, the early administration buildings frequently demonstrated shortcomings in design that were altered within the period of significance or soon thereafter, so interior alterations will need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Ancillary

Ancillary buildings that were related to infrastructure, such as meter houses, sheds, and yard houses typically were smaller one-story buildings with rectangular footprints. Clad in the same brick exterior as the residential buildings, meter houses generally featured metal louvered venting, metal doors, and hipped tile roofs. Yard stations may also exist at New Orleans public housing developments. These stations also were one-story utilitarian buildings with rectangular footprints that typically featured side gabled tile roofs. Yard stations were clad in the same exterior brick as the residential buildings. Job or project office buildings also were located on the housing development sites to provide general office space. Typical original features of project offices included a long, rectangular footprint with galleries, chimneys, and side gabled roofs. These buildings were not directly related to the social history of a public housing site, as their construction is based on simple functional necessity. Moreover, other than brick cladding, these structures do not feature a set of characteristics that distinctively identify them as being related to the USHA program in Louisiana. Due to this fact, infrastructural buildings do not possess the qualities of significance for individual eligibility under either Criteria A or C, but rather possess significance only as part of an overall district.

Property Subtype – Low-density Rural

The low-density rural subtype housing development is found throughout smaller areas of Louisiana. This property subtype includes residential buildings, administration and service buildings, utility sheds, small parking lots, recreational playgrounds, and typically large shared yards. These buildings are limited to single-story residential buildings, and are generally less dense geographically than their urban counterparts. Frequently residences were located on large lawns, and fronted cul-de-sacs. Virtually all of these low-density complexes feature twin houses, served by paired doors on their facades. Each two-unit building is detached. Sheds, where they were present, were small gable roofed, brick clad, and generally located in back yard areas.

Low-density housing development sites also had separate administrative and ancillary buildings, which were designated for multiple purposes. These buildings typically were located centrally in the complex, for easy community access. Unlike in cities, these administration buildings did not feature architectural adornment, but rather were clad and massed to match the low-profile residential buildings.

Property Type Significance – Buildings
Individual buildings on both high- and low-density public housing developments could be eligible for statewide significance under Criterion C, as examples of Louisiana's response to federal public housing legislation as part of the United States' New Deal program. To be eligible, these buildings must exhibit architectural features that are representative or unique examples of local elements in the programmatic architecture. If that were the case, such buildings could be unique examples of federally-funded architecture in Louisiana during the New Deal era.

Property Type Registration Requirements – Buildings
Buildings at both urban high-density and rural low-density sites can be subdivided into three notable categories: residential, administrative, and ancillary. Individual residential or administrative buildings located on a public housing development may be eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C through this Multiple Property Listing if they possess at a minimum integrity of location, setting, materials, and workmanship; these aspects of the structure, in turn, likely will clearly evoke feeling and association with the USHA program, regardless of the context. Ancillary buildings, such as the yard houses and meter houses described in previous sections will not qualify for individual eligibility under any criteria.

Residential
Residential buildings on a public housing development site embody most directly to the purpose of the USHA federal public housing program. Due to this strong link to the greater social history of a site, residential buildings can potentially qualify for the National Register of Historic Places both as part of a group or on an individual basis. As a group, residential buildings most clearly are eligible under Criterion A, for their strong association with the social history of federally-funded public housing in Louisiana between 1935 and 1950. As NPS Bulletin 15, "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation" points out, a property eligible under Criterion A "is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that made up its character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event, historical pattern, or person(s)."[103] If a group of residential, or mixed residential and administrative, structures possess integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and location, they certainly will also possess integrity of association and feeling. In such a group, some amount of design or material alteration would be common, and not negate the eligibility of the group; common alterations, both historic and modern, include replacement of roof materials, windows, and doors. An aggregate of these alterations would not necessarily render a group of buildings ineligible under this context, since these housing units have been continuously occupied and still evoke their association with Criterion A. At high-density urban housing development sites, these alterations often sought to address shortcomings identified by residents, and ultimately informed regulations around federal public housing design. A group of residential buildings on a site may provide a large enough sample to negate the effects of alterations on that group's eligibility under Criterion A. A group of several buildings could also be eligible under Criterion C, if the group was not a large or centralized enough to represent a clear association with federally-funded housing developments; for example, if there were 3-4 buildings separated by newer infill, so that the group is not evident from the street. These could also be nominated as several individual nominations under Criterion C.

Individual residential buildings can potentially qualify as eligible listings, however, only under Criterion C. As NPS Bulletin 15, "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation" points out, a property eligible under Criterion C are significant "for their physical design or construction," specifically if the building embodies "distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction." If a residential building remains as the last example of its building type at a site, it has been removed from the majority of its social context, and cannot

[103] NPS Bulletin 15, 1997:51.

be eligible under Criterion A for its association with the social history of federally-funded public housing. To be individually eligible under Criterion C, the building must retain a high degree of material, workmanship, and design integrity to remain eligible as a singular example of a site's development, especially is the site is largely-redeveloped or demolished. Residential buildings constructed as part of the USHA federal housing program between 1935 and 1950 do possess recognizable architectural characteristics associated with this housing program. These characteristics include those related to high-density urban buildings types, and low-density rural building types. Individual buildings must retain a high level of interior spatial integrity as well; however, it is clear that overall size of apartments was altered historically, and so precise original interior layout need not be replicated. However, building entrances, the relationship of window and door openings, and the location and design of architecturally designed exterior spaces, such as stoops and balconies, must be retained. Individual buildings differ in this respect from groups of residential buildings, as individual buildings provide the sole remaining example of construction and development on a given site. Loss of design, materials, and/or workmanship likely would be a fatal flaw in nominating a building under Criterion C. The character defining features specific to a residential building as they relate to material, workmanship, and design integrities include the following:

Material
- brick exteriors
- first-floor concrete steps

Design
- central or side-gabled chimneys
- parapets

Workmanship
- retention of those character-defining features noted above, including original configuration of openings, exterior spaces, ironwork detailing, and spatial organization
- retention of important "bonus" or "upgrade" features, where present, such as fireplaces
- retention of workmanship quality post-renovation

Administrative

Administrative buildings such as managerial offices and community buildings may qualify as a group under Criterion A, if grouped with other residential and Administrative buildings, or if there were a grouping of several individual buildings under Criterion C. They represent an association with the social history of federally-funded public housing due to their former use by administrative staff in carrying out the various social goals of the USHA public housing program, or communal uses by the residential community. This directly relates to Criterion A's significance based on events or social patterns. These buildings represented the governmental presence and/or the residential community purpose of a public housing site. These buildings also may be individually eligible under Criterion C if they retain a high level of integrity of design, materials, and workmanship.

Administration and community use buildings often exhibited more ornamentation than residential buildings, and may be significant if ornamentation such as quoins, porticos, pediments, and cupolas remain in place. However, absent the residential buildings that formed the raison d'etre for housing development, these buildings do not qualify for individual eligibility under Criterion A, since they have no residential context to relate to, and therefore cannot be associated with or evoke the feeling of the USHA program's government presence at a federally-funded public housing site. The characteristics specific to an administrative building as they relate to material, workmanship, and design integrities include the following:

Material
- brick exteriors

Design
- T-shaped floorplan
- entrance facing a major roadway
- quoins
- pediments
- porticos
- cupolas

Workmanship
- retention of those character-defining features noted above, including original detailed ornamentation, configuration of openings, exterior spaces, and spatial organization
- centralized main entryways, immediate designated public spaces, and adjacent conference rooms; these interior organizations will need to be examined on a case-by-case basis, since interior organizations often changed within or soon after the period of significance to overcome design shortcomings
- retention of workmanship quality post-renovation

Ancillary

Ancillary buildings such as meter houses, yard houses, and utility sheds are not individually eligible under any criteria. These acted purely in an infrastructural capacity on a public housing site. They did not serve any social function, cannot evoke the social history of the residential development, and did not possess any characteristic design elements that could make them architecturally significant. These buildings however can contribute to the eligibility of an overall site.

G. Geographical Data

The following high-density urban public housing developments are included in this MPN: St. Thomas, Magnolia, Iberville, Lafitte, Calliope, and St. Bernard. These sites are all located in New Orleans, Louisiana.

The following low-density rural public housing developments are included in this MPN: Fairway Terrace and Carver Village of Alexandria, LA, Clarksdale of Baton Rouge, LA, and High School Park Homes of Lake Charles, LA. In addition, the Monte Sano Village in East Baton Rouge (built '41-43), and the Booker T. Washington Courts in Lake Charles (built '41-42) also were studied for their part in the historic housing trend; however, they have both been completely demolished.

H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

The multiple property listing of United States Housing Authority-funded public housing developments focused on resources in the state of Louisiana. These were all constructed during the period of significance between 1935 and 1950.

Background research began at the Housing Authority of New Orleans archives to identify blueprints, site plans, and historical publications for the developments located in New Orleans. Research continued into the City Archives and in the Special Collections of the New Orleans Public Library. Here researchers sought additional information on the Housing Authority of New Orleans, and local city council documents concerning public housing developments in the city. Researchers also visited the National Archives and Records Administration in College Park, MD to examine New Deal Era housing records and internal publications. The Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, the Southeastern Architectural Archive, and the Architecture Library of Tulane University were all consulted during the research process. The archives of the McNeese State University library were consulted for information on low-density rural developments in Lake Charles, Louisiana.

Field investigations began with site visits to both a low-density rural development, and several high-density urban developments. Researchers recorded information on remaining structures at each site, modern renovations, and current site plans. Researchers also took photos of buildings at these sites when necessary.

Historic contexts are organized by both chronology and government level (i.e. local, state, federal). The property types are organized by similarities in density, design, and regional location. The architectural design and site planning of individual developments were taken into consideration during the development of eligibility requirements. The sites identified in this form represent the physical results of significant New Deal & Pre-World War II federal legislation. They are also examples of the architectural and design philosophies of their era.

I. Major Bibliographical References

Brodtmann, James P. *Report of the Housing Authority of New Orleans For the Year Ending December 31, 1941*. New Orleans, Louisiana: Housing Authority of New Orleans (1942), p.33

Campanella, Richard. *Geographies of New Orleans: Urban Fabrics Before the Storm*. Lafayette, Louisiana: Center for Louisiana Studies, 2006.

Congressional Research Service. *A Chronology of Housing Legislation and Selected Executive Actions, 1892-2003*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004. http://financialservices.house.gov/media/pdf/108-d.pdf.

"'District' Personnel Taking Up Residence in 'Back of Town' Area After Quarter Clean Up," *New Orleans Item-Tribune*, 29 September 1940

Division of Information. *America Builds: The Record of PWA, Public Works Administration.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939. https://ia600300.us.archive.org/27/items/americabuilds00unitrich/americabuilds00unitrich.pdf.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum. "FDR and Housing Legislation: 75th Anniversary of the Wagner-Steagall Housing Act of 1937." Accessed May 21, 2014. http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/aboutfdr/housing.html.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum. "1944 State of the Union Address: FDR's Second Bill of Rights or Economic Bill of Rights Speech." Accessed May 22, 2014, http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/archives/stateoftheunion.html.

Friedman, Lawrence M. "Public Housing and the Poor: An Overview." *California Law Review* 54, no. 2 (May 1966), article 12. http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview/vol54/iss2/12.

Holt, Thomas C. "The Second Great Migration, 1940-70," accessed May 28, 2014, http://www.inmotionaame.org/texts/viewer.cfm?id=9_000T&page=1.

Housing Authority of New Orleans. *Report of the Housing Authority of New Orleans For the Period March 1, 1937 to December 31, 1938*. New Orleans, Louisiana. Housing Authority of New Orleans. *Report of the Housing Authority of New Orleans For the Year Ending December 31, 1939*. New Orleans, Louisiana.

Klutznick, Philip M. *Public Housing Design: A Review of Experience in Low-Rent Housing*. Washington D.C.: National Housing Agency (1946), p.28

Living New Deal. "New Deal Programs & Timeline." Accessed May 22, 2014. http://livingnewdeal.berkeley.edu/resources/timeline/.

Lusignan, Paul R., Judith Robinson, Laura Bobeczo, and Jeremy Shrimpton. *National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form: Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949.* Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004.

Marks, Carole. "The Great Migration: African Americans Searching for the Promised Land, 1916-1930," accessed May 28, 2014, http://www.inmotionaame.org/texts/viewer.cfm?id=8_000T&page=1.

National Park Service. "Public Housing in the US, MPS." Department of the Interior, 2004.

"Nathan Strauss to Inspect Housing Conditions Here," The Times-Picayune, 10 December 1939.

Owens-Manley, Judith. "The Emergence of Public Housing." Accessed May 22, 2014, http://www.hamilton.edu/cache/the-emergence-of-public-housing.

Radford, Gail. *Modern Housing for America: Policy Struggles in the New Deal Era*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Record Group 207. Records of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1935-1942. U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, Washington D.C. and College Park, MD

Saxon, Lyle. "Old New Orleans Fades with Years," *The Times-Picayune*, 8 November 1920.

Stoloff, J.A. *A Brief History of Public Housing*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Undated.

"Tenement House Commission Year," *The Times-Picayune*, 2 January 1910.

University of Virginia Library. "Historical Census, County-level Results for 1910," accessed May 28, 2014, http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/php/county.php.

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Housing Agency, Federal Public Housing Authority. *Public Housing Design: A Review of Experience in Low-Rent Housing*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1946.

U.S. Department of the Interior, United States Housing Authority. *Bulletin No. 11 On Policy and Procedure: Site Planning*, 15 August 1938. Record Group 96, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, United States Housing Authority. "Deputy Administrator Order No. 16," 24 August 1939. Record Group 96, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, United States Housing Authority. "Order No. 32," 22 December 1937. Record Group 96, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C.

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration.. "Records of the Federal Housing Administration [FHA] (Record Group 31)" and "Records of the Public Works Administration [PWA] (Record Group 135)." Accessed May 22, 2014. http://www.archives.gov/research/guide-fed-records/groups/031.html and http://www.archives.gov/research/guide-fed-records/groups/135.html, respectively

Von Hoffman, Alexander. "The Origins of American Housing Reform," accessed May 29, 2014, http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/jchs.harvard.edu/files/von_hoffman_w98-2.pdf

Walker, Richard. "The New Deal in Brief." Accessed May 22, 2014. http://livingnewdeal.berkeley.edu/Indp-content/uploads/2012/01/New-Deal-in-Brief.pdf.

White House Historical Association. "Franklin D. Roosevelt." Accessed May 22, 2014. http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents/franklindroosevelt.

Williams, L. Kemper. *Annual Report 1937-1938*. New Orleans, Louisiana: Housing Authority of New Orleans, 1938.

Wood, Edith Elmer. *Slums and Blighted Areas in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1935.

Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.* Cambridge, Massachusettes: MIT Press, 1995.

National Register of Historic Places
Memo to File

Correspondence

The Correspondence consists of communications from (and possibly to) the nominating authority, notes from the staff of the National Register of Historic Places, and/or other material the National Register of Historic Places received associated with the property.
Correspondence may also include information from other sources, drafts of the nomination, letters of support or objection, memorandums, and ephemera which document the efforts to recognize the property.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
EVALUATION/RETURN SHEET

Requested Action: COVER DOCUMENTATION

Multiple Name: United States Housing Authority Funded Public Housing in Louisiana MPS

State & County: LOUISIANA, Orleans

Date Received: Date of 45th Day:

Reference number: MC64501224

Reason For Review:

__ Appeal	__ PDIL	__ Text/Data Issue
__ SHPO Request	__ Landscape	__ Photo
__ Waiver	__ National	__ Map/Boundary
__ Resubmission	__ Mobile Resource	__ Period
__ Other	__ TCP	__ Less than 50 years
	__ CLG	

_____ Accept _____ Return _____ Reject _____ Date

Abstract/Summary Comments:

Recommendation/ Criteria

DOCUMENTATION: see attached comments: No see attached SLR: No

If a nomination is returned to the nomination authority, the nomination is no longer under consideration by the National Park Service.

14000692

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
EVALUATION/RETURN SHEET

REQUESTED ACTION: COVER DOCUMENTATION

MULTIPLE NAME: United States Housing Authority (USHA) Funded Housing in Louisiana, 1935-1950 MPS

STATE & COUNTY: LOUISIANA, Multiple Counties

DATE RECEIVED: 08/08/14 DATE OF 16TH DAY: 09/24/14

REFERENCE NUMBER: 64501226

___ACCEPT ___✓___RETURN ___REJECT 9.24.2014 DATE

ABSTRACT/SUMMARY COMMENTS:

See Attached Comments

RECOM./CRITERIA Return

REVIEWER _____ DISCIPLINE _____

TELEPHONE _____ DATE _____

DOCUMENTATION see attached comments Y/N see attached SLR Y/N

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20240

The United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Return/Evaluation Sheet

Property Name: United States Public Housing Authority (USHA) Funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-1950 MPS (Cover Document)

Reference Number: 64501226

This MPS Cover Document is being returned for technical revision.

The registration requirements, especially those for the property type - buildings, need to be re-written to clarify why an individual building from a larger complex can stand alone as an eligible resource. There are also a few editorial comments that need to be addressed.

Overall, the registration requirements for the two district types are adequate. On page F-24, when talking about alteration of interior spaces, insert a sentence that indicates that alterations made during hte period of significance do not need to be considered as detracting from integrity (since they "often corrected what tenants see as shortcomings").

Please also note that the citation for the MPS on Public Housing, first found in footnote #39, incorrectly identifies one of the authors. It is Paul R. Lusignan, not Longman.

On page F-22, first paragraph, it notes the presence of "aluminum 2/2 windows." Are these post-war? Or replacements? Aluminum windows would have been very uncommon during the 1935-1950 period.

The property type - Buildings is the most problematic. In the description of the High Density Urban subtype, building types are identified as residential, administrative and service, yard stations, meter houses, and jobs offices. I am trying to imagine a situation where a meter house can stand alone as an individually significant building under any criterion or at any level of significance. Since the concept of this MPS is it identify resources associated with social history, and the influence of the federal government in public housing, ancillary or support buildings such as meter houses or yard stations are not likely to be individually eligible. The most important buildings in any of these complexes, whether dense urban or low-density rural are going to be those that are directly associated with the theme - residential buildings, community buildings (clubhouses/community halls), and administrative buildings. The first two are where the targeted community lived and gathered, the latter is where the ever-present shadow of governmental intervention was housed. The registration requirements need to focus on these types of individual buildings, and they need to be more explicit in defining first *why* a single building that survives a once larger complex can be eligible, and then what characteristics of this building type must be present in order to be individually eligible. As presented, the registration requirements are vague and could be construed to mean

that a single building in an extant larger complex could be listed. The situations where a single building can be listed must be explicitly described.

The nomination for the Iberville Public Housing Development Historic District is also being returned. We cannot accept a nomination under an MPS Cover until th Cover itself is accepted.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I can be reached at (202) 354-2275 or email at <James_Gabbert@nps.gov>.

Sincerely,

Jim Gabbert, Historian
National Register of Historic Places
9/26/2014

JAY DARDENNE
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

State of Louisiana

OFFICE OF THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE, RECREATION & TOURISM
OFFICE OF CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

PAM BREAUX
ASSISTANT SECRETARY

November 18, 2014

TO: Mr. James Gabbert
National Park Service 2280, 8th Floor; National Register of Historic Places
1201 "I" Street, NW; Washington, DC 20005

FROM: Jessica Richardson, National Register Coordinator
Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation

RE: United States Housing Authority-funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-50 Multiple Property Documentation Form

Jim,

The enclosed disk contains the true and correct copy of the USHA-funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-50 MPDF to the National Register of Historic Places as edited per your guidance. The second disk contains the photographs of the property in TIF format. Should you have any questions, please contact me at 225-219-4595 or jrichardson@crt.la.gov.

Thanks,

Jessica JR

Enclosures:
__x__ CD with PDF of the National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form
_____ CD with electronic images (tif format)
__x__ Physical Transmission Letter
__x__ Physical Signature Page, with original signature
_____ Other:

Comments:
__x__ Please ensure that this nomination receives substantive review
_____ This property has been certified under 36 CFR 67
_____ The enclosed owner(s) objection(s) do_____ do not_____ constitute a majority of property owners.
_____ Other:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
EVALUATION/RETURN SHEET

REQUESTED ACTION: NOMINATION

PROPERTY NAME: Iberville Public Housing Development Historic District

MULTIPLE NAME: United States Housing Authority Funded Public Housing in Louisiana MPS

STATE & COUNTY: LOUISIANA, Orleans

DATE RECEIVED: 8/08/14 DATE OF PENDING LIST: 9/04/14
DATE OF 16TH DAY: 9/19/14 DATE OF 45TH DAY: 9/24/14
DATE OF WEEKLY LIST:

REFERENCE NUMBER: 14000692

REASONS FOR REVIEW:

APPEAL:	N	DATA PROBLEM:	N	LANDSCAPE:	N	LESS THAN 50 YEARS:	N
OTHER:	N	PDIL:	N	PERIOD:	N	PROGRAM UNAPPROVED:	N
REQUEST:	N	SAMPLE:	N	SLR DRAFT:	N	NATIONAL:	N

COMMENT WAIVER: N

___ACCEPT ✓ RETURN ___REJECT 9.24.2014 DATE

ABSTRACT/SUMMARY COMMENTS:

MPS Cover Returned
Nomination Returned with Cover

RECOM./CRITERIA Return

REVIEWER _____ DISCIPLINE _____

TELEPHONE _____ DATE _____

DOCUMENTATION see attached comments Y/N see attached SLR Y/N

If a nomination is returned to the nominating authority, the nomination is no longer under consideration by the NPS.

The United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Return/Evaluation Sheet

Property Name: United States Public Housing Authority (USHA) Funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-1950 MPS (Cover Document)

Reference Number: 64501226

This MPS Cover Document is being returned for technical revision.

The registration requirements, especially those for the property type - buildings, need to be re-written to clarify why an individual building from a larger complex can stand alone as an eligible resource. There are also a few editorial comments that need to be addressed.

Overall, the registration requirements for the two district types are adequate. On page F-24, when talking about alteration of interior spaces, insert a sentence that indicates that alterations made during hte period of significance do not need to be considered as detracting from integrity (since they "often corrected what tenants see as shortcomings").

Please also note that the citation for the MPS on Public Housing, first found in footnote #39, incorrectly identifies one of the authors. It is Paul R. Lusignan, not Longman.

On page F-22, first paragraph, it notes the presence of "aluminum 2/2 windows." Are these post-war? Or replacements? Aluminum windows would have been very uncommon during the 1935-1950 period.

The property type - Buildings is the most problematic. In the description of the High Density Urban subtype, building types are identified as residential, administrative and service, yard stations, meter houses, and jobs offices. I am trying to imagine a situation where a meter house can stand alone as an individually significant building under any criterion or at any level of significance. Since the concept of this MPS is it identify resources associated with social history, and the influence of the federal government in public housing, ancillary or support buildings such as meter houses or yard stations are not likely to be individually eligible. The most important buildings in any of these complexes, whether dense urban or low-density rural are going to be those that are

directly associated with the theme - residential buildings, community buildings (clubhouses/community halls), and administrative buildings. The first two are where the targeted community lived and gathered, the latter is where the ever-present shadow of governmental intervention was housed. The registration requirements need to focus on these types of individual buildings, and they need to be more explicit in defining first *why* a single building that survives a once larger complex can be eligible, and then what characteristics of this building type must be present in order to be individually eligible. As presented, the registration requirements are vague and could be construed to mean that a single building in an extant larger complex could be listed. The situations where a single building can be listed must be explicitly described.

The nomination for the Iberville Public Housing Development Historic District is also being returned. We cannot accept a nomination under an MPS Cover until th Cover itself is accepted.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I can be reached at (202) 354-2275 or email at <James_Gabbert@nps.gov>.

Sincerely,

Jim Gabbert, Historian
National Register of Historic Places
9/26/2014

JAY DARDENNE
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

State of Louisiana

OFFICE OF THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE, RECREATION & TOURISM
OFFICE OF CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

PAM BREAUX
ASSISTANT SECRETARY

July 30, 2014

TO: Mr. James Gabbert
National Park Service 2280, 8th Floor; National Register of Historic Places
1201 "I" Street, NW; Washington, DC 20005

FROM: Jessica Richardson, National Register Coordinator
Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation

RE: United States Housing Authority-funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-50 Multiple Property Documentation Form

Jim,

The enclosed disk contains the true and correct copy of the USHA-funded Public Housing in Louisiana, 1935-50 MPDF to the National Register of Historic Places. The second disk contains the photographs of the property in TIF format. Should you have any questions, please contact me at 225-219-4595 or jrichardson@crt.la.gov.

Thanks,

Jessica

Enclosures:
_x_ CD with PDF of the National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form
___ CD with electronic images (tif format)
_x_ Physical Transmission Letter
_x_ Physical Signature Page, with original signature
___ Other:

Comments:
_x_ Please ensure that this nomination receives substantive review
___ This property has been certified under 36 CFR 67
___ The enclosed owner(s) objection(s) do_____ do not_____ constitute a majority of property owners.
___ Other: