THE MAYOR'S TASK FORCE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
HARRIS STEINBERG, CHAIR

MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY, 18 JANUARY 2018, 6:30 P.M.
THE ENTERPRISE CENTER, 4548 MARKET STREET

PRESENT
Harris Steinberg, Chair
Dominique Hawkins, Vice Chair
Peter Angelides
Oscar Beisert
Catherine Califano
Carl Dress
Lorraine Gomez
Nan Gutterman
David Hollenberg
Lou Iatarola
Bob Jaeger
Cory Kegerise
Scott Maits
Randall Mason
Trapeta B. Mayson
Matt McClure
Justino Navarro
Elhadji Ndiaye
Aparna Palantino
Laura Spina
Fon Wang
Seri Worden, National Trust for Historic Preservation
James Wright

ALSO PRESENT
Jon Farnham, Philadelphia Historical Commission
Randal Barron, Philadelphia Historical Commission
Kim Chantry, Philadelphia Historical Commission
Laura DiPasquale, Philadelphia Historical Commission
Allyson Mehley, Philadelphia Historical Commission
Megan Cross Schmitt, Philadelphia Historical Commission
Reina Murray, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Mike Powe, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Denise E. Gilmore, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Di Gao, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Anthony Veerkamp, National Trust for Historic Preservation

CALL TO ORDER

Harris Steinberg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., following approximately half an hour of interactive discussion among the public and Task Force members.

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Steinberg introduced Jesse Blitzstein from the Enterprise Center, who welcomed the audience (approximately 68 people) and gave a brief overview of the organization.

PRESENTATIONS

Seri Worden, Senior Field Officer at the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), opened the presentations with an overview of her organization's role in providing technical expertise on a variety of topics to the Task Force. She then introduced the first presenters.

Historic /Cultural Resource Survey: Lessons Learned from Peer Cities

Reina Murray, GIS Project Manager, Preservation Division
Mike Powe, Ph.D., Director of Research, Preservation Green Lab

Ms. Murray and Mr. Powe began by posing four questions about the scope of the Survey Sub-Committee:

- What do we know about Philadelphia's historic assets and its past historic resource surveys?
- What are the merits of comprehensive, traditional, lot-by-lot survey and research vs newer techniques?
- How can neighborhoods and the interested public share in the identification process and the resulting data?
- What can we learn from other city's best practices and innovations in surveying methods (nationally and internationally)?

Next, they defined *Historic Resource Survey* as, "Process of identifying and gathering data on a community's historic resources." This process includes the collection, evaluation, presentation, organization and updating of the data gathered. There was also a brief overview of how survey techniques have evolved with advances in technology.

The focus then turned towards Philadelphia, with an overview of how surveying fits into other plans for the city such as Phila2035 and the World Heritage Philadelphia strategic plan. The presenters estimated that only approximately 4% of Philadelphia's buildings have been surveyed for listing on the National Register.

Next, the presenters introduced the peer cities that they looked at for their analysis: New York City, Chicago, Baltimore, New Orleans, Buffalo and St. Louis. The date and extent of their last surveys was examined, as were any partners and stakeholders that were involved. Each city did things slightly differently. Los Angeles, CA and Alexandria, VA were identified as examples of places with very good survey programs.

The presenters closed with a summary of their key takeaways:

- There is no single “right way” to survey
- The usefulness of the survey and associated data is influenced by who “owns” it and how well they coordinate with stakeholders
- Effective outreach improves a survey’s usefulness
- New technologies improve speed of work and allow for increased customization

The presentation ended with questions for Philadelphia to consider:

- Survey will be conducted citywide? District by district? Thematically?
- Who manages new survey process and data?
- How much emphasis on public outreach and engagement?
- Balance of depth/investment and breadth/speed

Outreach and Education to Build Constituency: Lessons Learned from Peer Cities

Denise E. Gilmore, Community Development Specialist
Robert Nieweg, Senior Field Director & Attorney

Ms. Gilmore introduced herself and informed the audience that Mr. Nieweg was sorry that he was unable to be with them that evening. She then gave an overview of the topics she would be discussing in her presentation.

Ms. Gilmore opened with the following question:

Across the country, how do local non-profits and city agencies use outreach and education programming to build a public constituency for historic preservation?

She explained that a broad and diverse constituency was beneficial for several reasons; it provides residents with access to information; integrates the public’s needs and vision into preservation activities; improves the public’s understanding of processes; helps to avoid misconceptions and controversies; fosters support for the way resources are used; helps officials to better appreciate the public’s interest.

Next, Ms. Gilmore reviewed some examples of city agencies with creative engagement strategies.

- The St. Louis Cultural Resources Office provides their constituents with several options to consult with staff including office hours, appointments, telephone consultations, expedited review and approval of smaller projects and detailed technical assistance with larger projects.
- New Orleans’ Historic District Landmarks Commission staff conduct “Neighborhood Strolls” which are opportunities to get out of the office and on to the streets they regulate

to create stronger relationships with their constituents. It allows residents to learn more about the mission of the agency in an informal setting.

- Attendance at neighborhood meetings is a typical part of the work conducted by local preservation agencies, but Washington D.C.'s Historic Preservation Office takes it a step further. Staff attends events and celebrations within neighborhoods that are not necessarily related to historic preservation but are important to the community as a way to foster relationships with their constituents.

Ms. Gilmore described the takeaways from these agencies as: the importance of providing the public with easily accessible information in many forms; agencies' responsiveness to requests from the public; most agencies are under-resourced.

Ms. Gilmore moved on to review examples from non-profit organizations.

- Baltimore Heritage, Inc. offers 70 tours to 35 places that highlight architecturally and culturally significant places.
- Preservation Buffalo Niagara uses social media and weekly emails to stay connected to their constituents, sometimes targeting their messages according to councilmanic district.
- The New York City Landmarks Conservancy provides technical assistance on projects, and keeps the public informed about current land-use issues and development projects.

Ms. Gilmore described the takeaways from these organizations as: the importance of influencing key decision-makers as a way to protect landmarks and districts; the importance of maintaining and expanding a broad community of supporters; non-profits are under-resources.

Next, Ms. Gilmore presented an analysis of the best practices they reviewed, which she broke down into three key components:

- "To achieve your mission, create a diverse and broad constituency"
- "To build a constituency, reach your constituents where they are."
- "Make a commitment to invest in constituency building."

In closing, Ms. Gilmore said that constituency building, though not highly technical, is essential for success and should be intentional. Next steps include collecting further information from agencies and non-profits outside of the field of historic preservation, looking more closely at specific tactics, and evaluating different options for a constituent database.

Incentives for Building Reuse: Lessons Learned from Peer Cities

Anthony Veerkamp, Director of Policy, Preservation Green Lab
Di Gao, Real Estate Specialist, Preservation Division

The presenters began with an overview of their presentation and laid out four questions to address the scope of the Incentive Subcommittee:

- What activities should the Task Force try to incentivize?
- What are the incentives that can be used to promote historic preservation?
- How can historic preservation incentive help defray the costs and maximize the benefits of preservation?
- How do we determine who receives an incentive?

Broadly defined, incentives fall into three categories: 1) financial; 2) regulatory; 3) other. Broadly speaking, resources can be targeted in three ways: 1) geographic scope; 2) historic status; 3) policy alignment.

Next, the presenters gave an overview of the opportunities and threats facing the Philadelphia real estate market in the context of historic preservation. The recent increase of new construction in "transitioning markets" has resulted in an increase in demolition. However, economic growth can also present opportunities to establish incentives that foster desired outcomes.

The presenters gave an overview of some of the financial and regulatory incentives the selected peer cities offer in support of reusing existing buildings, including state and local programs. Some of the highlights included:

- The Baltimore City Historic Tax Credit is widely considered one of the most comprehensive tax incentives offered at a municipal level specifically targeting designated properties, applying to both interior and exterior work. $850 million has been leveraged to date.
- Buffalo's Unified Development Ordinance is only the third "form based code" in the country. Some of its strengths include the ability to legalize historic buildings and uses, and the elimination of minimum parking requirements.
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs incentivize the preservation of low density historic properties by allowing property owners to sell their unused FAR.
- The Chicago Neighborhood Opportunity Bonus allows developers to purchase bonus floor area in sections of downtown by making a one-time contribution, 10% of which goes to an adopt-a-landmark program.
- The Phoenix Adaptive Reuse Program bundles financial and regulatory incentives by offering development guidance, streamlined processes, reduced timeframes and cost savings to developers of eligible adaptive reuse projects.
- The New Orleans Cultural Product Districts supports the revitalization of communities by incentivizing the protection of historic buildings and promoting cultural activities. Within these districts, buildings that are 50+ years old become eligible for historic tax credits.
- The San Francisco Legacy Business Registry and Historic Preservation Fund is the first program in the country to offer financial incentives both to owners of businesses that have been officially registered as contributing to their neighborhood's identity and also to landlords with such tenants.

Finally, the presenters offered these key takeaways from their findings:

- Effectiveness of local programs increases when coordinated with broader policy incentive programs
- Removal of regulatory barriers to reuse as an incentive
- Regulatory overlays and analytic tools as a way to customize incentive programs
- Create capital sources that incentivize developers' participation
- Effective programs collect metrics, evaluate impacts and refine

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Steinberg adjourned the meeting at 8:00p.m.