



UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:

H30-HH

MAR 14 1967

Informational

Memorandum

To: All Field Offices

From: Deputy Director

Subject: Report of Special Committee on Historic Preservation

We are enclosing a copy of the report of the Director's Special Committee on Historic Preservation. The report explains the considerations underlying the recent reorganization of our history, archeology, and historic architecture staffs. We believe you will find it useful in understanding our broadened responsibilities in historic preservation and the measures we are taking to meet these responsibilities.

The appointment of Dr. Ernest Allen Connally, Professor of the History of Architecture at the University of Illinois, to head the new Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation has been announced. Dr. Connally will take office this summer.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Acting Chief, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation.

This memorandum is cancelled on May 1, 1967.

Enclosure

REPORT OF  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

September 30, 1966  
Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## Foreword

It is already clear that 1966 was a landmark year for historic preservation in the United States. No fewer than four new Public Laws were enacted by the Congress to strengthen preservation of our national heritage of history, archeology, and architecture. One of these, Public Law 89-665, signed by President Johnson on October 15, 1966, adds substantially to the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior in this field. It also establishes a national Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, composed of six members of the President's Cabinet, the Chairman of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and ten State and local officials and individuals significantly interested and experienced in historic preservation. The Director of the National Park Service is designated Executive Director of the Council.

Because the Secretary of the Interior and the Congress rightly expect the National Park Service to carry out its growing preservation responsibilities in accordance with the highest professional standards, in May 1966 I appointed a Special Committee for Historic Preservation to advise and assist me in evaluating our existing situation and our probable future requirements. The document that follows is the Special Committee's report, which, with the full approval of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, I have adopted as the basis for a major strengthening of the Service's professional organization to meet today's needs.

The Special Committee on Historic Preservation consisted of three members, one each from the fields of architecture, archeology, and history.

Dr. J. O. Brew, Director of the Peabody Museum at Harvard, the archeologist member, first knew the Service in 1931, and has been in almost continuous touch with its work ever since. He has conducted important archeological excavations in Service areas in the Southwest, has served six years as a member of the Secretary's Advisory Board, has aided the Service for many years as a Consultant, and for twenty years has served on the Committee for the Recovery of Archeological Remains, during the last ten years as Chairman. This Committee has guided the progress of the uniquely important Inter-Agency Archeological Salvage Program. For many years Dr. Brew has participated in and has often served as Chairman of international meetings of experts in the preservation of monuments and sites, sponsored by UNESCO. Dr. Brew headed a special

UNESCO technical mission that laid the groundwork for the rescue of archeological and historical sites in Egypt and the Sudan, which has preserved the record of over 500,000 years of human occupation in the valley of the Nile. This project has made international conservation history. He is exceptionally familiar with preservation organization and practices in major countries throughout the world.

Dr. Ernest Allen Connally of Texas, now professor of the History of Architecture, University of Illinois, the historical-architect member, has been in close touch with the architectural aspects of historic preservation in the National Park Service as well as in the National Trust for many years. He has conducted Historic American Buildings Survey projects on Cape Cod and in Salem, Massachusetts, and made initial studies for the restoration of Andrew Johnson's home at Greeneville, Tennessee. Some of Dr. Connally's students are important members of the Service's historical-architectural staff, including the principal historical-architect for the restoration of Independence Hall. Dr. Connally is the author of many articles on American architectural history, speaks widely throughout the United States on preservation work, and is a frequent participant in National Trust regional and national preservation conferences. He has served as a national officer of the Society of Architectural Historians. He is familiar with preservation and restoration practices in many other countries, including Mexico and Australia where he has made special studies. Dr. Connally served on the Preservation Advisory Services Panel, for Salem, Massachusetts, set up by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to help establish a pattern for services of historic preservation experts in connection with urban renewal projects.

Mr. Ronald F. Lee, the historian member and Chairman of the panel, has been directly involved in the historic preservation program of the Service for thirty-three years, including service as Chief Historian for nine years, Chief of Interpretation for seven years, and Regional Director of the Northeast Region for six years with responsibility for many of the major historical holdings of the Service and for an extensive program of Registered National Historic Landmarks. For many years, Mr. Lee has had first-hand knowledge of the work of the archeologists, historical-architects, and historians on the Service staff. Mr. Lee has been active in the National Trust since its founding and serves on its Board of Trustees and Executive Committee. Mr. Lee served on UNESCO's initial international committee of experts on the preservation of monuments and

sites in 1949, and served as a consultant during the studies and conferences of the Rains Committee, both in the United States and abroad. Mr. Lee also served on the recent Preservation Advisory Services Panel for the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Salem, Massachusetts.

The Special Committee's report fully recognizes and meets the organization problems posed both by the continuing and the new responsibilities of the National Park Service for historic preservation.

January 16, 1967

George B. Hartzog, Jr.  
Director, National Park Service



IN REPLY REFER TO:

H26

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

~~WASHINGTON, D. C. 20240~~

Independence National Historical Park  
313 Walnut Street  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19106

September 30, 1966

Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr.  
Director, National Park Service  
U. S. Department of the Interior  
Washington, D. C. 20240

Dear Mr. Hartzog:

I am pleased to transmit herewith the report of your Special  
Committee on Historic Preservation signed by Dr. J. O. Brew,  
Dr. Ernest A. Connaally, and myself.

Sincerely yours,

Ronald F. Lee  
Chairman

Enclosure

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE  
ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

September 30, 1966  
Washington, D. C.

The Problem

You requested this Committee to make recommendations to you regarding the organization of the National Park Service as a major bureau of the Department of the Interior to provide national professional leadership and guidance for historic preservation by the Federal Government in the United States. This professional leadership includes the contributions of Service historical-architects, archeologists and historians. You expressed an urgent need to strengthen the National Park Service historic preservation organization for several compelling reasons, including (1) the needs of the extensive and rapidly increasing historical holdings in the National Park System; (2) the special urgency of preservation problems in urban areas, including historic districts, and in the path of expressways, which increasingly involve the National Park Service as the primary Federal agency concerned with preservation; (3) the rapid growth of public interest in historic preservation throughout the country as important landmarks, including Federal properties, are lost or placed in jeopardy; (4) the emergence of the National Trust as a major vehicle for public participation and citizen leadership in preservation; (5) the rapidly growing interest of other Federal agencies in historic preservation; (6) the important report of the Rains Committee, With Heritage So Rich, based on current European experience, recommending major new Federal legislation, now pending in Congress; (7) the possible early establishment of a National Preservation Advisory Council, to be staffed by the National Park Service for the Department of the Interior; (8) the urgent needs of Federal, State and local governments for a much more comprehensive National Register based on the combined findings of the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings and the Historic American Buildings Survey; (9) the remarkable continuing public, Congressional, and Federal agency interest in salvage archeology in river basins and in the path of highways and other Federal construction projects; (10) the importance of historic preservation as an integral part of the new conservation set forth by President Johnson, and closely related to natural beauty and environmental control; and (11) the clear need for high level professional representation by the Government of the United States in major international conferences devoted to preservation and restoration of historical and architectural monuments, such as the recent professional conference in Venice, Italy.

These reasons set the framework within which your Committee has undertaken this report. We sense in your discussions with us a feeling that historic preservation in the United States, at the Federal level, may have reached an important turning point, perhaps as significant as the turning points experienced in recent years in the fields of outdoor recreation and wilderness preservation. We are deeply aware that in most European nations, and in many other nations, around the world, the preservation of historic and architectural monuments is the special responsibility of a separate bureau or department created solely for this purpose. We sense that within the Government of the United States, and specifically within the National Park Service, there is a need to bring professional preservation work into sharp focus, and to conduct it at a very high level. This is a need implicit in the present state of the preservation movement in the United States and in the meaningful growth of the National Park Service as a great Federal bureau. The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Service is a significant year in which you may wish to inaugurate a strengthened program for historic preservation.

#### The Background

It is clear to your Committee that the National Park Service, in 1966, is faced with no ordinary problem of routine improvement to its existing organization for historic preservation. Rather, this year of major new Federal legislation presents an opportunity for fundamental progress of the kind that comes rarely, perhaps only once in a generation. In the long history of Federal historic preservation there appear to have been comparable turning points only twice before, each a generation apart.

Two generations ago Congress enacted the Antiquities Act of 1906, the first general national legislation for historic and prehistoric preservation. Its broad purpose was to preserve antiquities situated on lands belonging to the United States. In implementing this legislation the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture and War were instructed to adopt uniform rules and regulations governing the preservation of antiquities on Federal lands within their respective jurisdictions. This is probably the earliest example of that kind of inter-agency cooperation which the proposed new Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is expected to develop on a much broader basis to meet today's historic preservation needs. The rules and regulations adopted in 1906 still remain in effect today, but we are informed they await a badly needed revision. After the National Park Service was created as a Federal bureau

in 1916, the numerous historical and archeological monuments established pursuant to the Antiquities Act, and initially administered by different Federal Departments, were all brought together into the National Park System in the reorganization of 1933. Perhaps this may be thought of as marking the culmination of the first generation of work under the earliest broad preservation legislation.

Just one generation after adopting the Antiquities Act, Congress enacted its second comprehensive preservation law. This was the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which for the first time declared it to be "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." This national charter for preservation went far beyond the Antiquities Act of 1906 which had concerned itself solely with antiquities on Federal lands. The new legislation was directed toward the preservation of all properties of national significance, regardless of ownership. The single limitation in the Act concerned properties owned by religious or educational institutions, which could only be acquired with the consent of their owners. Broad powers were granted to the Secretary of the Interior to conduct surveys, to determine the national significance of historic sites and buildings, and to acquire and thereafter to restore, reconstruct, rehabilitate, preserve and maintain such properties. An Advisory Board was authorized to assist the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the National Park Service to discharge their duties under the legislation.

During the past thirty years the Historic Sites Act of 1935 has been the cornerstone for historic preservation through Federal means. Organizationally, it resulted in establishment of the Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings within the National Park Service, from which today's Divisions of History Studies and Archeology Studies are lineal descendants. The Act provided a firm legal basis for the Historic American Buildings Survey, the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings and the Inter-Agency Archeological Salvage Program. Numerous historical properties were added to the National Park System under this authority and beginning in 1960, a National Registry of Historic Landmarks was instituted to recognize nationally significant historic properties however owned and wherever situated. In 1949, the national policy set forth in the Historic Sites Act became the basis for the Congressional charter of the non-governmental National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, assigned by law the function of increasing public participation in carrying out the national policy. New inter-agency preservation programs were

developed including one to govern the disposal of surplus Federal historic property; another to control restoration of historic buildings through Federal public works funds; and most effective of all, the continuously evolving program for salvaging archeological material adversely affected by any Federal construction project.

Another generation has passed and now, in 1966, these admirably beneficial programs are proving insufficient. Today the nation again faces a growing accumulation of unsolved preservation problems stemming in large part from such contemporary trends as urban expansion and decay, massive highway and dam constructions, accelerated population growth, industrial and commercial development and increasing leisure time. The impact of these forces on historic sites and buildings and on our total environment is fully documented in President Johnson's conservation messages, in the Rains Committee report, in addresses by Secretary Udall, Assistant Secretary Cain and yourself, in National Trust publications, in professional journals, and in hearings before key Congressional Committees, notably Interior and Insular Affairs, Banking and Currency, and Public Works, both in the House and in the Senate.

It now appears almost certain that the 89th Congress will enact no fewer than four public laws to strengthen historic preservation throughout the nation. Of these the proposed Interior legislation, S. 3035, will have the greatest effect on the National Park Service, an effect comparable in significance in every way to the Antiquities Act of 1906, and the Historic Sites Act of 1935. The new legislation is the first general law for historic preservation in a generation. It contemplates a major expansion of the National Register to include districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects of regional, state and local significance in addition to those of national significance. It initiates an entirely new program of matching grants to the States and to the National Trust. It provides for a new and comprehensive coordinating body--an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, including six Cabinet Officers or their representatives, the Chairman of the National Trust, and ten state and local officers and individuals interested and experienced in preservation. In addition to this legislation, other pending bills would substantially enlarge the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to assist historic preservation in urban areas, and would limit the authority of the Department of Transportation to affect registered historic sites and buildings adversely.

Clearly, the wheel has again come full circle, and in 1966 historic preservation through Federal means is on the threshold of a third generation of important growth. It is unmistakably clear to your Committee that the National Park Service now requires a fully developed professional preservation organization commensurate to the major tasks ahead.

#### The Procedure

Conferences. Beginning May 24-25, 1966, and continuing at intervals, the Committee had the benefit of several long and thorough discussions with you, and in accordance with your suggestions also conferred with the following members of the Service organization, all of whom, without exception, were friendly, helpful, and very informative. We record our deep appreciation for the great benefit we derived from these discussions and conferences.

Howard R. Stagner, Assistant Director, Resource Studies  
(Mr. Stagner remained with us through all conferences)

J.E.N. Jensen, Assistant Director, Design and Construction

Howard W. Baker, Assistant Director, Operations

Harthon L. Bill, Deputy Assistant Director, Operations

Robert M. Utley, Chief, Division of History Studies

John W. Corbett, Chief Archeologist

Charles W. Lessig, Chief Architect, Branch of Historic  
Structures and HABS

James C. Massey, Supervisor, Branch of HABS

Henry A. Judd, Supervisor, Branch of Historic Structures

Charles S. Pope, Architectural Historian, Division of  
History Studies

Following our May meetings, the first draft of our report was submitted to you on June 16. After a further exchange of views by correspondence the Chairman met with you on August 16, and again with you, the Regional Directors, and the Senior Executive Committee on August 24. As our report took final shape we joined you on

September 27, in a valuable discussion of basic objectives with Assistant Secretary Stanley A. Cain. His comments and support were particularly helpful. Last of all, individual members of the Committee were especially privileged on three different occasions to join you in the discussion of important aspects of our recommendations with Secretary Stewart L. Udall, whose interest in strengthening historic preservation through new legislation and other means underlies the whole undertaking.

Documents. During its meetings the Committee had access to pertinent documents relating to the past and present organization of professional historic preservation work in the National Park Service, ranging from Schneider's Report to the Secretary of the Interior on the Preservation of Historic Sites and Buildings, 1935, which formed the basis of the Historic Sites Act, to the most recent organization charts for the National Park Service, and accompanying functional statements. Several conferees furnished special documentation. Committee members were also informed about important special studies, including the Rains report, With Heritage So Rich, and the analysis of Federal archeological programs recently made for the Committee for the Recovery of Archeological Remains. The Committee was also furnished copies of pending preservation legislation introduced into the present session of Congress by Senator Jackson, and by Senators Muskie, Hart, Hartke, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Long of Missouri, Mansfield, Metcalf, Morse, Nelson, Sparkman and Yarborough.

#### Observations

Your Committee desires to preface its recommendations with several general observations based on consideration of the problem you placed before us, and related discussions and documentation. These observations represent significant highlights of our thinking but do not attempt to embrace every point brought up and discussed.

1. The National Park Service, over a period of many years, has developed a unique professional staff of historians, archeologists, and historical-architects, specializing in historic preservation, who are a very important source of strength and stature for the organization. These now number approximately 80 in the Washington Office, the three Planning and Service Centers, the Regional Offices, the Southwestern Archeological Laboratory, and detailed to special projects, including approximately 26 historians, 16 historical-architects, 4 exhibition specialists (restoration),

and 35 archeologists, including staffs of two ruins stabilization units. These figures include several vacant positions and exclude other professional personnel in these fields on park staffs. While individual professional competence naturally varies, and there is particular need for a stronger historical-architectural organization, this staff, collectively, is unparalleled in the Federal Government.

2. The professional staffs in history, archeology, and historical architecture are now subdivided, and in our view, fragmented, under four of the six Assistant Directors. These fragmented staffs function at a regrettably low level in the Service organization. This low level in the organization makes communication of staff professional viewpoints within the Service, and outside the Service, both difficult and often ineffective. The consequence of this ineffectiveness is failing momentum in the program, and seriously diminished efficiency and morale among the staff. It is the Committee's view that an improved and consolidated organization would release much pent-up staff energy to the great benefit of the Service and Department.

3. As "creative Federalism" begins to involve the Federal Government increasingly in cooperative programs with State and local governments, it becomes evident that professional historic preservation counsel will be increasingly needed in connection with urban renewal, highway construction, river basin development, park conservation, and other national programs. Your Committee feels that the National Park Service, with its accumulated experience in this field is the appropriate Federal agency to provide this counsel.

4. The best preservation and restoration work requires close collaboration between historical-architects, archeologists, and historians. While such collaboration has been achieved on some Service projects, it has been incomplete, or missing on other projects. This is partly because for many years the historical-architects have been located in one Service organization unit, and the historians and archeologists in one or more others. The Historic American Buildings Survey and the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, have been somewhat parallel, but quite independent programs for thirty years, collaborating only sporadically. While each survey has a special character that should be carefully preserved, much closer coordination of these programs is essential if an enlarged National Register is to become a reality. The work of all three of these professional staffs should be closely coordinated in the interest of efficiency and high standards in Service preservation and restoration work.

5. While restoration work of the highest standards has been carried out by the National Park Service in many cases, the current execution of rehabilitation and restoration projects on historic buildings in the National Park System appears to require significantly greater continuity of professional control from inception to completion than presently obtains. Current construction programs include 113 rehabilitation or restoration projects in 58 areas of the System, involving the expenditure of approximately \$7,000,000. Under present organization, the historical-architectural research is performed by one staff under the Assistant Director, Resource Studies. When the research report is completed, working drawings and specifications are prepared by a different historical-architectural staff under the Chief Architect, Historic Structures and HABS, who reports to the Chief of Design, who is under the Assistant Director, Design and Construction. If the work is accomplished by contract, (which is the case for 53 projects totaling \$5,700,000) project supervision is then taken over by a third staff--a project supervisor who reports to the Chief of Construction in one of the three Planning and Service Centers. Few project supervisors are trained in architecture, and none in historical architecture. Most are engineers or landscape architects. There is room for many a slip in this procedure for restoring irreplaceable historic buildings.

If the work is accomplished by day labor, however, (which is the case for 60 projects totaling \$1,350,000) the situation is considerably better. Supervision is then the direct responsibility of the Supervisor, Historic Structures, under the Chief Architect (Historic Structures & HABS). The big problem here is the small size of the staff available to supervise restoration projects scattered in park areas throughout the country. A larger staff is needed and more careful programming of restoration work, we are advised, would greatly help to bring this situation under better control. In all cases, maintenance of restored buildings then passes to a fourth staff, at a park level, which is given professional guidance by the Division of Maintenance, under the Assistant Director for Operations. We were advised that some park personnel have not maintained significant details of historic buildings carefully restored at considerable cost after exhaustive research.

6. The management and growth of the National Park System, in which presently 2 out of 3 areas or a total of 127 are primarily historical or archeological in character, requires the professional services of historians, archeologists and historical-architects in the preparation and review of an important range of Service documents including master plans, historic structure reports, interpretive prospectuses, and suitability and feasibility studies of proposed

areas. While these professional services may be provided in several ways, it appears to your Committee that they can be supplied most efficiently and economically, and more important, at the highest standard, through a carefully organized and competently led professional unit, serving the entire organization.

7. The Committee was impressed by the scope and impact of the Service and Department program for Registered National Historic Landmarks, which now number 643 eligible sites and buildings. This program, to be meaningful, requires a system of annual inspections by Superintendents and staff members, who will perform functions something like those of Inspectors of Ancient Monuments in Great Britain.

8. It appears to the Committee that you may want to review Advisory Committees and Boards in the field of preservation to make sure there is neither overlapping nor omission of important areas. These Boards and Committees now include:

Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites,  
Buildings and Monuments

Consulting Committee for the National Survey of  
Historic Sites and Buildings

Committee for the Recovery of Archeological Remains

Advisory Board to the Historic American Buildings  
Survey

It is also probable that any growing Service program in historic preservation will require wider use of consultants and contractual services than has been the general practice in the past. In this connection, your Committee was very favorably impressed by the scope and effectiveness of the contract program in salvage archeology, which now totals approximately 70 contracts a year.

9. The Historic Sites Act of 1935 was intended by the Secretary of the Interior and the Congress to bring the National program of historic preservation in the United States fully abreast of the best European practice. That Act located this program in the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. While the United States was and is world leader in National Park conservation, many nations have had much longer experience in historic preservation. The Schneider report presents charts of the organizations for preservation work in effect in 1935 in Belgium, France,

Great Britain, Italy, Sweden, Canada and Mexico. Schneider stated, "the important point here is to stress the opinion that the planning, development and administration of historic sites and buildings by a separate division or branch is the proper method . . ." Based on his study, he recommended that the National Park Service establish two Deputy Director positions, one for Historic Sites and Buildings, and one for Natural and Scenic Areas. The Service decided, however, to establish an Assistant Director for Historic Sites and Buildings, paralleling five other Assistant Directors. The Rains report reviews past World War II legislation for Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and Italy. Because of the grave problems of war damaged monuments in Europe, as well as the impact of post-war construction, new legislation and organization have been found necessary in most European countries, further strengthening what is usually an independent bureau or commission for historic preservation. It appears to your Committee that there are equally valid grounds for strengthened preservation organization in the United States.

#### Recommendations

1. That the Service create an Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, and consolidate in this office its top-level professional historical-architects, historians and archeologists. This would mean bringing together the following present organization units and their staffs:

Division of History Studies - Resource Studies  
(19 historians; 4 historical-architects;  
1 archeologist)

Division of Archeology Studies - Resource Studies  
(32 archeologists)

Chief Architect, Historic Structures and HABS -  
Design and Construction (12 historical-  
architects)

Chief, Division of Construction - Design and  
Construction (4 exhibit specialists, restoration)

Branch of History Resources Management - Operations  
(2 historians; 1 historical-architect;  
1 archeologist -- proposed)

Division of New Area Studies and Master Planning -  
Cooperative Activities (5 historians)

It is recognized that this professional staff would be physically distributed among the Washington Office, the three Planning and Service Centers, the Regional Offices, the Southwestern Archeological Laboratory, and detailed to special projects and tasks, and that it would have to serve the entire organization as a professional services unit.

In order for this Office to function in the most effective way, it should be supported at the highest levels so that it brings to the National Park Service the same professional and scholarly prestige that similar offices in other countries enjoy.

2. The head of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation should report directly to the Director. He should hold the highest rank possible, and not less than Assistant Director. The head of this major Office should be prepared to represent the Director and the Secretary of the Interior on professional historic preservation matters at the highest levels within the United States and at international conferences.

It is recommended that a head for the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation be sought who would have as many of the following qualifications as could be found:

- High professional standing.
- Leadership ability.
- Managerial ability and experience.
- Imagination and conceptual ability.
- Drive.
- Unusual ability to deal with the public.
- Broad sympathy for the three fields of history, archeology and historical-architecture.

Your Committee hopes that an historical-architect can be found with these qualifications, partly because we foresee rapidly-increasing national need for experts who have specialized in historic buildings, and also because this side of Service professional work is most in need of further strengthening and development. It is also true that the heads of comparable organizations in other governments are almost without exception selected from the field of historical-architecture. However, should a highly qualified historical-architect not be available, a historian or archeologist could fill the position very satisfactorily with proper staff support.

3. The Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation might well have the following divisions:

Division of Historical Architecture.  
Division of Archeology.  
Division of History.  
Division of Landmarks and Preservation.

The first three of these divisions are largely self-explanatory. Under the Division of Historical Architecture might well be three branches devoted respectively to Historic Structures, Historic American Buildings Survey, and Historic Architectural Investigations and Reports. Under the Division of History might well be two branches, as at present, devoted respectively to History Studies, and to the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings. The Division of Archeology presently does not require branches, but its work subdivides into National Park Service Archeology, River Basin Archeology, and responsibilities of the Division Chief as Consulting Archeologist for the Department of the Interior under the Antiquities Act.

It is noted that the Division of Archeology is responsible for the supervision of two ruins stabilization units in the Southwest. It is suggested that the Division of Historical Architecture be made responsible in a somewhat parallel manner for all phases of day labor projects for the restoration of historic buildings in the National Park System. Restoration projects executed by contract would probably require participation by Design and Construction after the preparation of working drawings and specifications. Eventually, however, as staff is developed, project supervisors trained in historical architecture might well be detailed from the Division of Historical Architecture to Design and Construction to supervise major restoration projects executed by contract.

The fourth division suggested above would coordinate the Landmarks program after designation, and would handle many important day-to-day matters such as drafting replies to correspondence; preparing recommendations on pending legislation; participating in planning for special historical events, and a wide variety of other quasi-professional duties.

In order to carry out the mission of this Office for the Service, additional professional appointments will need to be made as the organization develops. Such appointments ought to be made with

the same seriousness and at the same level of professional and scholarly attainment as professional appointments are made in a good university.

4. Once an Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation is established, should this recommendation or some modification of it be approved, it is suggested that the Service systematically review and where necessary update its cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies involving historic preservation, including:

- a. Existing inter-departmental regulations under the Antiquities Act of 1906.
- b. Existing cooperative agreement with Smithsonian Institution.
- c. Existing cooperative agreement with National Trust.
- d. Initiate a cooperative agreement with the Urban Renewal Administration.

5. It is recommended that a study be made of the relation between the Advisory Board for the Historic American Buildings Survey, and the Consulting Committee for the National Survey for Historic Sites and Buildings to see if their work can be correlated, and if their composition is appropriate. On the basis of this study, a decision can be made regarding reappointment of the HABS Board whose services are said to be urgently needed.

6. In view of the present and prospective shortage of expert staff in historic preservation, especially historical architecture, it is suggested that wider use be made of consultants and contract services in this field.

#### Conclusion

Your Committee is keenly aware that you have asked us to advise you on a matter of great importance to the Service. We have given you our frank observations and recommendations in the light of the knowledge we have, which we are fully aware can never be complete. Nothing in this report is to be taken as criticism of any official

in the Service organization, each of whom, including those most likely to be affected, has given us the fullest and friendliest cooperation. If, after reviewing this report, you would like to consult with us further, we will endeavor to be available.

Respectfully submitted:

(SIGNED)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ernest Allen Connally

(SIGNED)

\_\_\_\_\_  
J. O. Brew

(SIGNED)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald F. Lee, Chairman