in eight-six was certainly a big year for anniversaries. Our Na-
tion celebrated its 210th birthday, the Statue of Liberty had its centennial, and the National Park Service observed its seventh anniversary. In this special supplement to Preservation News, the National Park Service is pleased to join with the National Trust for Historic Preservation in marking another milestone, the 20th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act.

When I was appointed California's first State Historic Preservation Officer 20 years ago by Governor Ronald Reagan, we did not dream that the historic preservation program would grow to the size and importance it has today. I am happy to say now in my position as Director of the National Park Service (NPS), that the Act of 1966 has been a success. The Act heralded a new partnership between the private sector and Federal, State, and local governments in the preservation of cultural resources. And it has been through this partnership that the Act's success has come. On the occasion of the Act's 20th anniversary, the Service has both celebrated and examined the role this legislation has had in protecting our heritage. In doing so, NPS has committed itself to reaffirm and update this unique Federal, State, local, and private partnership.

A year ago, I wrote a broad spectrum of leaders in the preservation movement, inviting them to join the celebration. On December 20, 1985, I met with these preservation leaders to outline NPS plans, which resulted in three groups of proposed activities: 1) historical accounts, publications, and public information; 2) short-term management actions; and 3) program analysis and strategic directions. In my "12-Point Plan," a management plan developed as one of my first initiatives as Director, I included as an action item to "reaffirm the principles of the National Historic Preservation Act on its 20th anniversary." As part of this commitment, we will be outlining our preservation goals and objectives to the year 2000.

The articles assembled here were written by some of the people who manage the historic preservation programs in NPS, and others who have played a major role in shaping the historic preservation programs at the Federal, State, and local levels—in the public and private sectors. They talk about early decisions and directions, about lobbying and legislation, and about technical assistance and tax incentives. But most of all, they reveal the true importance of partnership, and how essential this partnership is to the future of cultural resources in this country. Historic preservation is a complex and broad-based field, and credit for its growth belongs to a great many organizations and to thousands of individuals.

In commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the 1966 Act, and in honor of the many people who have contributed to its success, we present this series of essays, written by people who have been a part of the action over the past 20 years. We hope that their perspectives and collective memories of the events that shaped the direction of the historic preservation movement will serve not only as a record of where we have been, but more importantly, provide a look at where we are heading as we jointly guide historic preservation programs into the 21st century.

When the past 80 years, Congress has enacted four major laws encouraging the preservation of America's heritage, as well as a number of other measures that use the tax code to stimulate adaptive uses of historic buildings and to encourage charitable contributions. This year marks the 20th anniversary of one of these laws, as well as the 40th anniversary of the first federal legislation, the Antiquities Act, signed by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1906. Combined with the Heritage Sites Act of 1935 and the charter for the National Trust in 1949, these laws have helped make preservation a watchword of our society, an important contributor to the quality of life for all of us.

This special supplement to Preservation News commemorates the 20th anniversary of the most recent, and possibly most important, of these acts, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. In the 1966 Act, preservationists created the strong foundation of the modern American preservation movement in gaining passage of this law. It was the legislative handwork of the then-chairman of the National Trust, Gordon Gray, and its passage made official a crucial shift of focus for the preservation movement.

The preservation movement began with a central idea of saving individual old buildings associated with the patriotic beginnings of American culture—Mount Vernon and Independence Hall are two good examples—then progressed to the realization that old buildings existed in a context that was worth preserving as well. The 1966 Act, in a sense, codified the growth and newly-found maturity of historic preservation.

The intellectual foundation of the Act was the report. With Heritage So Rich is issued by the Special Committee on Historic Preservation, convened by the U.S. Conference of Mayors. The report's recommendations are a clear call to action.

"If the preservation movement is to be successful, it must go beyond saving bricks and mortar.

"It must go beyond saving occasional historic houses and opening museums.

"It must be more than a cult of anti-quarons.

"It must do more than reverse a few precious national shrines.

"It must attempt to give a sense of ori-entation to our society, using structures and objects of the past to establish values of time and place."

These are the ideas that inspired the 1966 Act. And for the most part, they continue to set the agenda for historic preservation today.
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 Origins of The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

By Ernest Allen Connelly

1 regulation is a response of govern-

ment to expressed needs. Conse-

quently, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was brought into being to give more effective scope to public policies pertaining to historic preservation in the United States.

Since the Act of 1966 supplements the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which remains in force, it is basically explained by comparision. The Act of 1935 was framed "to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiques of national significance..." for the inspiration and benefit of the American people." The Act of 1966 was created "to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation... as a living part of our community life and development..." Clearly, the enlarged Federal interest was conceived as reaching beyond properties of national significance to include those recognized as valuable in the heritage of a State or community. And historic properties should be preserved and restored not only for educational and patriotic values, but also for their continued practical use and meaning in the scenes of daily life. The comprehensive new program, which applied to every square inch under the flag, was a response to the multiple threats to the Nation's accumulated historic estate that followed World War II. Within the first post-war decade, preservation in this country was in a state of crisis brought on by pervasive new development in the private sector and by such massive public works as water impoundment, urban renewal, and highway construction. The speed and scale at which landscape and townscape were... (continued on page 52)
being resiled were wholly unprecce-
ded.
Notwithstanding their worthy in-
tention, the public works programs were increasingly viewed as an assault on the inherited environment. Since the demolitions and other programs were usually federally supported, the increasing volume of urgent pleas to Washing-
ton went to, however, the only sure safe-
guard that could be provided was Federal ownership or control, in accordance with the Act of 1935. From 1959 to 1961, some 70 properties per year were proposed by States, cities, or private associa-
tions for inclusion in the National Park System. But such a proposal involved a process of careful evaluation that was not designed to protect the endangered properties possessed such
significant qualities to justify Federal management that it was come evdence that an additional mecha-
nism was needed to protect the kind of locally endangered properties that were being sacrificed.

Over and above the individual pro-
posals, more than 50 bills for the general protection of historic buildings, lands, and works of art were introduced in Congress between 1939 and 1963. In ex-
ence, they were pressed against various initiatives of the Administration, such as proposals to tear down some of the nation's most notable monuments of 19th-
century public architecture. Rationally, protecting Federal properties from Federal actions would seem unnecessary, clearly, it was time to put brakes on the Federal bulldozers.

Beginning in the 1960s, a rapid success-

of a number of significant bills with special programs was developed in order to protect the nation's Historic Preservation Act of 1966, with its new, well-known provisions: an expanded National Register of Historic Places, Feder-
ral grants to assist the States and the Na-
tional Trust for Historic Preservation, and a National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the protective feature of Section 106 re-
quiring a new accountability from Federal
agencies. In 1961, Reps. Harris Brown McDow-
Ell, Jr., of Delaware and Torbert H. Mac-
Donald of Massachusetts introduced two pro-
gressive bills in the House of Representa-
tives. Both bills would have amended
the Act of 1935 by requiring the Secre-
tary of the Interior to request local gov-
ernments to supply lists of historic prop-
erties valuable to the localities and to publish the lists. Further, the head of any Federal agency undertaking a project would have to consult the lists before any expenditure of Federal funds to take into account the effect of the proj-
ect on listed properties.

Full expression of views on a project would be afforded in public hearings held at appropriate stages of its develop-
ment. The Department of the Interior supported the objectives of the bills but recommended a new act rather than an amendment. States were invited to make uniform criteria to permit ra-
ional integration of the local lists into the national registry already maintained by the National Park Service and to facili-
tate mutual exchange of data. It also pro-
posed limited financial assistance to the States on a matching basis for five years, to ensure even reliability in the lists and to encourage their adoption. The act was delayed. Hearings were never held on these bills, and the fruit of 1966 was already maturing.

An experimental event, the Seminar on Restoration and Preservation, was held in September 1963 in Williamsburg, Vir-
ginia. Its proceedings were published as Historic Preservation Today (1964). Meanwhile, its forward-looking thinking on Principles and Guidelines for Historic Preservation in the United States was adopted by the National Trust at its an-
nual meeting in San Antonio, October 1964. It envisioned the heritage as ex-
tending beyond individual buildings to include districts and landscapes. It em-
phasized the need for surveys and adequate registers at the national, state, and community levels, urging the incor-
poration of historic preservation values into planning at all echelons of govern-
ment.

The concern for city problems was so prevalent in these years that the Presi-
dent's Task Force on the Preservation of National Beauty included urban design among the subjects it considered. Submit-
ting its report in November 1964, the task force held that a resolution with un-
iqueness was the quality of the buildings and areas of historic and aesthetic signifi-
cance. It recommended that the National Park Service be required to complete, within five years, a comprehensive inves-
tory of the Nation's historic proper-
ties on a broadened concept of what ought to be saved, and to keep such files through workable system for the protec-
tion of those assets. It recommended cre-
atation of a board with power to veto Fed-
eral expenditures when necessary to pre-
vent Federally financed projects from conflicting with historic preservation. It called for Federal loans and grants to State and local governments for the preser-
vation task, and an annual appropriation of $2 million to give the National Trust a new lease on life.

The townscapes played in the White-

House Conference on Natural Beauty, 1965, reframed the task force's rec-
ommendations, with emphasis on the creation of historic districts and the over-
all impact on policies to encourage greater private investments in the preservation of approved historic and landmark struc-
tures and areas. The conference pro-
ceedings were published under the title Beauty for America (1965).

Calling for the conference in his Mes-

gage on Natural Beauty, February 1965, President Johnson also declared that the government should share in the effort to save "landmarks of beauty and beauty". He pledged support for the Na-
tional Trust and legislation to authorize grants to help local authorities carry out such purposes. The Department of the Interior drafted legislation to authorize the President's program. Although it was cleaned by the Bureau of the Budget, the Office of Management and Budget, it was overshadowed by the attention to the blue ribbon Special Commis-
sion on Historic Preservation, which began its work in October 1965.

Covered by Laurence G. Henderson, director of the Joint Committee on Housing and Urban Development, and Carl Feiss,
1965, the bipartisan Special Committee was organized under auspices of the United States Conference of Mayors, with financial support from the Ford Foundation. Known as the Rains Committee after its chairman, Rep. Albert Rains, the group made a road tour of Europe and prompt-
ly, at a meeting in New York on Decem-
ber 3, settled on final recommendations.

With staff assistance from the National Trust, the committee's report was pub-
lished as a book, With Heritage So Rich (1967, Resources for the Future Press in 1985), which appeared on the desk of every member of the House of Representatives on February 9, 1966. Only six months had elapsed since inception of the committee.

On February 25, 1966, President John-
son delivered his message on the Quality of the Environment, in which he stated: Historic preservation is the goal of citizen groups in every part of the country. To help preserve buildings and sites of historic significance, I will recommend a program of matching grants to States and to the Nation-
al Trust for Historic Preservation.

The legislative proposal previously developed in the National Park Service was promptly revised and sent forward. It was introduced in Congress by the Inter-
ior Committee's chairmen Henry M. Jackson in the Senate and Wayne N. As-
pinall in the House. As a service to the Rains Committee, Interior's legislative offi-
cer drafted a bill based on the recom-
mendations in With Heritage So Rich. It was introduced by the Congressional members of the Rains Committee: Sen. Edmund Muskie and Rep. Walter B. Winstead. Thus, in March 1966, there were introduced two sets of bills that were to become the National Historic Pres-
servation Act within the short span of seven months. In the legislative process of 25, it was agreed between the two approaches, as in the de-
liberations of the Rains Committee, criti-
cal roles were played by Gordon Gray, chairman of the National Trust, and George B. Harrell, administrator of the Na-
tional Park Service. The resulting act was a distillation of the content of re-
ports and proposals that had been fer-
menting for six or seven years.

Enron Allen Comity, currently the Chief Ap-
pellate Attorney for the tax certification pro-
rgrams of the National Park Service and the First Director, Office of Archaeology and His-
toric Preservation (OAH), 1967-1972, and Associate Director, National Park Service and Heritage Conservation and Recreat-

By Sidelle L. Longsworth

The organization of national grass-
roots advocacy for historic preserva-
tion, followed the enactment of early

preservation laws by many years. Success in 1966, and even 1976 was the result of well-placed men of vision such as Fran-
dor Gray (1966 Act), Richard Nixon (Executive Order 11953), and J. Glenn Fawcett (Senate Bill). However, the success leading to the 1976 Tax Reform incentives). While the results were excellent, it became clear that the need for a stronger legisla-
tion and appropriation at the Federal
level of government should no longer be left to the "luck of leadership" but should involve the thousands of Americans ac-
tive in preservation in their own commu-
nities. Preservation Action, the national grassroots lobby for historic preservation and neighborhood conservation, was spawned in this environment.

Preservation Action's entry into the political arena brought with it the chal-
lenge to redefine "historic preservation" in terms that would broaden our accep-
tance by politicians as akin to profession-
as in related fields. We had to under-
stand preservation as an environmental issue, a real estate issue, a local commu-


nity betterment issue, a design issue, a legal issue, an energy issue, and a heri-
itage issue, all at the same time. We had to develop answers and facts that would communicate with other potential sup-
porters.

• Members of Congress, governors, and mayors would ask us how many people were created by preservation, how aban-

doned buildings could be put back on the tax rolls, and what this would cost.

• Developers would only be interested in revitalizing older buildings and decaying


• Architects would need to understand the merits of designing new buildings and the preservation of historic areas that en-


• Planners were in the habit of ridding cities of anything old. They would not acccept


• Environmentalists were so busy with


• Environmentalists were so busy with


• Environmentalists were so busy with
The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and its review of Federal agency actions that affect historic properties, are creatures of the National Historic Preservation Act. The 106 process that preservationists rely on to ensure that Federal agencies pay attention to historic properties involved during the first decade or so of the Council’s existence. The process, and the policies and principles upon which it is founded, developed in response to the cases with which the Council was faced during its formative years. In its first decade, the Council reviewed several 4,000 Federal undertakings today about half that many are under review in a single year. Of those first 4,000, several stand out as particularly important in the development of the Section 106 context and associated Council policies. Each of the following cases has been reviewed and commented upon by the full Council, establishing principles that the Council has followed ever since.

Consultation and Consideration of Alternatives: The San Francisco Mint

The early case that established the necessity for consultation and consideration of alternatives began in June of 1969 when the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Rehabilitation and Welfare (HEW) proposed an alternative to the State of California, which planned to demolish it. The Council spoke strongly against demolition, calling HUD’s plan, "It should work with government and private interests to explore alternatives. In commenting on the reasoning of this comment, Council Chairman S. K. Stevens and I traveled to San Francisco. We consulted with HEW representatives and representatives of State and local governments to consider alternatives. Rebuilding the Mint to the Department of the Treasury for restoration and adaptive use proved the most feasible alternative. The Mint was saved. Based on this model, we build consultation and explicit attention to alternatives is the process we then developed and continue to use today. The Treasury—of the roots of today’s regulations.

Indirect Effects: Saratoga Battlefield

Early in 1968, the Atomic Energy Commission sought Council comment on a nuclear power plant that it proposed to permit the Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation to build across the Hudson River from Saratoga Battlefield in New York State. The project would have had no direct effect on the battlefield, but would have introduced visual elements of character from the site’s historical significance. This was the first case in which only indirect effects were at issue, but the Council unhesitatingly accepted the legitimacy of addressing such effects, and they have been considered on an equal footing with direct effects ever since.

Design Quality: Georgetown University

The very first case to come before the Council was the proposal of Georgetown University, using Federal financial assistance, to build a heating and cooling plant on its campus, which was Georgetown Historic District in Washington, D.C. The Council indicated a series of principles that it believed should be followed prior to new construction within historic districts: that buildings should be considered in relation to their environment; that new buildings should improve, not degrade, the unique quality of their neighborhood; and that new construction should not imitate historic architectural styles, but should be sympathetic in scale, texture, color, and materials. These principles were later integrated into the Secretary of the Interior’s “Standards for Preserving and Protecting Sites in National Parks,” which the Council concluded should be followed.

Comprehensive Planning and Archeology: Hunter-Liggett Military Installation

After issuance of Executive Order 11993 in 1971, the Council experienced an increase in cases involving archeology and western land management agencies. Beginning in 1972, a series of problems came to council attention at Fort Hunter-Liggett, in an installation in central California. We were called to meet a meeting there in 1975 to review the archeological problems with both historic buildings and, particularly, archeological sites. Recommended was a comprehensive survey of the installation designed to accommodate the protection of archeological sites and other historic properties within the Army’s ongoing training mission. This was the beginning of the Council’s emphasis on comprehensive planning and programming, which contribute to the management of historic properties, particularly with respect to archeological resources.

Traditional Cultural Values: Moanalua Valley

In 1975, the Federal Highway Administration requested the Council’s comments on a plan to build “Interstate” Highway H-3 through the Moanalua Valley on the island of Oahu in Hawaii. The highway was listed in the National Register, and the entire valley had been determined eligible for the Register. The Moanalua Valley was bitterly opposed by many local people, including native Hawaiians who spoke eloquently about the importance of the valley’s role in their traditional history and culture. The Council’s comment stressed the importance of the traditional relationship between Hawaiian culture and the natural environment, as expressed by the Moanalua Valley and urged that the highway not be constructed through the valley. The highway was rerouted. This case established the Council’s concern with preserving the role played by historic properties in the traditional cultures of native communities, a concern that has been expressed repeatedly since 1975 and that is reflected in the Council’s new regulations and guidelines.

These projects make up a sample of the cases worthy of consideration today, not only for the unique challenges they present, but also for lessons they offer. They also offer a reminder that the role of the Council is not only to defend historic properties, but also to promote their use and enjoyment. As we look ahead to the next 25 years, we must continue to work with Federal agencies and local governments to ensure that historic properties are protected and used in ways that reflect their unique character and significance.

Robert R. Gobrecht served as Executive Director of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation from its creation in 1966 until his retirement in 1995.

Footnotes

1. Nellie J. Longewater has been President of Preservation Action since its formation in 1974.
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5. Council’s comments on the Georgetown University, 1968.

Twenty Years of Progress
By Jerry L. Rogers

The 20th anniversary of The National Historic Preservation Act occurs this summer. As we consider the impact of past events and the implications of things to come, several conferences, numerous articles in professional and technical journals, an administrative history, The National Historic Preservation Act and the National Park Service participate in Parks Mackintosh, and other works have captured important historical information that busy people almost never have the time to read. We will be able to assemble a very respectable bookshelf.

Meanwhile, better read it and read it all. Our field has undergone enormous growth, change, and trauma in a very short time. Almost all participants have contributed to and been affected by events far greater than they expected to see in their lifetime. This natural has conditioned their interpretation of events that are larger than the events they saw firsthand. Many are befuddled by their own experiences, and few, if any, have comprehension of the whole. I have heard a disturbing amount of error in historic preservation meetings this year, often with no opportunity to question or correct. Error feeding upon error could become the deadliest crisis yet.

Mean reversion backward for the time when things were simpler and easier if we can tolerate high, even though the program had only a fraction of its current effectiveness. At least everyone wants the program to remain its central federal core with strong state participation, rather than becoming a collection of state programs. Most people also want Certified Local Government (CLG) to grow as a substantial benefit beneath the states, and wish for Federal agencies, non-profits, and private citizens to continue their growing roles. This can be done, but under our Constitution, it requires structure and system. That structure and system must be recognized as the key to the greatest simplicity possible for the program of today and tomorrow.

The principal direction of growth is outward from the central core. One can argue that new preservation programs began in the private sector, or that some local historic districts predate the Act of 1966, but in fact the program is rooted in the Act and grew out of the National Park Service’s old Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation (OAHIP). Until almost everything was done in that office by its employees. As State programs grew and began to assume the “front line” functions, OAHIP employees saw the institutional progress, but also felt a sense of loss from having their work transformed from “hands-on” activities into administrative ones. Many State employees now suffering a sense of loss do not recognize the very same wave washing over them as “front line” functions move on to Certified Local Government (CLG).

That transition is both inevitable and desirable for it enables program growth to continue. People who cannot adapt can solve their problems by making a move to a CLG. It would be better, however, to turn and face the more difficult and more important task of manipulating and refining an administrative system that makes it possible for CLGs, private organizations, and citizens to do their work.

As CLGs grow in number, strength, and capability, States must evolve into integral coordinators and administrators. Like it or not, this means “red tape.” The challenge will be to make the “red tape” hold things together without unduly holding them up. The National Park Service role will continue to evolve toward setting broad standards and general oversight of systems.

Those standards and systems exist now. The Secretary of the Interior’s “Standards for Historic Preservation Projects,” of which the Rehabilitation Standards are only one component, are matched by similar standards for Registration, HABS/HAER Documentation, and Archeological Data Recovery—for every major aspect of the national program. Each set is drawn directly from Federal law, and in accordance with an appropriate section of the Code of Federal Regulations. Each is explained by plain English guidelines, acceptable to experts but also intelligible to ordinary people, and will be, and will be, supplemented by state-of-the-art technical information that continues the never ending process of answering questions about how to do things better. The hierarchy of statute, regulation, standard, guideline, and technical information is the practitioner’s link to the central Federal authority (see Rogers, “The Integration of Law, Policy, and Technical Information in National Park Service Cultural Resource Programs,” CRM Bulletin, Volume 7, No. 5, 1994, pp. 12-17). Peers are available to people who believe the standards have been inappropriately applied. The system wherein States analyze their own past and create contexts of time, place, and theme in a device by which the National Service can look more itself from most of the decisions made about historic properties in States without simply denying responsibility for those decisions or properties. The State program approval system provides the final and most formal connection existing between a State, with its subordinate elements, is officially part of the national program.

These standards and systems weave a lifetime’s web. They give the practitioner a list of room to move in, but can be extended by adding new links, and they are connected to the secure center. They are the necessary foundation of a historic preservant movement and a historic preservation program, and a national program rather than many States’ individual ones. The standards and systems must be continually modified to make them work as well as possible, but there can be a large-scale “return” to any greater simplicity than this, unless it is in bias of the program or its effectiveness. The renewal of spirit many people seek must be found by accepting the challenge of using and improving these standards and systems, or by moving oneself further down toward the end of the lifetime.

Preservation in New Bedford
By John Ballard

Best known as the Whaling City because of the romantic fascination and undervalued economic success of its mid-19th-century whaling fleet, New Bedford re-achieved world-wide fame with the excellent quality and prodigious output of its turn-of-the-century cotton textile mills. New Bedford has been returning to those great times through restoration made possible in large measure by the timely infusion of Department of the Interior’s coordination (through National Register listing of many historic districts) and financial assistance (restoration grants). Historic preservation has played a crucial role in revitalizing New Bedford while retaining its unique identity.

The quiet crossroads-lading of the 1760s became a bustling port of 20,000 people with the highest per capita income in the world by 1845. Although it fell through three depressions, it would be too brief, New Bedford would always remain an active and vital working waterfront. Even before the whaling industry was in its death throes a few decades later, foreighned investors were nurturing the industrialization that would catapult New Bedford into the 20th century. Its population trebled in a brief 30-year span (from 40,000 in 1890 to 134,000 in 1924) as the insatiable labor demands of the cotton mills drew thousands with the promise of prosperity. Both periods created an unraveled collection of residential architecture. The tragic labor events, the Great Depression, subsequent labor unrest, and suc- Getting Involved In Historic Preservation:

B y o d d a n d S m i t h t a l k e d r e c e n t l y a b o u t t h e e a r l y d a y s o f t h e D e p a r t m e n t o f T r a n s p o r t a t i o n ( D O T ) a n d t h e A d v i s o r y C o u n c i l o n H i s t o r i c P r e s e r v a t i o n ( A C H P ) . D O T a n d A C H P w e r e c r e a t e d b y t h e D e p a r t m e n t o f T r a n s p o r t a t i o n Act and the National Historic Preservation Act, respectively, both signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson on October 15, 1966. For Boyd and Smith, enactment of these two landmark bills wide-ranging personal and professional consequences.

Boyd: Congress had deliberated about the need for a U.S. Department of Transportation since the presidency of Thomas Jefferson. When it finally opened for business on April 1, 1967, the Department gathered under one roof the transportation programs housed in the Department of Commerce—principally the Bureau of Public Roads—along with the Coast Guard from Treasury, the Federal Aviation Administration, St. Lawrence Seaway and eventually some of the urban transportation programs from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

All of these programs had at least one thing in common: the potential to affect our historic resources and our natural environment.

Smith: During the 1960s, the Nation began to become vitally concerned about environmental quality. As certain events like the "Lady Bird Johnson years," President Johnson convened the 1965 White House Conference on Natural Beauty The conference came up with all sorts of recommendations: scenic highways, billboard and junkyard control, and air and water clean.

Boyd: The conference addressed historic preservation, too. Gordon Gray, then chairman of the National Trust, took part in the conference and saw that preservation needs were reflected in its recommendations. Some of these recommendations became law and some—scenic highways and billboard and junkyard control—fell under the umbrella of the new Department of Transportation.

Smith: From the beginning, DOT had a strong environmental role—which came as a surprise to many people.

Boyd: I believe it was Sen. Ralph VPARATORI of Texas who was instrumental in getting environmental language into the DOT bill. They, or its section 4(f). Some feel that was the most powerful piece of conservation legislation of the period because it became law. Others bring up the preservation of wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites, as well. Senator Vaportori was, of course, one of the leaders of the San Antonio Conservation Society who were concerned about highway
A Conversation Between Alan S. Boyd and Ann Webster Smith

Boyd: To some preservationists, people in transportation were bad guys just like those involved in urban renewal and city center clearance.

Smith: I remember that we were a little self-conscious about our presence at the meeting but Cecil, in introducing himself, pointed out that he had been the National Trust of Scotland tie to show the Council members that he was "...one of you and on the side of preservation."

Perhaps thinking that "if you can't lick them, let them join you," we were welcomed at that meeting and subsequently within the company of the movers and shakers in preservation. I think they took us in not only because DOT tried—and DOT is still trying—but also because DOT had on its side the wonderful language of Section 4(f) of the DOT Act. It said, "The Secretary shall not approve,..." there was nothing equivocal about it—"the taking of historic places of national, State or local significance" and it went on to say, in language that many preservationists continue to know and love, "unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative and unless all possible planning has been done to minimize harm."

Anyway, I became the Secretary of Transportation's designee on the Council, "the lady from Transportation," and at DOT, I was for several years the "historic preservation person." It was a marvelous place to be.

As a cabinet officer you left DOT with the outgoing Johnson administration, Alan.

Boyd: With the change in administrations, I moved on to Chicago to become Vice Chairman of the Illinois Central Railroad, Mary Means, the National Trust's first field representative, was based in Chicago and we had a number of opportunities to work together. I was interested in what the National Trust was doing to spearhead preservation on the private side and to act as a catalyst for preservation activity in local, state, and national government as well.

I agreed to become a member of the Trust's board. There I learned more about the ways that we as Americans could use the available tools—Federal legislation, public funds, and private initiative and commitment to protect this country's rich architectural heritage. I was also familiar with some of the wonderful historic monuments in Europe and had seen what private and public funds and strong governmental controls were able to do there. I felt I would enjoy being involved with the National Trust.

One thing led to another. At the Trust's meeting in New York in 1980, Carl Hamelsween announced his intention to step down and I agreed to take on his job as chairman of the board of the National Trust.

I brought the Trust my interest and my commitment to historic preservation as an important component in the quality of American life.

Smith: We were both fortunate to have worked with many committed preservation professionals who have guided and supported us and who have helped make it all happen, in government and at the National Trust.

Working with you at DOT personally was a very rewarding experience for me. Alan. You did a great job in turning all the various programs pulled together in the Department into a smoothly functioning agency conscious of its responsibilities to preservation.

Boyd: I must say that the events of that day in October 1966 when President Johnson signed those two pieces of legislation—the Historic Preservation Act and the Department of Transportation Act—have come together in my life professionally and in a personally profound way as well. The 20 years since that day brought many changes to the American people. It has been a period of enormous accomplishment as well—and many of those accomplishments have been in the field of historic preservation and in the American perception of its importance.

Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Trust, came to preservation indirectly as the first Secretary of Transportation in 1967.
Preservation Tax Incentives: Past and Present

By H. Ward Jendal

Ten years ago, on October 4, 1976, when President Ford signed Public Law 94-455, popularly known as the Tax Reform Act, the long process finally began to bring federal tax policy into harmony with federal preservation policies. This first step after years of study and debate, was greeted with guarded enthusiasm in the preservation community. For one thing, although the law provided incentives to encourage rehabilitation, the Tax Reform Act was filled with a bewildering number of new terms and concepts—accelerated depreciation, rapid amortization, adjusted basis, among others—requiring crash courses in real estate law and financing. For another, Congress gave the law only a five year life.

In the months following passage of the law, the National Park Service quickly developed procedures, criteria, and standards for evaluation as well as application forms for handling certification requests, all without the benefit of additional staff. The first applications began trickling into the National Park Service in March 1977. As these regulations were expanded to cover new properties, more paperwork was required by the Park Service and more project applicants were certified. A backlog of applications built up, and in 1980, more than 1,000 projects were still waiting to be certified.

These duplexes in Allegheny East Historic District, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, were rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation. (Charles E.H.)

The Certification Process

From the beginning of the certification program, review and approval of historic structures for certification as a partnership effort between the Department of the Interior and the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service regulations direct property owners to the State agency for assistance. The Park Service's tax incentive programs—standards—one for determining which buildings contribute to the significance of the historic district to qualify as certified historic structures, the other for determining whether rehabilitation work is consistent with the historic character of the resource—which have been in use, with only minor modifications, since 1966 when the National Park Service began certifying buildings. The certification procedures has occurred periodically, in 1980, when certification standards were redefined to include National Park Service regional offices, and again in 1984, where procedures were streamlined. In 1986, further administrative changes speeded the review process by eliminating remaining duplication of effort between State preservation offices and the Park Service.

Tips for Tax Credit Users

As the program begins its second decade, the following pointers can help ensure speed approval of rehabilitation work by the Park Service:

1. Take time to become familiar with the "Standards for Rehabilitation" and the accompanying guidelines, even if not directly involved in the design process. A general understanding of rehabilitation treatments that are and are not acceptable will help ensure a compatible use for the historic building.

2. Document the condition of the building thoroughly prior to rehabilitation, both on the inside and out, with photographs and drawings.

3. Determine rehabilitation plans accurately. Prepare written justifications for changes that fall into the "Not Recommended" category, provide complete drawings, specifications, drawings showing partition changes, and any other material that will help explain the project to reviewers.

4. Hire experienced professionals who have a solid track record in undertaking certified rehabilitations. If the project is large, a consultant can help prepare the application. Check credentials carefully and talk to developers who have used consultant services in the past.

5. Don't confuse local, State, and Advisory Council (section 106) approvals with National Park Service certifications for tax purposes. Only the Park Service has the authority to certify rehabilitation work for the investment tax credit.

6. Maintain close communication with the State Historic Preservation Office in your area. Staff in the Park Service is familiar with the certification process. Keep the staff informed about what is happening with the project throughout the course of construction.

7. As work progresses and if changes occur, bring the changes to the attention of the State and the Park Service immediately. Official concurrence with the changes will avoid unpleasant surprises later.

8. Get approvals in writing. Oral agreements are only as good as the paper upon which they are written.

9. Get the application in early, before work begins. If revisions are needed to bring the project into conformance with the Standards, it is much easier to make changes before work gets underway or is completed.

10. Be patient. The State and the National Park Service process large numbers of applications, and delays sometimes may occur.

from $750 million in 1981 to $2.146 billion in 1985. While this growth has now slowed somewhat, partly due to taxpayer interest and over the long history of the incentives, there is no question but that the incentives have been one of the most effective and least expensive mechanisms devised for community revitalization and economic development. Over 1,958,000 property owners, with take place or are now underway—a strong indication that the goals of the legislation are being met.
Historic Preservation: Looking Ahead to the Next 20 Years

By the Honorable John E. Seberling

When I came to Congress in 1971, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was already over four years old. As I looked around today, the only current Member of the House Interior Committee who served in 1966 when the Act was signed is Morris K. (Mo) Udall (D-Arizona), a staunch champion of historic preservation who now chairs the Committee. Indeed, of the 515 members of this Congress, only 50 Representatives and 10 Senators were serving in 1966. Of the 41 current members of the House Interior Committee, only 16 were on the Committee when the 1980 Amendments to the NHPA was passed.

Despite this dramatic turnover, Congressional support for historic preservation has never been easier, particularly in recent years. Congress has saved this program, largely because of help from the combined forces of many private citizens and organizations, such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Preservation Action, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, to name a few. The need for the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is not merely a cause for celebration. It is also a time for reflection. We must examine not just what has been accomplished under the Act in the past, but also what needs to be done for the future.

This is particularly important for the Congress, since it has a continuing responsibility to oversee the programs it has created. The Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Public Lands, which has primary jurisdiction over the authorization of these programs in the House, has undertaken at my direction a two-year oversight review of the entire national historic preservation program. This view has included several hearings, a survey of Federal and State preservation programs, and reports by the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, and the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA). I hope to schedule the review in a report to full Interior Committee this fall. (For information on the review and on how to obtain the printed reports, please contact the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Room 812, House Annex, Washington, D.C. 20515; phone 202-226-7730.)

If this review has made one thing clear to me, it is that we need a more comprehensive approach to historic preservation. Today, we face a host of fragmented, ad hoc voices that focus only on one issue or one person—architects who promote historic preservation for ex ample, or preservationists who talk only of buildings. This may be effective as a lobbying tool. However, it does little to increase understanding of the total program, by the Congress, the Administration, or the public.

In Congress, we must deal with the whole range of preservation issues, from the designation of vast wilderness areas and great national parks to the protection of remote archeological sites and the rehabilitation of historic places in towns and cities. I am often surprised to discover that lobbyists on these different issues do not often know each other. Yet all are part of an overall effort to save our Nation's natural and cultural heritage. To designate a wilderness area is not merely to save a landscape or protect a water source. It is also to preserve a cultural experience; a view of an essentially unaltered world that our ancestors saw but that they could not experience, and our grandchildren will never know. Similarly, historic preservation is not merely the protection of buildings and archeological sites. Rather, it is one part of a broader environmental ethic that speaks to the desires of man and woman. Historic preservation includes designed landscapes as well as buildings and shipwrecks, bridges and monuments, historic districts, significant mansions and turn-of-the-century skycrapers. It is the protection of communities as well as one-room schools. It is the designation of historic sites and national landmarks honoring the rich and famous. It is the protection of our society and anthropology as well as architecture and design. It is oral history and folklore as well as artifacts and written information. It is done in the library as well as the field, and uses computers and laser beams as well as picks and trowels. It is Federal as well as State, public as well as private, international as well as local, new as well as old. Most of all, historic preservation is to use a term coined by academic historians: "something we must experience in its total context if we are fully to appreciate it.

The beauty of the NHPA is that it can accommodate this vision without the need to make radical changes in the program. The Act is comprehensive; it may be needed in the Act and some new directives added. However, the institutional framework of the NHPA, as enacted 20 years ago and subsequently amended, makes the Act a very effective tool for historic preservation in the future.

In the National Historic Preservation Act of October 15, 1966—listing proof that men and women of vision and energy, intelligence and dedication, and luck and the help of providence, can undertake a good to counteract the evil of urban congestion at the positive man 创建! Twenty years later, the face of America has changed, but it has changed for the better. Much has been accomplished by the

(continued on page 58)
The National Register After 20 Years

By Carol D. Shull

In addition to comprising the Nation's list of historic resources worthy of preservation, the National Register of Historic Places is a national evaluation and registration system that exists at the heart of the national preservation program. The role the National Register has played in focusing attention and concern on the heritage of the Nation and the way the Register has evolved is in much about growth and changes in the preservation movement in the last 20 years.

In 1966, the National Register included only eight historic landmarks and historic units of the National Park System. In 1986, about 45,900 properties are listed in the National Register, with over 11,000 more determined eligible for listing. Four million properties have been included in State inventories, compiled for the most part using National Register criteria and standards. The National Register is not a comprehensive catalogue of the Nation's historic resources. It is a list of evaluated properties to consult during project planning, the most importantly, it is a consistent system for documenting, evaluating, and registering historic resources. National Register criteria for evaluation and documentation standards are used by every Federal agency, State, and Territory of the United States to identify historic properties for consideration in making planning and development decisions. The National Register of Historic Places has been the focus since after the passage of the Act, and the National Register nomination form has remained virtually unchanged in 20 years, while the National Register program has matured with the preservation movement.

In this system, the National Park Service has issued standards and guidelines for documentation, evaluation, and registration, and the States, Federal agencies, local governments, and the public conduct these activities. Nominations to the National Register receive several levels of professional review and evaluation, first in the States, and then in Washington. The system has become more sophisticated as standards and guidelines have improved, as colleges and universities have trained professionals for the preservation field, and as experience in identification and evaluation of historic resources has increased.

Under the early system, States slowly began to inventory and nominate historic properties to the National Register. By 1967, 29 new properties were added to the Register, in 1968, 357 in 1969, and 886 in 1970. It became clear that it would be many years before the National Register could be an authoritative list of the Nation's historic properties. In the meantime, significant historic properties were being destroyed by Federally assisted projects without benefit of review by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. In 1971, Executive Order 11935 directed Federal agencies to locate, inventory, and nominate their historic properties, and to ask the Secretary of the Interior for an opinion concerning a property's significance before taking any action that might harm an eligible property. The National Park Service asked each Federal agency to appoint a liaison officer, established procedures to accept Federal nominations, and began to make official determinations of eligibility on properties, all of which furthered the institutionalization of preservation programs in Federal agencies.

The 1970s saw a marked increase in the number of listings. As Federal historic preservation grant funds increased, and State and local preservation programs, and, to a lesser extent, Federal agency programs gained strength, listings, which hovered at 1,000 a year in 1971, rose to over 4,400 a year by 1980. Currently there are about 3,900 new listings a year. As interest in historic preservation grew, Congress passed new laws which added benefits and protection to properties qualifying for the National Register. In 1974, the Housing and Community Development Act made local surveys of historic resources eligible for funding under Community Development Block Grants, dramatically increasing the funding available for local surveys. In response, the National Register published Guidelines for Local Surveys. A Basis for Preservation Planning, to encourage communities to conduct high quality surveys from which properties could be nominated to the National Register, and to use these surveys for preservation planning.

So far we have made the use of the National Register in the registration of historic properties, the National Register instituted two types of multiple property nominations, which provide an efficient way to nominate properties identified in surveys of a specific geographical area, or of a specific historical theme. The concept has been so successful that by 1986 over half of all National Register listings were nominated as part of multiple property submissions.

The Tax Reform Act of 1976 and subsequent amendments to the Internal Revenue Code influenced the National Register both by contributing to increased listings each year and by making structures in State and locally designated historic districts eligible for rehabilitation tax benefits if the districts met the requirements for Register listing. National Park Service certification of about 1% of such historic districts to date is intended to expand the National Register evaluation and registration system.

The impact on the National Register of the 1980 Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act reflected the growing strength and importance of State and local preservation programs, and concerns about the rights of private property owners. The Amendments gave

Thematic Resource (TR) and Multiple Resource Areas (MRA) nominations comprise the majority of recent National Register nominations. One property in the U.S. Coast Guard Lightships and Light Stations on the Great Lakes TR, the Buffalo Main Light played a critical role in the development of Buffalo, New York, as a port. Built between 1853-1856, the Buffalo Main Light is among the oldest lighthouses in this thematic resources. (Historic American Engineering Record (HAER))

Historic districts, urban, suburban, and rural, from large to small, comprise a large segment of National Register listings. The Dupont Circle Historic District in Washington, D.C., is a commercial and residential urban area. (Anne H. Heilig Adams)

private sector—the National Trust, the statewide organizations, the local commissions, societies, and associations, and individual owners. But almost all of these accomplishments depend upon the recognition of public utility which the Federal and State governments, inspired by the Act of 1966, have built to make historic preservation a fundamental element of American life. Without the National Register of Historic Places—without the inventories, surveys, determinations of eligibility, and nominations that lead to the Register, without the section 106 protective procedures, planning projects, historic rehabilitation tax credits, and certified local governments that build upon the Register—the national historic preservation program would be the bit-orness affair it was 20 years ago.

The catalytic work of the past two decades has been, as is often noted, the work of a State-Federal partnership. At times, the Federal government has been the leading partner; at times, especially in recent years, the acte, but it has always been, and must continue to be, for the good of the country, a partnership in which both parties share goals, policy-making, costs, and labor.

The significance of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 lies in the response that the Federal and State governments have made to it. Its impact on State programs! State programs as such remain much as they were in 1966: some are good, some not so good. But each of the 50 States, plus each of the seven associated Commonwealths and Territories, and the District of Columbia, has a State Historic Preservation Office implementing the tremendously important Federal programs which grew out of the Act of 1966.

In 1968, if I may echo a comment made 200 years ago, we have a national historic preservation program, if we can keep it. The States have done and will continue to do their share.

Charles E. Lee has been South Carolina's State Historic Preservation Officer since 1965, and currently serves as President of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, 1985-1986.
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private property owners the ability to prevent listing their property in the National Register if a majority of the owners of nominated private property object to listing. A nomination still can be evaluated and placed on the National Register's list of eligible properties, even if a majority of its owners object to listing. Only about 65% properties have been deter- mined eligible because of owners' objections.

In the 1980 Amendments, Congress also acknowledged the increased professionalism and experience of States by allowing properties to be added to the Na- tional Register without substantive review as long as nominations were re- viewed on a spot-check basis, or as otherwise necessary to ensure the integrity of the National Register. The National Park Service has subsequently reduced its role in property-specific decisions to one of reviewing technical and pro- cessual aspects of all nominations, while evaluating some nominations to ensure professional adequacy and consistency.

In addition to authorizing decentraliza- tion to States, the 1980 Amendments in- troduced the participation of Federal agencies, local governments, and the public in the National Register process. So far, about 120 local governments meeting professional standards and certi- fied to participate in the national pro- gram have been given a greater authority in the nomination process. These Certi- fied Local Governments have the opportu- nity to comment on the nomination of properties within their jurisdiction, to prevent the State from nominating a property if both the local preservation commission and the chief elected official oppose it, to carry out their own identification activities, and to prepare National Register nominations. The pub- lic, too, has a greater role in National Register decision-making: anyone can now appeal the denial of States and Fed- eral agencies to nominate properties to the National Register.

The 1980 Amendments also better de- fined the role of the Department of the Interior in setting standards and guide- lines to be used by participating States in the national program. The National Register staff has increasingly focused its atten- tion on ensuring that participation in preservation programs, which must carry out their work in accordance with the secre- tary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Identification, Evaluation, and Registration, rather than on decisions about individual nominations. The Na- tional Register staff now also provides more direct assistance to individual States and Federal agencies on such tops as developing historic contexts and assessing resource types of growing in- terest: maritime resources; historic landsca- pes; vernacular architecture; and re- cent properties such as those associated with the Depression and World War II. Guidelines on these and similar topics are published as part of the National Register Bulletin series.

In 1986, the National Park Service will complete its entry of all National Register listings into an automated informa- tion system, which greatly enhances the value of the National Register as a plan- ning tool. Soon, properties determined eligible for listing will be added to the National Register Information System. States and Federal agencies should even- tually be able to enter nomination data directly into the data base. Analysis of the 4+ data elements en- tered on each property can be used to develop priorities for future identifica- tion and registration efforts, plan other preservation activities, and develop pub- lic policy. Many States and Federal agen- 

cies may begin to use the same data ele- ments to automate their inventories, thus making information on thousands of addi- tional evaluated properties available for future planning purposes. Finally, ready access to this information makes comparison of similar resources easier and allows all of us to know just what has been listed in the National Register.

Data drawn from the Information System contain data that indicate the breadth and scope not only of the Na- tional Register but of nationwide preserva- tion interests since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act. Most National Register listings, 56 percent, are of local significance; 32 percent have State significance; a much smaller 12 percent have national significance. Clearly, the intent of the National Historic Preser- vation Act to expand the National Regis- ter to properties of State and local signifi- cance has been realized.

Most, or 70 percent, of the listings are in private ownership. Thirty percent of the listings are publicly owned: 5 percent by the Federal government with the Na- tional Park Service and U.S. Postal Service owning the largest number, another 6 percent by States, and 19 percent by local governments. By far the greatest number of listings are historic buildings, followed by histor- ic districts, which represent almost 15 percent of the total listings. Plainly, preser- vation has looked beyond the individu- al building and landmark to the historic and architectural areas and districts of value to the community, as called for in 1966 by the Special Committee on His- toric Preservation in With Heritage So Rich. If the numbers of contributing re- sources within listings are counted, the National Register includes about '760,592 historic resources.

The committee also declared in its findings that the preservation movement must recognize the importance of archi- tecture, design, and aesthetics as well as historic and cultural values. That Ameri- cans do appreciate these values is re- flected in the fact that 70 percent of the listed properties possess architectural, ar- chitectural, or engineering significance: 55,519 accepted nominations cite architecture as an area of significance. Some 49 percent of the properties are listed for their association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history: 12 percent are recognized because they are associated with the lives of persons sig- nificant in our past, and 7 percent, gener- ally archeological resources, have yielded or may be likely to yield information im- portant in prehistory or history, surpris- ingly, nearly as many properties repre- sent our history from the 20th century (50 percent) as from the principal peri- od of significance: the 19th century (65 percent).

This information confirms that the Na- tional Register has the breadth and scope intended by the 1966 act, although clear- ly some areas of our history have been neglected in the registration of resourc- es. States and Federal agencies can now use available data to fill in gaps. This in- formation can be used to develop priori- ties for preservation work, based on looking at the resources in a given area. The need now is to find an efficient and responsible way to extend official recognition to eligible properties in Federal, State, and local inventories. The answer lies in further decentralization of decision-making, and more efficient doc- umentation and design methods. These are the challenges for the future.

Carol D. Shull is Chief of Registration, Na- tional Register of Historic Places, Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service.

National Register of Historic Places Areas of Significance Ranked by Percentage of Listings* Areas Percentage Number

| 1. Architecture | 76.0 | 55,519 |
| 2. Commerce | 14.0 | 6,506 |
| 3. Social History | 10.4 | 4,854 |
| 4. Politics | Government | 10.0 | 4,686 |
| 5. Archeology | 8.0 | 4,155 |
| 6. Industry | 10.4 | 4,854 |
| 7. Exploration/ Settlement | 10.4 | 4,854 |
| 8. Transportation | 10.4 | 4,854 |
| 9. Education | 10.4 | 4,854 |
| 10. Religion | 5.6 | 2,075 |
| 11. Agriculture | 2.5 | 954 |
| 12. Landmarks | 2.5 | 954 |
| 13. Military | 4.5 | 1,235 |
| 14. Community Planning | 10.4 | 4,854 |
| 15. Ethnic History | 10.4 | 4,854 |
| 16. Art | 2.7 | 1,238 |
| 17. Landscape | 2.7 | 1,238 |
| 18. Architecture | 2.5 | 1,093 |
| 19. Communications/ Transportation | 15.4 | 6,200 |
| 20. Law | 1.0 | 478 |
| 21. Literature | 0.5 | 238 |
| 22. Performing Arts | 9.0 | 430 |
| 23. Economics | 7.0 | 308 |
| 24. Science | 7.0 | 308 |
| 25. Invention | 7.0 | 308 |
| 26. Conservation | 6.0 | 252 |
| 27. Health/Medical | 6.0 | 252 |
| 28. Other | 6.0 | 252 |
| 29. Maritime History | 2.0 | 107 |
| 30. Philosophy | 0.1 | 51 |

*Note that a single property can have up to ten separate areas of significance.
The National Historic Preservation Act and The Local Level

By Evelyn Widel

The blueprint for achieving this goal was simple and straightforward. Locate, survey, and register all significant historic properties. From them, protect them from adverse effects of Federal projects, and provide financial and professional assistance to State and local governments to produce plans, legislation, and incentives to protect historic resources. The final report of With Heritage So Rich recommended that local governments undertake a comprehensive survey, study local legal preservation tools such as historic district zoning and architectural review boards, and provide an annual budget to preserve "places of importance to the community."

Supported by Federal legislation and funding, historic preservation was intended to be embraced by State and local governments as an important component in future planning. In the 1960s, the environmental movement was in its infancy too. Environmental planning and protection was nearly unknown at the local level. Through public education and the mass media, environment became a household word supported by a peaceful movement. Today, environmental protection has become a national issue institutionalized at all levels of government. The importance of protecting the environment is taught to every school child in the Nation. We can learn from the environmentalists. The continued success of the national historic preservation program will depend on broad public support gained through education, not legislation. Preservation must be a part of the day-to-day decision making in our cities and our State and houses if we are to protect historic resources. We must protect buildings listed in the National Register through State and local legislation. We must incorporate the findings of historic sites surveys into local plans. We must make preservation a part of the planning process in every community. Most important, we must teach public officials and citizens alike that the preservation of historic resources is important to protecting the character and history of a community as well as a nation.

Today, preservation is riding on a wave of popularity fueled by the success of tax act projects and the recent restoration of the Statue of Liberty. Opportunities abound for generating public support and understanding of the preservation movement. Armed with the brilliant plan afforded us by the National Historic Preservation Act and With Heritage So Rich, we have opened 20 years building a strong foundation. The goal of the national historic preservation program was to make the protection of our nation's history a part of our national ethic. Now is the time to finally realize that dream come true.

Evelyn Widel is the Executive Director, National Alliance of Preservation Commissions.

Bringing Preservation Home

By Loreta Neumann

I'm celebrating the 20th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act does one thing. I hope it is that more people become aware of the Act's importance. Federal law often seems remote from our daily lives. This one, however, has a direct effect on all of us, in towns and cities everywhere. The Act sets up certain governmental processes and protections that we now may take for granted but which simply did not exist two decades ago.

It has been a good fortune to work on preservation issues at both the national and local levels. Washington, D.C., my home for 20 years, is a city of neighborhoods as it is the Nation's capital. In my neighborhood of Takoma, a group of us were concerned in the mid-1970s about what might happen to the character of our 100-year-old neighborhood when a then-proposed subway stop opened. We worked with the city on a comprehensive plan for the area and got it completely rezoned, mostly to our liking.

We soon learned, however, that zoning only deals with things like the height and bulk of buildings. It would not of itself prevent the crazing of our small but charming commercial block or the insinuation of a favorite landmark. So we pooled our abilities and the development survey, lobbied the city offices, and even entertained Takoma as a historic district within the National Register. Takoma is now protected by both Federal and local law. Perhaps equally important, the residents of Takoma also have more at stake in maintaining that these protections are not diluted, whether by the city council or by the United States Congress. Indeed, wearing my "national hat" as a Congressional staffer for the past 13 years, I see the continued need for vigilance to assure that historic preservation receives the attention and support that it must have to survive. The Federal-State-local partnerships established by the National Historic Preservation Act are still young and fragile—20 years is not so long ago that we can take them for granted. As Members of Congress and Administration officials come and go, there is a constant need to re-educate both branches of government on why the national historic preservation program is so important to the American people.

I hope that this is a way of celebrating the 1966 Act that will help accomplish the goals. Loreta Neumann became legislative assistant to Representative John F. Seiberling (D-Ohio) in 1971, and staffed a preference staff of the Subcommittee on Public Lands (Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives) when Seiberling became Chairman of the Subcommittee in 1977. For the local preservation community, she has been a founder and continuing leader in Plan Takoma, Historic Takoma: An Action Plan for Women in Preservation.

Revolutionizing Historic Preservation Through Tax Incentives

By Sally G. Oldham

A Gallup poll conducted for the Urban Land Institute early in 1986 established that 98 percent of opinion leaders and 95 percent of the general public consider historic preservation important. This is an overwhelming testimonial to preservationists' successful enactment of the National Historic Preservation Act—successes due in part to the Federal tax incentives. Besides these and other statistics, the preservation tax incentives included in the Tax Reform Act of 1976 may be said to have revolutionized the field of historic preservation. Predictions of this outcome were made by a few key preservation advocates at the time that the law was enacted, but the reality of the revolution was not apparent until some years later.

The components of the revolution were several—information transfer, the awakening of interest in the real estate development community, the opening of opportunities for preservation professionals, a gradual change in taste among the populace to a liking for offices and residential units in historic buildings, along with an attendant appreciation for their character and their ambiance. To preservationists who had been active in the field over the past 10 years, the effects of the revolution are apparent everywhere.

These effects can be measured. By the end of 1977, having published regulations by which to administer the tax credit program earlier that year, the national historic preservation program will depend on broad public support gained through education, not legislation. Preservation must be a part of the day-to-day decision making in our cities and our State and houses if we are to protect historic resources. We must protect buildings listed in the National Register through State and local legislation. We must incorporate the findings of historic sites surveys into local plans. We must make preservation a part of the planning process in every community. Most important, we must teach public officials and citizens alike that the preservation of historic resources is important to protecting the character and history of a community as well as a nation.

Today, preservation is riding on a wave of popularity fueled by the success of tax act projects and the recent restoration of the Statue of Liberty. Opportunities abound for generating public support and understanding of the preservation movement. Armed with the brilliant plan afforded us by the National Historic Preservation Act and With Heritage So Rich, we have opened 20 years building a strong foundation. The goal of the national historic preservation program was to make the protection of our nation's history a part of our national ethic. Now is the time to finally realize that dream come true.

Evelyn Widel is the Executive Director, National Alliance of Preservation Commissions.

Bringing Preservation Home

By Loreta Neumann

I'm celebrating the 20th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act does one thing. I hope it is that more people become aware of the Act's importance. Federal law often seems remote from our daily lives. This one, however, has a direct effect on all of us, in towns and cities everywhere. The Act sets up certain governmental processes and protections that we now may take for granted but which simply did not exist two decades ago.

It has been a good fortune to work on preservation issues at both the national and local levels. Washington, D.C., my home for 20 years, is a city of neighborhoods as it is the Nation's capital. In my neighborhood of Takoma, a group of us were concerned in the mid-1970s about what might happen to the character of our 100-year-old neighborhood when a then-proposed subway stop opened. We worked with the city on a comprehensive plan for the area and got it completely rezoned, mostly to our liking.

We soon learned, however, that zoning only deals with things like the height and bulk of buildings. It would not of itself prevent the crazing of our small but charming commercial block or the insinuation of a favorite landmark. So we pooled our abilities and the development survey, lobbied the city offices, and even entertained Takoma as a historic district within the National Register. Takoma is now protected by both Federal and local law. Perhaps equally important, the residents of Takoma also have more at stake in maintaining that these protections are not diluted, whether by the city council or by the United States Congress. Indeed, wearing my "national hat" as a Congressional staffer for the past 13 years, I see the continued need for vigilance to assure that historic preservation receives the attention and support that it must have to survive. The Federal-State-local partnerships established by the National Historic Preservation Act are still young and fragile—20 years is not so long ago that we can take them for granted. As Members of Congress and Administration officials come and go, there is a constant need to re-educate both branches of government on why the national historic preservation program is so important to the American people.

I hope that is what this anniversary celebration of the 1966 Act will help accomplish.

Loreta Neumann became legislative assistant to Representative John F. Seiberling (D-Ohio) in 1971, and staffed a preference staff of the Subcommittee on Public Lands (Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives) when Seiberling became Chairman of the Subcommittee in 1977. For the local preservation community, she has been a founder and continuing leader in Plan Takoma, Historic Takoma: An Action Plan for Women in Preservation.

Revolutionizing Historic Preservation Through Tax Incentives

By Sally G. Oldham

A Gallup poll conducted for the Urban Land Institute early in 1986 established that 98 percent of opinion leaders and 95 percent of the general public consider historic preservation important. This is an overwhelming testimonial to preservationists' successful enactment of the National Historic Preservation Act—successes due in part to the Federal tax incentives. Besides these and other statistics, the preservation tax incentives included in the Tax Reform Act of 1976 may be said to have revolutionized the field of historic preservation. Predictions of this outcome were made by a few key preservation advocates at the time that the law was enacted, but the reality of the revolution was not apparent until some years later.

The components of the revolution were several—information transfer, the awakening of interest in the real estate development community, the opening of opportunities for preservation professionals, a gradual change in taste among the populace to a liking for offices and residential units in historic buildings, along with an attendant appreciation for their character and their ambiance. To preservationists who had been active in the field over the past 10 years, the effects of the revolution are apparent everywhere.

These effects can be measured. By the end of 1977, having published regulations by which to administer the tax credit program earlier that year, the National Park Service (NPS) had received only 25 project applications. NPS reported publicly on the tax projects in terms of dollars invested in historic buildings because the project numbers seemed so small. Preservationists talked about the Tax Reform Act program as though the preservation provisions were the central features of the 1976 law. But the rest of the world took little notice until NPS mounted an education effort publishing dozens of articles in professional journals and speaking to meetings of developers, attorneys, accountants, archivists, and others. Activity increased slowly, leading to more National Register listings as well as increased certification applications. In fiscal year 1976 (FY76), 1,731 properties were listed in the National Register of Historic Places. In FY77, the listings were to bring the total to 19,000. Today, the National Register includes 45,000 listings, encompassing 500,000 buildings. A review of National Register listings in the late 1970s showed a significant increase in the numbers of commercialdistricts listed in relation to residential districts, a trend which has continued. By mid-1979, 755 projects, representing over $424 million of rehabilitation, had been approved. By mid-1986, indicated investment over the ten-year period leaped to $10 billion in over 15,000 projects.

Although key preservationists had lobbied for Federal laws and appropriations for the National Park Service and NPS, community really cut its teeth in acquiring lobbying acumen in the passage of the Economic Recovery Act of 1981. By this date, tax incentive projects had totaled 9,300 involving $1.6 billion in private investment. This work had a great significance for a program where
American Engineering Record was formed in 1909 and has amassed an immense collection of documentation on the historic technology and industry during the past 120 years. The National Park Service contains documents on 20,000 buildings and structures, including 3,900 drawings. The collection has grown to 6,900 buildings and structures since 1979.

Richfield Oil Building, located at 759 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, has been designated by the Los Angeles chapter of the American Institute of Architects as one of the most significant buildings in the city. The building was designed by Charles Moore and is considered to be a masterpiece of modernist architecture.

The National Park Service is responsible for preserving and maintaining the built environment of the United States. In 1966, the National Park Service implemented the 1966 Act, which is still in effect today. The act authorizes the National Park Service to preserve and protect the nation's cultural and historical resources. The service has been instrumental in preserving and restoring many important buildings and structures across the country.

In the National Park Service, conservationists have become great stewards of their land. They have worked tirelessly to ensure that the nation's cultural and historical resources are preserved for future generations. The service has been able to achieve this by working closely with local communities and other stakeholders to develop comprehensive conservation plans.

For example, in the 1950s and 1960s, the National Park Service worked to preserve and protect the historic buildings in the National Park System. They have also been involved in the preservation of historic streets and neighborhoods, ensuring that these areas remain as authentic as possible.

The National Park Service has also been involved in the preservation of historic structures in the private sector. In the 1960s, the National Park Service worked closely with the American Institute of Architects to develop guidelines for the preservation of historic structures in the private sector.

Today, the National Park Service continues to work with the private sector to ensure that historic structures are preserved for future generations. They have been able to achieve this by working closely with local communities and other stakeholders to develop comprehensive conservation plans.

The National Park Service is an important and valuable resource for the nation. Its work has ensured that the nation's cultural and historical resources are preserved for future generations. They have been able to achieve this by working closely with local communities and other stakeholders to develop comprehensive conservation plans.

For more information on the National Park Service, visit their website at www.nps.gov. They have a wealth of information on the historic resources of the United States and the work they are doing to preserve them.
The National Historic Landmark Program, the Parks, and The National Historic Preservation Act: A Vital Partnership

By Edwin C. Beards

There have been dramatic changes in how the National Park Service (NPS) oversees its cultural resource responsibilities in the years since I began duty as a park historian at Vicksburg National Military Park. This was but a score of years since the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, had established a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States. To implement this policy, the Act assigned broad powers to the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Service. The 1935 Act gave authority to conduct research, to restore, preserve, and maintain historic properties directly or through cooperative arrangements to acquire historic properties under certain conditions; and to mark properties, establish and maintain related museums, and engage in other interpretive activities for public education.

As a result of the Historic Sites Act, a historic sites survey of cultural properties was undertaken in the years before Pearl Harbor, but while a number of nationally significant sites were identified, and some added to the National Park System, none had been designated a National Historic Landmark before the survey became an early casualty of World War II. In fact, in the years between December 1941 and the mid-1950s, NPS had little involvement in the protection or interpretation of areas not included in or affiliated with the System. The parks were indeed islands in the sky.

In the autumn of 1957, as one throat of MMRON 66, the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings was reinstated. Beginning in 1960, properties surveyed and found nationally significant were designated National Historic Landmarks (NHLs). The National Historic Landmarks Program became a Service tool for recognizing and encouraging preservation of properties deemed nationally significant, regardless of ownership. In addition, the program identified those few most important areas that might be added to the System.

Between 1960, when Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton made his initial announcement of 92 sites and buildings eligible for landmark designation, and the months following enactment of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), landmark designation was mostly honorary. Inclusion of NHLs in the National Register of Historic Places afforded these properties protection against Federally funded or licensed undertakings, and, after 1976, qualified their owners for tax credits in rehabilitating their properties for commercial purposes.

The 1966 Act, as amended, brought other important changes to the National Historic Landmarks Program. Congress, cognizant of the action by a Federal district court in setting aside the designation of the Green Springs National Historic District, and likewise aware of owner protests at the designation of properties, took appropriate action. It mandated in 1980 that owners of properties, along with certain government officials, must be notified when a property is being considered for NHL designation. This led to a three-step notification process—when the decision to study is made, when the study is completed, and when the designation occurs. An objection by a private or corporate owner will preclude designation, although the property can be determined eligible.

During the past three years, the Service has undertaken thematic studies focusing on Man-in-Space and World War II in the Pacific. These studies charted new horizons for the program. The first of these concerned the "50-year rule on designation of properties as NHLs and their entry in the National Register. This criterion had been established to provide a proper perspective in making judgments of significance. But, in view of the significance of these two themes, few questioned this decision. Equally critical were the rapid and dramatic changes taking place at former stateside World War II installations, as well as in the western Pacific and Aleutian Islands. The final challenge that had to be resolved was raised by the Department of Defense (DOD) and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA). A number of sites studied and identified for probable designation as NHLs were DOD and NASA properties employed in on-going missions.

These agencies stated that the provisions providing for Advisory Council review and comment on proposals to alter or demolish NHLs would compromise their ability to discharge missions associated with national defense. After a series of meetings aimed at addressing the concerns of the affected agencies, and the recommendation of the National Park System Advisory Board, the Secretary of the Interior designated 23 NHLs associated with Man-in-Space and 37 significant to the War in the Pacific.

For most NHL personnel, the effects of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 have been more profound and beneficial as they affect properties within park boundaries. Management in the Service's natural and recreation areas has become responsible for the protection and inter-
The Development of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards

By Gary L. Hume

The 1966 Historic Preservation Act was a piece of foresighted legislation that set a national policy for the preservation of our cultural heritage. In this sweeping direction provided by Congress, the next challenge was to implement these goals. What was needed was an efficient, consistent, and professional methodology to identify our cultural heritage—be it an Art Deco skyscraper or a Tlingit totem—and to preserve these diverse cultural resources in a manner consistent with the legislative intent.

Two documents, a new codification of preservation standards and a method to shape the American historic preservation program. These were the National Register Criteria and the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Historic Preservation Programs." The National Register criteria were the yardstick for evaluating properties and districts for significance in American history; architecture; engineering, archeology, and culture; and the Standards were used to direct the treatment of these properties once they were identified as significant.

This discussion traces the development of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. After ten years of use, the Standards have been applied to more than 7,000 properties, and many of these projects assisted through the Historic Preservation Fund: they have been implemented for the more than 15,000 rehabilitation projects receiving federal tax incentives; and they have been incorporated into hundreds of local historic district zoning ordinances. The Standards and their accompanying Guidelines have won general acceptance in the United States and have been noted with interest in some foreign countries.

The architectural and historic preservation program envisioned a hierarchy of policy documents starting with the legal mandates, supplemented by regulations (including standards), interpreted by guidelines, and amplified by direction on specific issues and problems through technical assistance information. Although the need for standards to im

(continued on page 514)
Federal Archaeology and Historic Preservation: The Impact of the National Historic Preservation Act

By Francis P. McNamara

Archaeology has been an activity of the Federal government since well before the passage of the 1966 Act. Although a federal archaeology program did not develop until the 1930s, a policy of legislation or agency action, archaeology was a concern of the Federal government by the latter part of the 19th century. Archaeology activities in these early days included work done by the expeditions of the United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of (American) Ethnology. The Antiquities Act of 1906 added statutory weight to what was already a strong tradition of interest in archaeological resources and resources. Public employment projects of the 1930s, authorized by the Federal Works Administration, produced archaeological finds. Today, Federal archaeological activities are likely to be found in almost every corner of the country. These activities include surveys and inventory of sites, site reports, data collection, and archaeological investigations as well as data management and preservation of archaeological resources. The national government in the United States is a major project sponsor and is actively engaged in many aspects of archaeological research and education.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards (continued)

The National Park Service realized that while preservation terms appeared in the legislation and were used in contemporary magazines and other publications, major inconsistencies existed in the use and definition of these terms. "Adaptive renewal," "preservation," "rehabilitation," "reusing," "restoration," "adapted restoration," and "conservation," to name a few, were sometimes used interchangeably. The first task, therefore, was to define acceptable historic preservation treatments in precise and concise terms. This, the seven treatments for historic preservation—acquisition, stabilization, preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction—were defined. In 1976, the seven treatments were codified in the National Standards for Historic Preservation.
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A new era is an interminably
small speck in the unguilt of time, but
in terms of activity, the period from 1966
to 1968 has witnessed a burgeoning in
interest in historic preservation in the
United States and in the conservation of
our national patrimony. This was oc-
sulted in no small part with the passage
of the National Historic Preservation Act
on October 15, 1966. As we have moved
from the middle of the 19th century
with the early efforts of Anna Pulitzer,
Cummings to save Mount Vernon, to the
last quarter of the 20th century, we have
moved from a preservation with museums to
a concern for neighborhoods where people
live, and we have moved from a parvity
really reason to approach to history to a
greater appreciation of aesthetics.

In the National Historic Preservation
Act, Congress directed the Secretary of the
Interior to create a national list of what is
worthy keeping in the United
States known as the National Register.
The law stipulated that this list should
include sites, buildings, objects, and
structures significant in American
history, architecture, archeology, and
culture.

These could be national, State, or local
in significance. The importance of the
Act lies in the inclusion of the word
"district," the authority of the Secretary
of the Interior to make grants to the pri-
vate sector for preservation projects at
the State's discretion, and the creation of
the Advisory Council, which set up dia-
logue laterally at the highest level of
government, the Cabinet level, and allowed
preservation philosophy to filter down-
ward through the bureaucracy. The Na-
tional Historic Preservation Act of 1966
then, perhaps can be seen as an environ-
mental act concerned with what we
might call the cultural ecology of the Na-
tion. Here was a planning act to reverse
the traditional "rear guard" fire role of the
preservationist in the dialogue of change
and to bring the voice of the preservationist to the planning table before Federal dollars were spent to make change.

After functioning as the Director of
Programs of the National Trust, I be-
came the first Keeper of the National
Register in 1969. To publicize to the gener-
pic the great new capabilities that the
Congress had placed in the hands of the
American citizen, by creating a system by
which his voice could systematically
and legally be heard at the planning table
prior to implementation of Federal projects.
This new office in a new program in the
National Park Service organized a series
of 15 conferences around the country.
The Secretary of the Interior also wrote
to the governors of the 50 States and six
Territories and asked them for a represen-
tative to carry out the Secretary's di-
rectives from the Congress; these repre-
sentatives are now known as State
Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs).
It was shortly thereafter that a selection of
States in the South took the lead in de-
veloping this program by meeting with
me, in my capacity as Keeper of the Na-
tional Register. From these meetings
came the idea to organize the State His-
 toric Preservation Officers into the Na-
tional Conference of State Historic
Preservation Officers. Thus was established
the Federal State infrastructure that con-
tinues to carry on the preservation pro-
grams at the State level in the public
sector.

A flurry of creativity and activity has
followed in the 20 years since 1966. As a
result, a number of legislative building
blocks have been put in place relating to
the National Register of Historic Places,
and equally large number of develop-
ments have taken place in the private
sector. We have achieved in the past two
decades nearly everything called for in the
"Conclusion to the Findings" of "With
Heritage So Iraqi prior to the passage of the
National Historic Preservation Act, in-
cluding changing our tax laws to give
economic incentives for rehabilitation
purposes. Within this framework too, aca-
demia has seen fit to recognize the need
to develop programming to train individ-
uals to work in the preservation field.
The University of Virginia and Columbia
University in New York City were among
the first to enter this field.

In years since 1966, preservation has
become increasingly aware of econom-
ics, politics, and the law. It has also be-
come more technical, in part due to the
creation of such organizations as the
Association for Preservation Technology
(APT). Founded in 1968, the APT seeks
to improve the quality of preservation
practices and to promote education in
historic preservation by study of mate-
ials, structures, and techniques. In 1990,
the National Park Service created the
Historic American Engineering Record
in cooperation with the American Society
of Civil Engineers to document the history
eering and industrial structures in the
United States. As the Historic Ameri-
can Buildings Survey has been doing
since the 1930s with buildings of archi-
tectural interest.

A major tool was put in the hands of
preservationists when the President of the
United States in 1991 issued an Executive
Order 11993 for the protection and en-
chancement of the cultural environment.
This order directed Federal agencies to
preserve, restore, and maintain cultural
properties under their control and to es-
tablish procedures to implement a survey
of their resources. When in doubt as to
the significance of a property, these
agencies were required to seek a ruling from
the Secretary of the Interior as to
whether or not it were dealing with a con-
temporary proposal. The result was that a building no longer had to be
actually listed in the National Register for
the Second Amendment would have to be
counted, it could only be determined eligi-
bility for the National Register.
Over the same period, the National
Trust for Historic Preservation witnessed
an explosion of activity, thanks in large
part to grants which it received along
with the States from the National Histori-
cal Preservation Fund. In 1971, the Soci-
ety for the Preservation of Architecture was
founded to encourage the study of indus-
trial and engineering sites and artifacts.
The United States Postal Service issued its
first commemorative stamp honoring his-
toric preservation about the same time.
The following year, the National Register
was acknowledged as the World Heritage
List, when it became the first UNESCO
member to rank a historic place. Conven-
tional all sorts of activities continued to de-
velop in the decade of the 1970s. The Fed-
eral Government and its agencies and
Department of Justice at federal courts
upheld the constitutionality of historic
disputes when it supported the right of denial of demolition of an impor-
T
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Preservation Planning: An Enduring and Valuable Part of the Change

Laurence E. Allen

In these early years, it means that the scale of preservation activities was becoming so large that expert individuals would no longer be able to keep up with the numbers to make valid, though often ad hoc, technical decisions about preservation. Since NPS and SHPOs have devoted considerable effort to developing more specific, concepts and techniques for comprehensive preservation planning in States that is more appropriate to the objectives of the National Historical Preservation Act. It was essential that, as NPS did in 1970, that it was, to seek some clarification of plans rather than planning processes in States. Historic preservation planning is one of the most critical public administration functions, it is from a particular viewpoint that the planning for historic and archeological resources at either a regional or a national level.

Although early National Park Service (NPS) requirements for State planning were embodied in Historic Preservation Plans (HPPs) employed today, an adequate planning model had not yet been designed and tested. In general, any resulting "planning" were static documents that could not be adapted readily to changes in property information, budget, or administrative policy. Moreover, despite the fact that the National Register often was described as a planning tool, the Register was primarily a device to qualify properties for federal or other assistance, not for planning.

While this approach to preservation planning focuses on NPS and States adequately for the first years under the 1966 Act, as survey data accumulated, staffs were better incorporated, and the NPS and its opportunities became more widely known, the preservation program's complexity quickly outstripped these early planning formulas. It was becoming ever clearer that preservationists did not have adequate techniques to set priorities for conducting surveys, nominating properties to the National Register, selecting projects for the NPS, and developing subgrant projects. This is not to say that State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) were doing a mediocre job of

The Preservation Act: 20 Years Later (continued)

tant building in the Vieux Carre Historic District. The interest of citizens in the neighborhood was high and it was decided to grow nationally Seattle for example, as early as 1974, became the first locality in the United States to appoint a city councilor responsible for directing the preservation activity under the city's Office of Urban Conservation. The first change in the tax laws to promote preservation came with the Tax Reform Act of 1976.

Perhaps the most important development of this period was the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of Penn Central Transportation versus the City of New York, which ruled that the Penn Central Corporation had a responsibility to preserve the existing structure—the Grand Central Terminal—for public benefit rather than to tear it down and replace it with a skyscraper. This set a general precedent in favor of preservation.

Where does this leave us nationally? Generalizations are always dangerous, but it seems fair to state that the environmental threat of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 has been published and retained. One can also observe that during the implementation period between 1966 and 1969 of the National Historic Preservation Act, legal counsel has moved litigation from an evaluation of the subject and its relative quality to an evaluation of process. Lawyers are more comfortable in dealing with absolutes than in dealing with the subtle scale of values of the humanities. Thus, policies and methodologies have evolved subject in many instances. If one accepts that preservation is a humanity, and if one accepts the premise that the humanities are man's concern with the humanism of mankind, then preservation today involves a humanity which is exercised in the non-humanistic environment of today's increasingly politically and economically oriented society.

That's a very difficult place to be in, but to paraphrase the late Adelum Adams when he said, "we are living through an era that knows the cost of everything and the value of nothing," we must be sensitive to this, yet we must know values as well.

William J. Murtough, currently a lecturer and consultant in historic preservation, was the first Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places (1964-1979). He was formerly Section Chief of the Division of Preservation Assistance. This article was written in support of the report "Preservation: The Next 20 Years," prepared for the National Park Service (1984-1986).

Except for reprinted from an article in Notes on Virginia, Number 28, Spring 1986, with permission of William J. Murtough and the Virginia Department of Conservation and Historic Resources, Division of Historic Landmarks.