

# Tax Act Review Reform Policy Paper

JG603

## **Summary Statement:**

Below are outlined suggested reforms to the Tax Act Review process conducted between the individual states and the National Park Service (NPS). These reforms are recommended to NPS for discussion in order to improve the review process, to clarify the roles in the review process, to streamline reviews and to apply the Standards in a consistent and direct manner. The proposed reforms are related to three issues: Issue I: Streamlining, Issue II: Unique or Unusual Circumstances and Issue III: Applying the Standards.

Under Issue I six reforms are suggested: 1. Project training and education, 2. Certifying reviewers, 3. Application form revisions, 4. Reviewer training, 5. Preliminary reviews and 6. Electronic submissions. Under Issue II two reforms are suggested: 1. Review process negotiations and 2. Appeal process clarification. And Under Issue III there are three reforms suggested: 1. Compliance with the standards, 2. Design approach and 3. Increasing the incentive.

Comments received on this policy paper from the states are attached: Appendix A: Arizona, Appendix B: New York, Appendix C: Kansas, Appendix D: Texas and Appendix E: South Carolina.

## **Introduction:**

The NCSHPO Tax Act Review Task Force was charged to research and articulate concerns and issues in relationship to the NPS/State interface on Tax act projects; and to make recommendations on potential ways to reform the review process and application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

The task force prepared and distributed a questionnaire to all the states in February 2003. The questionnaire sought responses to specific administrative procedures between the states and NPS, possible approaches to changing the review process, application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and issues involving owner/developers.

The results of the survey were compiled, presented and posted in March 2003. Out of the 52 topics related to the state/NPS interface there was general agreement that, in the vast majority of cases, the review process and application of the Standards was going very well and many states strongly supported the positive working relationship the state's have with NPS.

This paper addresses those problem areas most often mentioned in answering the questionnaire and offers suggested reforms to address these consensus issues.

## **Issue I: Streamlining (The Front End, First Chance, Review)**

Several questionnaire responses fell under the concept of streamlining. They include:

- We have had owners back out because the review process takes too long.
- Expand the use of the facilitated review sheets.
- Let certified states complete the reviews themselves.
- Make the NPS review either Pass or Fail.
- Allow on-line submission of applications.

**Background:**

There are various opinions as to the perfect time to complete the tax act review process. Certainly the principle of "the earlier the better" is preferred until one sees a finished product that doesn't look at all like the original submission, especially after changes that may be required by local and state permitting reviews. Just as problematic is having the owner begin the review process after the building is already in service.

Ideally the project should be reviewed during design development at a time when meaningful consultation can occur and cost effective changes can be incorporated into the design. It is also helpful to have the eligibility criteria and character defining elements identified and agreed upon before schematic design starts.

Obviously having an owner, architect, structural engineer and contractor who understand the Standards and are familiar with the review process leads to a quick review and timely approval.

**Current Situation:**

The tax act credit for rehabilitation continues to be a positive historic preservation force in every state and the overall success of the review process is quite high.

The unanswerable questions are how many rehabilitation projects never take advantage of the credit, how many projects drop out because of extended review periods and how many unsubmitted poor projects would have been improved if they had come under the tax credit program?

NPS has tried to address some of the process issues by providing the "facilitated review sheets," by allowing preliminary early review comments (yes, the "Blue Plate Special" reviews) and by having an electronic version of the application form.

**Reform Suggestions:**

1. Project training and education. Increase the training opportunities for owners, developers, architects, engineers and lending institutions. These training workshops should be sponsored by both the States and NPS and should occur cyclically at a regional level.
2. Certifying reviewers. Any reviewer with five years experience in the private and/or public sectors and attendance at three NPS tax act reviewer workshops should be given expedited review status. NPS would then address only those items referred to on the expedited review sheet. If there were no specific items listed the project would be automatically approved.
3. Application form revisions. In addition to the significance criteria, Part I should list the character defining elements that must be preserved if at all possible during the

- project. Part II should target the major "Top Ten" priority issues that could affect the continued eligibility of the property ideally tied back to the CDE list from Part I.
4. Reviewer training. NPS staff time gained through an expedited review process should be used to train reviewers with less than five years experience, to cyclically visit the states to see specific conditions affecting projects and to conduct workshops for owners, architects and engineers.
  5. Preliminary Reviews. NPS should formalize the preliminary review procedure to clarify the role of the states, how the review is initiated, conditions and time frames.
  6. Electronic submissions. NPS should study if and how applications and reviews could be done electronically.

## **Issue II: Unique and Unusual Circumstances (The Back End, Last Chance, Review)**

Several of the questionnaire responses dealt with unique and unusual circumstances. They include:

- NPS should implement a "last chance" review.
- Allow the States a role in the appeal process.
- We find out a project we felt met the standards ended up being rejected by NPS.

### **Background:**

When the tax act program began in the 1970s, the movement to reuse the existing building stock, especially historic buildings, was unsupported by the construction industry, the community redevelopment offices, local building codes, lending institutions and federal tax law that favored demolition over rehabilitation.

The historic preservation movement was at the forefront in promoting rehabilitation as a viable and cost effective project treatment. But since the 1970s other environmental movements have promoted preservation-related concepts such as "smart growth", energy conservation, sustainability, "green" architecture, neo-traditional planning and neighborhood conservation. Many of these programs look to the past for inspiration, identification of principles and documentation of standards.

### **Current Situation:**

Rehabilitation of historic properties continues to be a major community tool for both preservation and redevelopment programs.

The development community has seen many successful rehabilitation projects combined with new construction. At the same time many historic properties continue to be lost due to unsympathetic or uninformed owners and/or specific project constraints that don't exactly fit the standard rehabilitation mold for success. In some instances progressive environmental policies, that should be viewed as a complement to historic preservation, can compound issues and clearances and lead to the complete loss of historic resources while promoting the very principles represented by the historic examples.

As the states work to save historic properties as part of community redevelopment programs, rehabilitation projects that require real or imaginary special considerations are appealed up through the SHPO staff while at the same time coming under NPS review.

A built in point of disagreement can occur when the state starts treating the project like a 106 undertaking (even though they are dealing with a private developer), looking for ways to minimize the adverse effect of completely losing the resource. Meanwhile the NPS reviewers who never face the 106 process directly apply program policies more like an iron clad 4F program of take it or leave it and the lack of any perceived ability to compromise puts the owner out of the program.

To remain in the forefront of property management options, historic preservation efforts must be in tune with other progressive environmental movements. Historic preservation treatments must allow for local density increases, smart growth policies, energy conservation programs and adaptive use flexibility that meet local needs while at the same time preserving those qualities that make a property eligible for listing. The application of the Rehabilitation Standards needs to be within a framework that recognizes local or state policies aimed at quality-of-life issues related to and enhanced by historic preservation principles.

NPS has addressed this issue when it comes to archaeology where a mitigation option is allowed through excavation (Standard No. 8 allows for mitigation, although excavation is now considered adverse). But when a contributing building is to be demolished, no mitigation can be addressed that still allows the owner to take advantage of the 20% investment tax credit.

#### **Reform Suggestions:**

1. Review process negotiations. Allow the states to negotiate (similar to a 106 review) with a project owner before submission to NPS. The goal of the negotiation would be to consider prudent and feasible alternatives and/or to satisfactorily mitigate any adverse effects of the project. If the state signs a MOU with the owner that addresses mitigation of adverse effects then NPS should review the tax act project in accordance with the mitigation measures offered by the owner but still allowing the use of the 20% tax credit.
2. Appeal process clarification. Allow the states an official role in the appeal process that allows incorporation of unique and unusual factors that affect the project.

#### **Issue III: Applying the Standards (The Philosophy of Rehabilitation)**

Several of the questionnaire responses dealt with application of the Standards. They include:

- Eliminate any mandatory use of the restoration standard for a rehabilitation project.
- NPS concerns on a project appear to relate to application of a personal design philosophy.
- NPS requires restoration of damaged plaster areas.
- NPS rejection of rooftop and other density/zoning related additions.

#### **Background:**

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Projects and specifically the Standards for Rehabilitation have been the most unifying force in historic preservation since the criteria of eligibility for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Standards are specific but flexible and have been incorporated into state register programs and local preservation ordinances across the United States. Derived from international standards under specific application to resources in the United States development of the Rehabilitation Standards was a major prerequisite for the tax act program.

Nearly all construction projects involving historic buildings utilize more than one "treatment". For example projects promoting the adaptive use of a building are clearly "rehabilitations", but structural "stabilization", door "preservation", window "restoration" and porch "reconstruction" may all occur within an overall "rehabilitation" project.

It is also important to remember that the Rehabilitation Standards must be applied to an eligible or listed building. Any "new work" or replacement of missing features (even so called "restoration" work) on an existing eligible building does nothing to increase or improve its eligibility. It may do wonders aesthetically. It may do wonders economically. It may help promote the building and be more pleasing to the eye, but replacement of a missing element or other rehabilitation work does not enhance the property's basic eligibility.

The preservation of the character defining elements that make the building eligible is the key and primary goal of any state and/or federal involvement in the project. The building must be listed or determined eligible before the rehabilitation project. The Rehabilitation Standards are directed toward this goal. Rehabilitation projects need to place a high priority on the preservation of the character defining elements and of "original fabric" that is essential for preserving these character-defining elements. Any divergence from this overriding principle under any treatment heading (be it stabilization, restoration, rehabilitation and/or reconstruction) is not in the best "long term" interest of the historic preservation movement. Insisting on the preservation of elements or fabrics that do not define the historic character and/or insisting on the restoration of missing elements may unnecessarily burden the overall economic feasibility of the project. After all, this is the "historic preservation" movement not the "aesthetic restoration" movement.

Because the Rehabilitation Standards have a degree of flexibility, any individual's interpretation of them should be based on the collective meaning of any single standard and an overall recognition of how the Standards are tied to eligibility. Flexibility also comes into play in applying the Standards in light of changing environmental issues such as lead paint management, energy conservation and smart growth.

**Current Situation:**

Rehabilitation appears to be losing its economic edge over new construction. Rehabilitation used to clearly have an economic advantage over demolition and new construction even without use of the tax credit. Today rehab projects are bigger, more expensive; sitting on expensive lots and often surrounded by increased density. The tax credits are now part of the basic economic equation required to make a project pencil out. No credit translates into no project and ends up leading to certain demolition or radical alteration.

Construction project costs continue to shift toward increased systems costs at the expense of spatial costs. Traditionally the base cost of systems were equal when applied to a new or an existing building but now the effort to retrofit expanded systems into existing buildings (including fire detection, security protection, computer networks, fire suppression, lighting, power outlets, HVAC and plumbing) has shifted the overall rehab budget toward these system upgrades and installation and away from original fabric materials conservation and stabilization; let alone the luxury of restoration. Without additional subsidy through increased tax credits or direct grants, rehabilitation projects will soon become marginal in favor of new construction where labor costs can be more closely controlled.

### **Reform Suggestions:**

1. Compliance with the Standards. The review should focus on how well the project preserves and protects character-defining elements as agreed to in Part I of the application. Although comments on the desirability to restore and/or even reconstruct deteriorated or missing elements can be suggested, no requirement to restore a feature of an otherwise eligible or listed property should be mandatory.
2. Design Approach. Because there is a plurality of approaches toward contemporary design, tax act review should remain focussed on maximizing the preservation of the character-defining elements and the spatial characteristics of the property. Obviously new work should not overwhelm and/or dominate the original overall architectural statement, but reviewers at both the state and NPS levels should not try to dictate any specific design approach to the project design team. NPS should assume the state has made a good faith effort to "improve" a marginal project and focus, in a pass/fail way, on basic compliance with the Standards. Professional suggestions to improve the quality of a project should definitely be offered if the design can still be modified, but any mandatory requirement to upgrade a marginal project that meets the Standards to one that better meets the Standards should be avoided.
3. Increasing the Incentive. There should be an effort to apply the investment tax credit toward the rehabilitation of as many listed or eligible properties as possible. The first and primary change would be to increase the credit back to 25%.

### **Appendix A: Comments from Arizona**

Jim: The reform issue that will have the greatest benefit, i.e. saving the resource, will result from your suggestion for allowing the same treatment flexibility to the private sector that is enjoyed by Federal Agencies pursuant to Section 106. The tendency for NPS to view projects more as Restoration than as Rehabilitation is the issue that has not had enough attention, and it needed to be raised; as it, more than anything else, causes frustration in both owners and state reviewers in their effort to bring historic buildings into current use. To be forced to reverse their forward looking perspective, somehow takes the wind out of their sails, while they were feeling good about doing the right thing for quality of life issues. Just as consideration is given to the needs of a Federal Agency in fulfilling their program mission, in addition to consideration of the effect of their undertakings on historic properties, the private sector has a need to pursue project viability, and in some cases marketability, in fulfilling the objectives of economic redevelopment. A return to the 25% credit, especially in this period favoring tax cuts

generally, would encourage redevelopers to go the extra mile in meeting the Standards. I too often hear that it's just not worth the bother. Moreover, the proposed tax reduction for dividends will divert rehabilitation investment unless it is seen to be more appealing.  
Bob Frankeberger, AIA

## **Appendix B: Comments from New York**

### **Issue I: Streamlining (The Front End, First Chance, Review)**

Several questionnaire responses fell under the concept of streamlining. They include:

- We have had owners back out because the review process takes too long.
- Expand the use of the facilitated review sheets.
- Let certified states complete the reviews themselves.
- Make the NPS review either Pass or Fail.
- Allow on-line submission of applications.

#### **Background:**

There are various opinions as to the perfect time to complete the tax act review process. Certainly the principle of "the earlier the better" is preferred until one sees a finished product that doesn't look at all like the original submission, especially after changes that may be required by through local and state permitting reviews. Just as problematic is having the owner begin the review process after the building is already in service. ***In fact, the CFR advises that starting work before getting a Part 2 "Description of Rehabilitation" certification from the NPS puts the applicant in danger of not receiving the credit, and currently the IRS does not use of the credit if an application is received after the building is placed in service.***

Ideally the project should be reviewed during design development at a time when meaningful consultation can occur and cost affective changes can be incorporated into the design. It is also helpful to have the eligibility criteria and character defining elements identified and agreed upon before schematic design starts.

Obviously having an owner, architect, structural engineer and contractor who understand the Standards and are familiar with the review process leads to a quick review and timely approval.

#### **Current Situation:**

The tax act credit for rehabilitation continues to be a positive historic preservation force in every state and the overall success of the review process is quite high.

The unanswerable questions are how many rehabilitation projects never take advantage of the credit, how many projects drop out because of extended review periods and how many unsubmitted poor projects would have been improved if they had come under the tax credit program?

NPS has tried to address some of the process issues by providing the "facilitated review sheets," by allowing preliminary early review comments (yes, the "Blue Plate Special" reviews) and by having an electronic version of the application form.

### **Reform Suggestions:**

7. Project training and education. Increase the training opportunities for owners, developers, architects, engineers and lending institutions. These training workshops should be sponsored by both the States and NPS and should occur cyclically at a regional level.
8. Certify reviewers. Any reviewer with five years experience in the private and/or public sectors and attendance at three NPS tax act reviewer workshops should be given expedited review status. NPS would then address only those items referred to on the expedited review sheet. If there were no specific items listed the project would be automatically approved.
9. Review application forms. In addition to the significance criteria, Part I should list the character defining elements that must be preserved if at all possible during the project. *This might not be useful and it could "tie the hands" of the Part 2 reviewers if something is overlooked or found after the Part 1 is certified. It could result in more inflexibility.* Part II should target the major "Top Ten" priority issues that could affect the continued eligibility of the property ideally tied back to the CDE list from Part I. *Again, this could lead to inflexible reviews, and cut out the creativity and "horse-trading" that makes many projects work*
10. Reviewer training. NPS staff time gained through an expedited review process should be used to train reviewers with less than five years experience, to cyclically visit the states to see specific conditions affecting projects and to conduct workshops for owners, architects and engineers.
11. Preliminary Reviews. NPS should formalize the preliminary review procedure to clarify the role of the states, how the review is initiated, conditions and time frames.
12. Electronic submissions. NPS should study if and how applications and reviews could be done electronically.

### **Issue II: Unique and Unusual Circumstances (The Back End, Last Chance, Review)**

Several of the questionnaire responses dealt with unique and unusual circumstances. They include:

- NPS should implement a "last chance" review.
- Allow the States a role in the appeal process.
- We find out a project we felt met the standards ended up being rejected by NPS.

### **Background:**

When the tax act program began in the 1970s, the movement to reuse the existing building stock, especially historic buildings, was unsupported by the construction industry, the community redevelopment offices, local building codes, lending institutions and federal tax law that favored demolition over rehabilitation.

The historic preservation movement was at the forefront in promoting rehabilitation as a viable and cost effective project treatment. But since the 1970s other environmental movements have promoted preservation-related concepts such as "smart growth", energy conservation, sustainability, "green" architecture, neo-traditional planning and neighborhood conservation. Many of these programs look to the past for inspiration, identification of principles and documentation of standards.

**Current Situation:**

Rehabilitation of historic properties continues to be a major community tool for both preservation and redevelopment programs.

The development community has seen many successful rehabilitation projects combined with new construction. At the same time many historic properties continue to be lost due to unsympathetic or uninformed owners and/or specific project constraints that don't exactly fit the standard rehabilitation mold for success. In some instances progressive environmental policies that should be viewed as a complement to historic preservation can compound issues and clearances and lead to the complete loss of historic resources while promoting the very principles represented by the historic examples.

As the states work to save historic properties as part of community redevelopment programs, rehabilitation projects that require real or imaginary special considerations are appealed up through the SHPO staff while at the same time coming under NPS review. A built in point of disagreement can occur when the state starts treating the project like a 106 undertaking (even though they are dealing with a private developer), looking for ways to minimize the adverse effect of completely losing the resource. Meanwhile the NPS reviewers who never face the 106 process directly apply program policies more like an iron clad 4F program of take it or leave it and the lack of any perceived ability to compromise puts the owner out of the program.

To remain in the forefront of property management options, historic preservation efforts must be in tune with other progressive environmental movements. Historic preservation treatments must allow for local density increases, smart growth policies, energy conservation programs and adaptive use flexibility that meet local needs while at the same time preserving those qualities that make a property eligible for listing. The application of the Rehabilitation Standards needs to be within a framework that recognizes local or state policies aimed at quality-of-life issues related to and enhanced by historic preservation principles.

NPS has addressed this issue when it comes to archaeology where a mitigation option is allowed through excavation (Standard No. 8 allows for mitigation, although excavation is now considered adverse). But when a contributing building is to be demolished, no mitigation can be addressed that still allows the owner to take advantage of the 20% investment tax credit.

**Reform Suggestions:**

1. Review process. Allow the states to negotiate (similar to a 106 review) with a project owner before submission to NPS. The goal of the negotiation would be to consider prudent and feasible alternatives and/or to satisfactorily mitigate any

- adverse effects of the project. If the state signs a MOU with the owner that addresses mitigation of adverse effects then NPS should review the tax act project in accordance with the mitigation measures offered by the owner but still allowing the use of the 20% tax credit.
2. Appeal process. Allow the states an official role in the appeal process that allows incorporation of unique and unusual factors that affect the project.

### **Issue III: Applying the Standards (The Philosophy of Rehabilitation)**

Several of the questionnaire responses dealt with application of the Standards. They include:

- Eliminate any mandatory use of the restoration standard for a rehabilitation project.
- NPS concerns on a project appear to relate to application of a personal design philosophy.
- NPS requires restoration of damaged plaster areas.
- NPS rejection of rooftop and other density/zoning related additions.

#### **Background:**

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Projects and specifically the Standards for Rehabilitation have been the most unifying force in historic preservation since the criteria of eligibility for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The Standards are specific but flexible and have been incorporated into state register programs and local preservation ordinances across the United States. Derived from international standards under specific application to resources in the United States development of the Rehabilitation Standards was a major prerequisite for the tax act program.

Nearly all construction projects involving historic buildings utilize more than one "treatment". For example projects promoting the adaptive use of a building are clearly "rehabilitations", but structural "stabilization", door "preservation", window "restoration" and porch "reconstruction" may all occur within an overall "rehabilitation" project.

It is also important to remember that the Rehabilitation Standards must be applied to an eligible or listed building. Any "new work" or replacement of missing features (even so called "restoration" work) on an existing eligible building does nothing to increase or improve its eligibility. It may do wonders aesthetically. It may do wonders economically. It may help promote the building and be more pleasing to the eye, but replacement of a missing element or other rehabilitation work does not enhance the property's basic eligibility.

The preservation of the character defining elements that make the building eligible is the key and primary goal of any state and/or federal involvement in the project. The building must be listed or determined eligible before the rehabilitation project. The Rehabilitation Standards are directed toward this goal. Rehabilitation projects need to place a high priority on the preservation of the character defining elements and of "original fabric" that is essential for preserving these character-defining elements. Any divergence from this overriding principle under any treatment heading (be it stabilization, restoration,

rehabilitation and/or reconstruction) is not in the best "long term" interest of the historic preservation movement. Insisting on the preservation of elements or fabrics that do not define the historic character and/or insisting on the restoration of missing elements may unnecessarily burden the overall economic feasibility of the project. After all, this is the "historic preservation" movement not the "aesthetic restoration" movement.

Because the Rehabilitation Standards have a degree of flexibility, any individual's interpretation of them should be based on the collective meaning of any single standard and an overall recognition of how the Standards are tied to eligibility. Flexibility also comes into play in applying the Standards in light of changing environmental issues such as lead paint management, energy conservation and smart growth.

### **Current Situation:**

Rehabilitation appears to be losing its economic edge over new construction. Rehabilitation used to clearly have an economic advantage over demolition and new construction even without use of the tax credit. Today rehab projects are bigger, more expensive; sitting on expensive lots and often surrounded by increased density. The tax credits are now part of the basic economic equation required to make a project pencil out. No credit translates into no project and ends up leading to certain demolition or radical alteration.

Construction project costs continue to shift toward increased systems costs at the expense of spatial costs. Traditionally the base cost of systems were equal when applied to a new or an existing building but now the effort to retrofit expanded systems into existing buildings (including fire detection, security protection, computer networks, fire suppression, lighting, power outlets, HVAC and plumbing) has shifted the overall rehab budget toward these system upgrades and installation and away from original fabric materials conservation and stabilization; let alone the luxury of restoration. Without additional subsidy through increased tax credits or direct grants, rehabilitation projects will soon become marginal in favor of new construction where labor costs can be more closely controlled.

### **Reform Suggestions:**

4. Compliance with the Standards. The review should focus on how well the project preserves and protects character-defining elements as agreed to in Part I of the application. *Refers to the Part I "list" of things to keep, again I don't like this "shopping list" approach. Such things have led to unintended consequences in historic districts where developers can pick and choose, and the overall effect is to lose things that may not have seemed so bad in themselves, but diminishes the overall resource in practice.* Although comments on the desirability to restore and/or even reconstruct deteriorated or missing elements can be suggested, no requirement to restore a feature of an otherwise eligible or listed property should be mandatory.
5. Design Approach. Because there is a plurality of approaches toward contemporary design, tax act review should remain focussed on maximizing the preservation of the character-defining elements and the spatial characteristics of the property. Obviously new work should not overwhelm and/or dominate the original overall architectural statement, but reviewers at both the state and NPS levels should not try to dictate any

specific design approach to the project design team. NPS should assume the state has made a good faith effort to "improve" a marginal project and focus, in a pass/fail way, on basic compliance with the Standards. Professional suggestions to improve the quality of a project should definitely be offered if the design can still be modified, but any mandatory requirement to upgrade a marginal project that meets the Standards to one that better meets the Standards should be avoided. ***Preservation of the original fabric includes making sure that the new part in no way hurts the setting, scale, form, overall perception, etc. This may mean that a new radical design may not be appropriate, and reviewers should have the ability to say so. This might result in some rather shocking new construction next to historic structures, without the ability to address it better to the existing structure.***

- 6.
7. Increasing the Incentive. There should be an effort to apply the investment tax credit toward the rehabilitation of as many listed or eligible properties as possible. The first and primary change would be to increase the credit back to 25%.

### **Appendix C: Comments from Kansas**

Jim,

Other than just a few typos I noticed, and marked in red on the attached copy, I just have a comment on the suggestions for Part 1s. I like the idea of listing out the character defining features on the Part 1, if it could perhaps be part of an overall simplification of the Part 1 applications. I'm afraid that this will fall on SHPO reviewers to provide since most people have no idea what the character defining features of their building are.

I spend a lot of time redoing Part 1s (basically writing them for people) because they have no concept of what information needs to be included or how to organize it. Many times I do much of the organizing of their research and writing of the narratives because it's just easier and faster for me to do it rather than try to explain how to do it. I understand wanting to have sufficient information in the Part 1 to determine a building's eligibility, but a little more direction or simplified format would really be helpful. I continually have projects drop by the wayside because the owner doesn't have the time or experience to get the Part 1 done. They are ready to do the work and don't want to wait. It is sometimes hard to believe that people will actually go without the tax credits rather than do paperwork!

Thanks for this opportunity to comment. You've done a great job organizing all of this.  
Sincerely,

Katrina L. Klingaman  
Tax Credit Program Coordinator  
Cultural Resources Division  
Kansas State Historical Society  
6425 SW 6th Avenue  
Topeka KS 66615-1099  
(785) 272-8681 ext.226  
kklingaman@kshs.org

## **Appendix D: Comments from Texas**

Subject: Re: Fwd: Re: Tax Act Review task Force  
From: Linda Roark <linda.roark@thc.state.tx.us>  
To: Jim Garrison <jgarrison@pr.state.az.us>  
CC: Stan Graves <stan.graves@thc.state.tx.us>, l.oaks@thc.state.tx.us  
Date: 4/25/03 7:57 AM

I think generally the document is sound; I just have a few comments:

### Issue II, Reform Suggestion 1:

The NPS has included the concept of mitigation in past projects, such as allowing reconstruction of missing features to make up for inappropriate demolition that occurred in a project (Rice Hotel). However, the NPS should not be bound by 106-type MOU agreements made between state offices and applicants; they would need to be a party to any such document. Additionally, the NPS allows for demolition of contributing buildings that are too deteriorated to rehabilitate, but is entirely correct in not allowing Historic Preservation Incentive tax credits on projects that demolish contributing buildings that can be rehabilitated.

### Issue III, restoration of missing features:

In our experience the NPS has not required the restoration of missing features, with the exception of mitigation agreements in compensation for damaging work that was done. Their recent decision to require repair of damaged plaster walls, when the majority of the material is intact, is an effort to preserve a building's historic character and the existing historic material. This is an effort prevent further deterioration, rather than an effort to require restoration.

### Issue II, Reform Suggestion 2:

Not all states are able or willing to provide careful project reviews, perhaps due to inadequate staffing, training or political issues. While it might be appealing to have the NPS to assume that states always make good faith efforts to improve marginal projects, there are some states that will send any project forward with a recommendation for approval. When this happens, it falls to the NPS to do the job that the state avoided and make recommendations for improvements in the project.

Linda Roark

## **Appendix E: Comments from South Carolina**

Dan Elswick  
May 19, 2003

### Issue I – Streamlining:

1. Training for owners, developers, architects, engineers and lending institutions is a commendable goal. As our state budget tightens, we can offer support for this type of activity, but we may not be able to provide funding.
2. Certification of reviewers is a goal that would seem reasonable on the surface, but is likely to be unworkable in practice. We appreciate the intent behind this suggestion, but do not agree that experience in the private sector or attendance at conferences will ensure that a reviewer will understand how to apply the Standards. Further, we see no reason that NPS should limit their review to items noted by the State reviewer. There are many reasons (politics, oversight, etc.) that a State reviewer may choose to include or not include specific items of project work in the State comments. Finally, we do not agree that a clean State review should require an “automatic approval” by NPS.
3. The suggestion that the Part 1 review include a list of character defining elements would put an unrealistic burden on the Part 1 review process in our agency. We do not support this suggestion. While it might be of some benefit to have a list of character defining elements when doing the Part 2 review, we do not agree that the Part 2 review must be linked only to the “top ten” items.
4. Training for reviewers is a commendable goal.
5. In our experience the preliminary review system works well. We see no need to “formalize” any changes to the existing preliminary review system.
6. Investigating the electronic submissions of application forms is an interesting suggestion. This must include the investigation of the computer systems of all SHPOs as well, however. Since there are over 50 SHPOs, we question whether or not all of these computer systems will be compatible. The issue of having an original signature must also be addressed.

### Issue II – Unique and Unusual Circumstances:

1. Changes to the review process to make it more like Section 106 reviews does not acknowledge the basic differences between the programs. Federal tax incentives are a benefit that the owner can ignore. Reviews under Section 106 are the responsibility of the federal agency to take into account the effect of their actions on significant historic properties. We do not support this suggestion for revisions to the review process.
2. We have stated in previous comments that the state offices already have an official role in the appeal process. If a state office chooses to appear at the appeal, then any opinion that the state office wishes to express will be considered in the appeal decision. We do not see any need for changes to the existing appeal process.

### Issue III – Applying the Standards:

1. We concur that the project review should reflect how well the project meets the Standards. At the heart of that concept is the understanding that the existing conditions set the baseline for the project review. We have never experienced a Part 2 being denied by NPS because the owner did not reconstruct a missing historic feature. Work on deteriorated historic features must meet Standard 6. Within Standard 6 is guidance for repair where possible or replacement in-kind where repair is not possible.
2. Meeting the Standards using a pass/fail approach. We do not support this suggestion. The suggestion mentions that “NPS should assume that the state has made a good faith effort to ‘improve’ a marginal project and focus, in a pass/fail way, on basic compliance with the Standards.” We do not believe that the NPS reviewers should be bound to **assume** anything about the state’s review. We appreciate the ability of NPS to approve projects with conditions rather than denying them outright. If NPS believes that a project needs a condition that we did not recommend at the state level, then we would prefer a conditional approval rather than a denial.
3. The suggestion to pursue increasing the incentive from 20% to 25% is not a wise move at this time. With state and federal budgets being cut and with Congress considering the elimination of the 10% credit, we believe that lobbying efforts must first be directed toward maintaining the programs currently in place.

### General Comments

We believe that the existing review system is a sound approach for this federal incentive. While we do not always agree with every NPS decision and while we have a sense that some owners may choose to ignore this incentive, we do not believe that the existing review system needs significant changes.

In any reform of an existing system, we believe that it is important to look at the system from the larger perspective. In this larger perspective, the state agency acts to **facilitate** the review process. The National Park Service **approves** work that is eligible for the federal tax incentive for rehabilitation, as the federal review agency. In our opinion, it is unreasonable for a state agency to request **review authority** of a federal program.

We see our role as the liaison between the owner and NPS. In that role, we offer the owner our best advice on what we believe meets the Standards for Rehabilitation and what NPS will approve or will not approve. Within that role, we appreciate the professionalism exhibited by our NPS reviewer and the support that NPS provides to this program.