

things, historic sites; and the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 required all federal agencies undertaking a project affecting the environment to prepare a detailed analysis that considers the effect of the project on historical, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage. Historic resources were included in the 1976 Tax Reform Act. Many states have added laws relating to historic preservation.

Private development has begun to be slowed and channeled by preservationists through more thoughtful urban planning where preservation is an integral tool. The concept of incentive zoning is becoming an increasingly valuable aid to preserving historic resources in urban areas.

Most resources worthy of preservation can be grouped under one of two categories: those having historical significance (Mt. Vernon, Independence Hall, the White House); or those environmental and/or aesthetic resources which are part of our community life and culture which give a sense of orientation to the American people.

The latter category would include most transportation facilities: the parkway designed for its scenic beauty, the metal truss bridge across a pastoral stream, railroad stations of architectural significance, railroad shops that can be recycled to new uses, -- all structures that trace the history of an important aspect of American life while also serving as landmarks to give a sense of orientation and a sense of place to the American people, as noted above.

Transportation planners, both federal and state, have made great strides and must continue to do so in working with preservationists. We need to assure that our citizens in their travels do not find, in the words of Gertrude Stein, "that there is no there there."

THE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY RESPONSE

Robert Crecco, Office of Environment and Safety, U.S. Department of Transportation

It has been a decade of push and pull for historic preservation in the transportation field. Since 1966 when the U.S. Department of Transportation was instituted, the agency's attitude toward historic preservation has progressed from indifference to where the words meant controversy and frustration and now to the beginning of an enlightened attitude of understanding and consideration.

DOT didn't take to preservation without scratching and fighting, wailing and remonstrance. The Transportation Act of 1966 contained the important section 4(f) which, among other things, required the Secretary of Transportation not to approve the use of historic sites unless there was no feasible and prudent alternative. But despite that directive it took a while for it to become a commitment. Impetus toward that end came in the form of the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 and historic preservation legislation related to you by the previous speaker. We were forced

into historic preservation recognition through legislation, as were other federal agencies.

In my estimation DOT is the leading federal agency in historic preservation - outside of Interior, which has historic preservation as a primary mission. DOT has committed an average of \$65 million in each of the last four years to historic preservation implementation in transportation programs. While the bulk of that figure was attributable to the highway program, aviation, transit, railroad and Coast Guard administrations also committed their share to historic preservation. This investment is almost three times the funding Interior made available directly to the states in FY 1977 for historic preservation grants. Over a half million dollars per year for the last ten years has been used directly for the recovery of archaeological data and materials.

The Secretary's office coordinates historic preservation policy and program for the Department and works closely with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Department of Interior, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In addition, the office has compiled a catalog of historic American Transportation sites that are not listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Currently, we have a study underway to document the reuse of historic railroad stations for multipurpose needs including transportation. DOT believes in historic preservation and considers it an important environmental consideration in transportation projects.

At this point, I would like to examine four problem areas in the preservation of historic structures related to transportation: site identification, National Register criteria, the process for property protection, and maintenance and preservation costs. Difficulties in these four areas have hindered the preservation of transportation landmarks.

Site identification is inadequate by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). It has not completed the required inventory task and the burden has been placed on federal agencies such as DOT. Unless a site is on the National Register or noted in a state register, state and city transportation administrations must survey project areas for historic resources. The paramount cause for this is lack of funding. The new National Heritage Trust program of Interior will broaden the national heritage resource inventory to natural resources as well as cultural resources. The federal agencies could experience relief on the additional costs of project surveys if Interior earmarks and adequately funds the SHPO's with more identification funds.

National Register criteria are too broad, resulting in listing properties of dubious quality; virtually anything qualifies for the National Register that is 50 years old or more. There are more than 14,000 historic properties now on the Register, and a projected 70,000 by the 1980s. A major increase in the number of Register properties is taking place through nomination of large urban areas to the register as historic districts, actions that are more in the nature of "conservation" of the character

and environment of the city than they are of historic preservation. The new National Heritage program will open this inventory to natural resources, which will have implications for transportation programs. More definitive criteria or stricter application of existing standards is needed. This will assist transportation agencies in preserving sites of landmark quality.

The process for the protection of historic properties needs simplification. We have successfully worked to improve some of the process. For example, Interior agreed with DOT that if the professionals in the state historic preservation agency and the federal and state project agencies, after applying the criteria agree that non-federal property meets the standards, there is no need for voluminous paperwork to seek a determination of eligibility to the Register. All that is needed is a brief statement to that effect in letter format. More needs to be done with both Interior and the Advisory Council on simplifying the inventory and evaluation of sites and the section 106 process for protection of properties.

Preservation and maintenance of historic sites owned by federal agencies are costly, particularly when they are no longer needed and cannot be transferred to other jurisdictions. We believe such costs for historic structures no longer needed by an agency should be recognized in the appropriations process by Congress for all programs affecting historic sites.

I would like to cite two cases in New Jersey that exemplify the ups and downs that transportation agencies experience in saving historic structures.

The Van Duyne House in Passaic County is a National Register property that was in the path of the proposed widening of Route 23. The Van Duyne House, built in 1706, was considered to be a rare and excellent example of Dutch frontier architecture in the State of New Jersey. In order to preserve this cultural resource, the New Jersey DOT in close cooperation with the Township of Wayne, undertook a preservation program at a cost of \$75,000 which included the purchase and relocation of the House to the site of another historic property. The Township agreed to provide for adequate maintenance.

This is an excellent example of a cooperative effort to preserve and enhance a cultural resource.

The other case, the Temple-Ryan House, built in 1710, is a National Register site directly in the path of proposed Interstate Route 95. The Department of Transportation, in consultation with others, agreed to preserve the house by relocating it to another property at a cost of \$84,500, shared by both the federal and state governments.

Notwithstanding exceptional efforts by the local historic society to restore and maintain this property, it has deteriorated as the result of vandalism and the lack of adequate funding. It presently remains at its relocated site boarded up and exposed to further neglect and deterioration. As a result of this experience, the FHWA will not recommend relocation and preservation as a reasonable alternative for mitigating any

adverse impacts without a firm commitment by those having jurisdiction over property to maintain it.

Assurance that historic transportation structures once designated, registered and saved have a future is a crucial issue in preservation programs. State transportation departments will hedge on interest and investment in historic properties if there is not a funding plan to carry on preservation.

The federal and state DOTs are interested in innovative historic preservation. Two examples are indicative of flexibility and accommodation in transportation in historic preservation. In order to visually separate the proposed elevated I-83 from historic sites, FHWA and the state/city suggested building new in-fill structures as part of the highway project. This innovation calls for building shells, contemporary in design yet respecting the scale, mass, and roof forms of the buildings that existed in the area during the early 19th century. The shells internally would be utilized by the city for activities such as a job skill training center. No decision has been made on this innovative \$6 million proposal.

Another case involved an unsafe historic bridge in Woodstock, Vermont. FHWA with state DOT initiative will replace the bridge with one that is more in keeping with the historic district and the desires of local preservationists. The bow trusses of the old bridge will be aesthetically reused as will the wrought iron fencing and the original granite blocks that form the piers. In order to keep the bridge scale closer to the old structure, the roadway width will be kept to 24 feet instead of the proposed 30 feet.

The Department of Transportation is sensitive to the goals of historic preservation. Our internal regulations support and carry out the legislative mandate, and we are providing large sums of money to lessen project impacts on historic sites. Education, training, and information programs are utilized to increase the application and understanding of historic preservation objectives with field personnel.

We have problems with site identification and registration criteria, the protection process and the cost of site maintenance, but hopefully look forward to positive action by all parties in the preservation field. We are making headway in this area, but more will have to be done with state transportation agencies. The states are where the TRB members and Task Force can be of help in preserving transportation-related structures.

Keep in mind that there is no second chance in preservation. A personal as well as an organization commitment must be made to preserve our transportation heritage.