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In order to resolve conflicts between health and safety objectives and historic preservation objectives, a number of states and cities have adopted special building code provisions. A survey was conducted to determine the extent of adoption of such special provisions. The survey included the states, territories and member cities of the Association of Major City Building Officials (AMCBO). The survey responses revealed that sixteen of the forty-seven responding states have special provisions or regulations as do fifteen of the twenty-four responding cities. The majority of states and cities has established a special preservation appeals board. Legislation and special provisions are reviewed in the report. Recommendations for additional research are included.
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Frequent conflicts involving building codes have occurred between building regulatory agencies and historic preservationists. To resolve this, a number of cities and states have adopted special building code provisions for historic structures. In order to determine the extent of adoption of such special provisions, a mail survey was conducted of the states, territories and the thirty member cities of the Association of Major City Building Officials (AMCBO).
The survey findings were that sixteen of the forty-seven states responding reported that they have special provisions or administrative regulations. Nine of these reported utilizing a special board to regulate preservation. Fifteen of the twenty-four responding cities reported special code or administrative regulations for historic structures. The overwhelming majority of these cities had established a special board to regulate preservation. The survey results are displayed graphically.

The report reviews legislation and special code provisions submitted by the respondents. Recommendations for additional research are also included.

II. INTRODUCTION

In support of the efforts of the Office of Building Standards and Codes Services, Center for Building Technology, National Bureau of Standards, Melvyn Green & Associates, Consulting Engineers, conducted a survey of special building code provisions for historic buildings. The intent of the survey was to determine the extent of adoption of special building regulations by states and local jurisdictions. An earlier study by the National Bureau of Standards revealed that eight states had adopted special regulations. Because of increased interest in historic preservation, it was determined that a special survey of both states and major cities would be of value in identifying trends and recent regulation adoptions.

Preservation legislation affecting building regulations may date back to the early 1930's when Charleston, South Carolina established the first historic district regulations. This legislation started a trend in historic district regulations,
some of which do contain specific exemptions to building code provisions.

In 1966 Congress passed the National Historic Preservation Act, enlarging the scope of national preservation policy and establishing the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Historic Preservation Act provides grants for restoration of historic properties. This was followed in 1971 by the Promulgation of Executive Order 11593, establishing the responsibility of Federal agencies in preservation.

These measures reflect the growing national concern for preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings and districts. This concern springs from a widespread desire to preserve community identity and continuity as well as our historic heritage. In the past two years the economic situation and the energy crisis have increased interest in rehabilitation and recycling of buildings. This new attitude has led to conflicts between preservation objectives and health and safety objectives as specified in building codes. Such conflicts have frequently been exacerbated by unresponsiveness or lack of information at the local level.

As a result, there is pressure on cities and states to grant some form of exemption for historic structures.

This study surveyed the special building code provisions developed by states, cities, and model building codes for dealing with this problem. The following types of provisions were anticipated and are reflected in the questionnaire. Responses were noted and analyzed on both an individual and a regional basis.
1. **Special Building Code Regulations**: Provisions for historic structures adopted by legislative action and embodied as provisions of the building code.

2. **Special Administrative Regulations**: Regulation of historic structures is accomplished by rulings of the building official, the code appeal board, a special preservation board, or similar body. Such rulings serve as precedents in future policy determination.

3. **Special Preservation Board or Special Preservation Appeals Board**: Appeals of code provisions, design decisions, landmark designation, and similar matters are referred to a special group, frequently composed of preservation experts and community representatives.

Two types of exemptions for building regulations exist: a) the building code provisions, or b) historic district legislation. The diversity of legislation between cities and states and the lack of communication at an intrastate level is especially significant.

The survey reports the state and city response. In cases of conflict between the report of the State Historic Preservation Officer and that of the building official, the legislation was studied to resolve conflicts. The survey data were collected in the fall of 1975 and were assumed to be correct as of that time.

### III. METHODOLOGY

A mail survey of state and local building officials was used to determine special building code provisions for historic structures. The agencies surveyed are discussed below.
A survey questionnaire was developed and submitted for approval to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Bureau of the Census. These agencies suggested certain revisions to the questionnaire wording to clarify its intent.

The survey package included the questionnaire, a postage-paid return envelope and a cover letter explaining the reasons for the study. Each respondent was requested to provide a copy of any adopted law or regulation. A follow-up letter was mailed to states that had not responded within forty-five days. Copies of these are included in Appendix A.

The survey package was mailed to the following types of agencies:

1. States. A questionnaire was mailed to each State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and each State Delegate to the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards (NCSBCS). The reason for surveying both was to probe for obscure regulations, perhaps unknown to one or the other. It was noted in some preliminary research that historic district legislation (zoning laws) may contain exemptions to building code provisions.

2. The member cities of the Association of Major City Building Officials (AMCBO) were surveyed to determine the extent of local adoption of code provisions relative to historic structures.

3. Other cities around the country were surveyed in addition to those specified by the contract. The purpose of this was to obtain additional
information and to include certain cities with active preservation movements.

4. The model code groups including Building Officials Conference of America, International Conference of Building Officials, Southern Building Code Conference, American Insurance Association, and National Fire Protection Association were sent questionnaires to determine if any provisions relative to historic preservation have been adopted.

5. Selected organizations were mailed copies of the survey package and asked for any comment on their experience in the matter of codes and historic structures. Included in this group were:

   A. The National Register of Historic Places (National Park Service)
   B. American Institute of Architects
   C. National Trust for Historic Preservation
   D. Restored Museum Villages

IV. FINDINGS

The results of the survey are displayed in the matrices described as Survey of Building Code Provisions for Historic Structures by State and Survey of Building Code Provisions for Historic Structures by City. Forty-seven of the fifty states contacted, and twenty-four of the thirty AMCBO cities contacted, responded to the questionnaire.

Of the forty-seven responses by states, eleven reported special code provisions in effect and five reported
utilizing special administrative regulations. Of the sixteen positive state responses, nine reported a special board to regulate preservation.

The city responses may be described as follows: Eight cities reported code provisions in effect and seven reported special administrative regulations.

Thus approximately one-third of the responding states had special provisions for historic structures in effect. More than one-half of the responding states utilized a special board to evaluate buildings or hear appeals from code provisions.

Approximately two-thirds of the cities reported special provisions for historic structures and the overwhelming majority reported a special board to regulate preservation.

Territories responding reported no historic preservation provisions.

Three of the four model code groups have recently considered adoption of special provisions relating to historic structures. The Building Officials and Code Administrators International, Inc. (Basic Building Code) and the International Conference of Building Officials (Uniform Building Code) have adopted administrative provisions permitting the Building Official to authorize deviations from code requirements. The Basic Building Code provisions are published in the current edition while those in the Uniform Building Code will be published in the 1976 edition.

The Southern Building Code Congress (Southern Standard Building Code) has provisions pending similar to those adopted by BOCA. These were held for further study at the 1975 Annual Meeting.
The National Building Code, published by the American Insurance Association, is currently undergoing a major revision, its first since the 1975 Annual Meeting.

The National Building Code, published by the American Insurance Association, is currently undergoing a major revision, its first since 1967. No information has been received relative to any proposed provisions.

The National Fire Protection Association has a standard for protection of library and museum collections, NFPA standard numbers 910 and 911, respectively. No information was received regarding any proposed changes.
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C. Summary of Alternate Code Provisions Received

D. Excerpts of Correspondence Received

E. Commentary
A. REGIONAL ANALYSIS

Positive city and state responses are displayed by regional grouping in Figure A. Using this matrix one may compare the degree of intra-regional consistency. In general, southern and western states exhibited a greater regional homogeneity than northern and eastern regions.

B. Summary of Positive State and City Responses

Provisions in effect in the sixteen states returning positive responses to the questionnaire are summarized as follows:

ALASKA: Both specific building code provisions and administrative regulations dealing with historic preservation are in effect in Alaska. Further legislation is pending. Such provisions are administered in various situations by the building official, the Code Appeal Board, the State Historic Sites Advisory Committee, or the State Historic Preservation Officer. Appeal of the building official's decisions usually may be made to a special preservation appeals board. Some effort is made to provide for minimum maintenance of historic buildings. Historic districts are established. Special exemptions and provisions for such considerations as fire and seismic safety are usually possible.

CALIFORNIA: The recently adopted State Historical Building Code addresses the problem of effecting an historically accurate restoration while providing for a reasonable level of safety for building users. Alternate code provisions for designated historic structures will be developed by state agencies, (ie: State Fire Marshal, State Building Standards Commission) in consultation with a State Historical Building Code Advisory Board. Such provisions will be administered by local building officials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Analysis</th>
<th>Building Official</th>
<th>Code Appeal Board</th>
<th>Special Preservation Board</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern Cities</td>
<td>Chicago, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Milwaukee, St. Louis</td>
<td>St. Louis, Kansas City, Indianapolis, Milwaukee</td>
<td>St. Louis, Kansas City, Indianapolis, Milwaukee</td>
<td>St. Louis, Kansas City, Indianapolis, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern States</td>
<td>Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa</td>
<td>Wisconsin, Iowa</td>
<td>Wisconsin, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western States</td>
<td>California, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon</td>
<td>California, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon</td>
<td>California, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon</td>
<td>California, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Preservation Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Maintenance Standards Established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Code Provisions Contained in Historic District Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Exemptions for Seismic, Fire Safety, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIANA: The Indiana State Building Official may grant exemptions from building code provisions that conflict with historical accuracy. Where such exemptions are made, the Building Official may limit the number of occupants allowed in the building at any one time, and may require that signs be posted to warn the public that exemptions from the state construction and fire code requirements have been granted. The Administrative Building Council sits as a body for variances and special provisions, and may hear appeals from the decisions of the building official.

IOWA: No legislation exists or is pending in Iowa. Administrative regulations delegate responsibility for historic building provisions to the building official, a Code Appeals Board, and a Building Code Advisory Council.

MAINE: There is an Historic Sites Commission under the Bureau of Parks and Recreation in Maine. Specific building code provisions were stated to exist, but their exact nature was not elucidated.

MARYLAND: Special historic building code provisions of the Basic Building Code are in effect in Maryland. These regulations are administered by the State Building Official.

MINNESOTA: The Minnesota Building Official may approve special variances on a case by case basis for historic buildings where such approvals will not jeopardize the public health, safety, or welfare. Definition of historic buildings is made by state or local government authority.

NEVADA: State statute provides for building standards for the Virginia City Historic District, which encompasses parts of three counties. Standards, including minimum maintenance standards, are enforced by a special preservation board.
NEW HAMPSHIRE: Administrative regulations provide for a special review of plans by an Historic District Commission.

NEW JERSEY: Special Building Code Administrative Regulations establishing a special Preservation Board are in effect in New Jersey.

NEW MEXICO: Special building code provisions for historic structures are in effect in New Mexico. Further legislation is pending. Approval of special provisions for historic buildings is granted by the Building Official, subject to appeal to a special preservation board.

NEW YORK: Historic buildings may receive special consideration in application of the fire code where the Building Official approves. This is a matter of administrative regulation rather than specific building code provisions. Historic district laws have recently been enacted.

NORTH CAROLINA: The State Building Code for North Carolina provides for exceptions to requirements that buildings be accessible and usable by the handicapped. Such requirements are waived for historic structures approved by the North Carolina Office of Archives and History, after consultation with the Governor's Study Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

OREGON: According to the Oregon State Building Code, designated historical buildings "shall not be required to comply with the requirements of this code for those items approved to be exempted by the Historical Building Review Committee and judged to be in the public interest to the preservation of such buildings." Such provisions and variations are regulated by the Building Official, with provisions for appeal to a Code Appeal Board. Historic
districts are established. Some effort is made to effectuate minimum maintenance standards.

VIRGINIA: Both special building code provisions and special building code administrative regulations are in effect in Virginia. Rulings of the Building Official regarding historic structures may be appealed to a special preservation board. Minimum maintenance standards are established for historic structures and districts.

WISCONSIN: The administrative regulations provide for exemptions from building code provisions for historic structures by petition to the Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations.

---

Fifteen Association of Major City Building Officials cities returned positive responses to the questionnaire. Provisions of their codes and administrative regulations are summarized as follows:

ATLANTA, GEORGIA: Special building code administrative regulations are in effect in Atlanta. These regulations are administered by the Building Official, the Zoning Board of Adjustments, and the Atlanta Civic Design Commission. Historic districts are established, within which facade alterations are regulated by the Civic Design Commission, which may also bring cases of deficient maintenance to the attention of the Building Official.

Baltimore, Maryland: Both special building code provisions and administrative regulations relative to historic structures exist in Baltimore. Special "Historic and Architectural Districts" have been established, regulated by a Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation. The Com-
mission's seven members are appointed by the mayor from specified professions and organizations.

BUFFALO, NEW YORK: Special building code administrative regulations have established a special board to address preservation questions in Buffalo. Minimum maintenance standards are established for historic structures.

CINCINNATI, OHIO: A special Architectural Board of Review with jurisdiction over historic districts has been established by building code administrative regulations.

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA: The Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission reports that both specific building code provisions and administrative regulations are in effect in Indianapolis. Such measures are in accord with detailed requirements contained in Indiana State Codes. The City of Indianapolis administers one historic district, with provisions and variations regulated by the Building Official and a special preservation board. Minimum maintenance standards have been established for the buildings in the district.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI: Special building code administrative regulations have established a landmarks commission to regulate historic districts.

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA: Special Building Code Administrative regulations have instituted a Cultural Heritage Board for the City of Los Angeles. This Board maintains a list of structures considered to be historic or cultural monuments, and, in cooperation with the Building Official, reviews applications for permits to alter listed buildings.
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE: Both special building code provisions and administrative regulations are in effect in Memphis. These measures have created a Memphis Landmarks Register for landmarks and historic structures, administered by the Memphis Landmarks Commission. Minimum maintenance standards for such structures and districts are enforced by the Building Official. Decisions of the Building Official may be appealed to the Landmarks Commission or the Rehabilitation Board, depending on the circumstances. Final appeal may be made to the City Council.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN: Special building code administrative regulations for historic structures are controlled by the Code Appeal Board.

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA: Special building code administrative regulations provide for review of building permit applications by the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Special provisions and regulations are also administered by the Code Appeal Board. Historic districts are established by these regulations.

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI: Special Building Code Provisions and administrative regulations have set up historic districts in St. Louis. These districts are administered by the Building Official and the Landmarks and Urban Design Commission. Minimum maintenance standards are provided for designated historic structures.

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS: An Historic Districts and Landmarks Ordinance has been established for San Antonio by special building code administrative regulations. Such provisions are administered by the Building Official and a special Board of Review for Historic Districts.
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA: Special provisions for fire safety requirements for historic districts are embodied in the San Diego Building Code. Such provisions are regulated by the Building Official with appeal to the Code Appeal Board.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON: Building code provisions in effect in Seattle provide for the use of alternate requirements for structures designated as historic by the city council. Determination of acceptable alternate requirements is made by the Building Official. In the Pioneer Square Historic District, the Historic Preservation Board administers and enforces aesthetic and maintenance standards.

WASHINGTON, DC: Special building code provisions and administrative regulations relative to historic structures and districts are regulated by the Building Official and a special preservation board. Minimum maintenance standards are enforced and decisions regarding special exemptions from regular code provisions are made according to this system.

C. Summary of Alternate Code Provisions Received

Some states and cities allow special exemptions from building code requirements for designated historic structures. Generally, these exemptions are granted on a case-by-case basis with power to set aside building code provisions vested in the Building Official. This type of legislation is used in Virginia and Oregon, and has been proposed in New Mexico, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

More specific provisions are provided by the codes of the states of Indiana, Oregon, New York and North Carolina, and by the City of Seattle.
Indiana requires that, where such exemptions are granted, the following notice must be displayed: "Historical Building-Warning. Since historical accuracy is a prime consideration in the preservation and use of this building, it may not comply with usual Construction and Fire Code requirements." The building official may limit the maximum number of occupants allowed in the building at any one time.

In Oregon, a State Historical Building Review Committee is vested with the authority to waive any provision of the State Building Code. This committee consists of the Director of the Department of Commerce, the State Fire Marshal, the building official or other local government representative of the local community, and the State Historic Preservation Officer. The committee may restrict occupancy where it grants exemptions.

New York State permits the substitution of sprinklers for certain other fire safety requirements in the code.

North Carolina exempts historic buildings from requirements for access by the handicapped, if approval is granted by the Governor's Study Commission for Employment of the Handicapped.

Seattle authorizes alternate means of achieving seismic safety where the Building Official is satisfied that the structure is strong enough to withstand lateral forces equal to those experienced in the earthquake in Seattle on April 13, 1949.

D. Excerpts From Correspondence Received

A number of letters and notes were received from the states and cities surveyed. Some responded enthusiastically to the
intent of the survey and mentioned the conflict between rigid code enforcement and historic structures. Many requested copies of the completed survey and asked when the report would be available. Some of the comments received are as follows:

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin wrote, "This is a matter of critical concern to us, since we are constantly having to petition for waiver of code requirements, particularly as to the number of exits in the buildings. Because of this, we are just beginning to look into the possibility of legislation to exempt historic structures from the building code requirements..."

"Because of the immediacy of this problem, I wonder if you would be able to give me some information in advance of the final report of your study...specifically, the names of some states which have made special provisions in their building codes for historic structures,..."

The State Historical Society of Colorado noted, "We intend to pursue this matter...would be most interested in your findings. When will they be available?"

The Utah State Historical Society wrote, "We have a critical need for the type of special historic code provisions you are inquiring about. Our preservation efforts are constantly being frustrated by rigid interpretation of modern codes which cannot be economically or aesthetically applied to historic sites."

The Connecticut Historical Commission wrote, "The lack of flexibility in Connecticut's Building Code is a major impediment to historic preservation..."
The Building Official in Savannah, Georgia stated, "...we find that there are two schools of thought concerning historic preservation... One is that the Code is enforced to an overbearing point where it becomes very difficult to restore historic structures and convert them to a useful life and, second, that Codes are completely ignored and the restorer is permitted to do whatever he wishes in the interest of historic preservation..."

"I have formulated a policy that good communication between my office and historic preservationists, and a willingness on both sides to meet...and work out problems, have solved the mystique of Historic Preservation and the Building Codes."

In referring to the proposed change to the Southern Standard Building Code he stated, "It is nebulous, arbitrary and, in places that have adopted it, they have found it to be unworkable..."

A number of states and cities responded that historic provisions would become operative with the adoption of the current or pending edition of a model code. Maryland, which adopts the Basic Building Code, is included as a positive response since adoption of the 1975 edition is anticipated on January 1, 1976.

The New Mexico State Planning Office reports special provisions are being discussed and in a staff letter noted, "Too often, the integrity and character of valuable historic structures could be irreparably harmed by the rigid imposition of current safety and health standards as set by our everchanging building codes."

The following states mentioned that committees or com-
missions were studying the possibility of recommending the adoption of special code provisions:

Connecticut
Florida
Mississippi
Ohio

E. COMMENTARY

1. Response Conflicts

A total of sixty-six responses were received from state building officials and historic preservation officers. Thirty-nine were received from Building Officials and twenty-seven from State Historic Preservation Officers.

Nineteen states were represented by a response from both officials contacted, nineteen by the building official only, nine by the SHPO only.

In eight of the nineteen cases of dual response, there were significant differences between the two replies. Such discrepancies were resolved by examination of the statutes of the state in question.

2. State Adoption of Model Codes

Twenty-two states reported in a recent National Bureau of Standards study that they have adopted a statewide building code. Of those twenty-two, nineteen noted the technical basis of their statewide code was one of the four model codes. One might assume that those adopting the Basic or Uniform Codes would, therefore, have in effect (in 1976) provisions for historic structures. However, upon closer inspection it was noted that in certain states the provisions may apply only to one occupancy group (residential—single and/or multiple family), or that the state has
adopted only the technical provisions and not the administrative provisions. In addition, many statewide codes are based upon a model code from which they differ considerably, (ie: Connecticut and North Carolina).

It was intended to display a state utilizing a model code as one with special provisions for historic structures. However, the closer examination described above prompted elimination of this listing.

3. **Questionnaire**

It appears that several positive responses were based on historic district laws which grant authority for control of the building exteriors to a special commission. Thus the study may indicate greater adoption of special provisions by more states than have actually adopted such provisions.

Some respondents may have confused the two questions referring to special preservation boards.

VI. **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Further research is necessary to resolve problems of conflict between historic preservation objectives and those of building codes.

In the case of the codes, it is necessary to evaluate the significance of individual code provisions, since provisions for life safety, structural safety, sanitation, electrical standards, heating standards, fire districts, and many others exist side-by-side without reference to individual necessity or importance. Some of these provisions are absolutely essential to the safe operation of a building,
others represent desirable levels of amenity which would not endanger public health or safety if abrogated in special cases.

Where code provisions are abrogated, serious questions concerning the designer's liability may arise. Further study of this problem is also indicated.

The effectiveness of existing historic preservation clauses and codes should be evaluated in terms of their ability to facilitate historic preservation and to provide an acceptable degree of safety to the building's users.

Initial efforts should be directed towards a better definition of the problem of preservation and building codes. Such a study could consist of a series of in-depth interviews with building regulatory authorities in urban and rural areas, architects engaged in historic preservation, and individuals and organizations involved in historic preservation. The result of such a study would provide a better focus on the problem, permitting the identification and development of solutions.

A number of areas considered appropriate for further research were noted during the course of this study. These include:

Legislative:

1. **Definition of "historic":** Laws currently in effect define historic as "listed in the National Register of Historic Places," "designated as historic by a special preservation board," "cited by any historic or preservation group as worthy of documentation," and many other definitions. Further research is needed to establish a generally acceptable definition.
2. **Model Legislation**: Greater effectiveness of historic preservation codes could be achieved if states considering the enactment of such legislation could refer to a well-researched model document.

3. **Impact of the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act** upon the establishment of State Historic Preservation Officers leading to proposal and adoption of state laws relative to building codes and historic structures.

**Technical:**

1. **Risk Analysis**: Further research is needed to enable designers and building officials to establish an accurate evaluation of risk for a particular building.

2. **Goal-Oriented Approach to Risk Abatement**: A preliminary study for the use of a qualitative approach to historic structures is now under way under a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts by Melvyn Green and Associates.

3. **Technical Trade-offs**: This system is used in New York State, where the building official is allowed to make determinations of acceptable alternate fire safety measures for restored buildings.

   Design alternatives for use in technical trade-offs and code compliance should be developed.

4. **An Historic Preservation and Building Codes Solution Catalog**: This would provide a vehicle for communicating goal-oriented solutions to designers and building officials. (cf. Kapsch, discussion paper, "Historic Preservation and Building Codes," Nov. 20, 1975.) The work being performed under item 2 above will provide some initial steps in such a program.
5. **Alternate Provisions for Handicapped Access to Historic Buildings:** The only state reporting specific consideration of access for the handicapped is North Carolina, where the code provides exemption for historic buildings. However, further research may be done on providing access without disruption of the historical integrity of the building.

6. **Increasing Standards for Ability to Resist Natural Disasters for Historic Buildings:** Where possible, without violation of the historic fabric of a building, resistance to disasters should be increased because of the buildings social and architectural importance.

Such research would provide much-needed information for building officials entrusted with the responsibility for decisions regarding code conflicts in historic structures.

**Administrative:**

1. **Operational Control for Historic Building use:** This method is currently being used in Indiana, where the Building Official may grant exemptions from building code provisions for historic buildings provided signs are posted to warn users that the building does not meet normal safety standards. A limitation may also be placed on number of occupants.

2. **Occupancy Modification:** An historic building might be subjected to control of occupancy to reduce fire hazard. Or, a special occupancy class for historic structures might be developed to permit greater flexibility in administering building code provisions.
Coordination of research is necessary to provide a basis for effective, aesthetically-sensitive regulations for restoration and adaptive reuse of historic structures.

Appreciation is extended to Eino O. Kainlauri, Ph. D., AIA, Associate Professor, Department of Architecture, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa for drawing the cover picture depicting a portion of Old Town in Alexandria, Virginia.
APPENDICES

A. Questionnaire and Form Letters

B. Listing of Agencies Contacted:
   B1 - State Building Regulatory Agencies
   B2 - State Historic Preservation Officers
   B3 - Member Cities of the Association of Major City Building Officials (AMCBO)
   B4 - Additional Cities Contacted
   B5 - Organizations Contacted

C. Listing of Legislation Reviewed
MELVYN GREEN & Associates, Inc.
Consulting Structural and Civil Engineers

690 NORTH SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD
SUITE 120
EL SEGUNDO, CALIFORNIA 90245
(213) 322-8491

October 24, 1975

Dear Sir:

In the past several years, increased interest has been expressed in preservation of historic structures. In response to this need, many building regulatory agencies have adopted special code provisions relative to such structures. This has been accomplished at both the local and state levels, as well as by some of the model codes.

In order to identify the current status of these special code provisions, we are conducting a state-of-the-art study under contract to the Office of Building Standards and Code Services, Center for Building Technology, National Bureau of Standards. This survey will include the states, territories and major cities, as well as other selected agencies. The survey intent is to identify those states and cities having enacted special provisions and the characteristics of those provisions. This questionnaire is being sent to both the Building Official and the State Preservation Officer (for states) since some historic district legislation has contained exemptions to building regulations. Each agency should respond.

It would be appreciated if you would devote a few minutes to completing the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed postage paid envelope. If possible, please enclose a copy of any applicable law and/or regulations.

It is anticipated that the results of this study will be available through the National Bureau of Standards.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours very truly,

Melvyn Green, P.E.

MG:cmd
encl.
SURVEY OF BUILDING CODE PROVISIONS FOR HISTORIC STRUCTURES

AGENCY __________________________
RESPONDENT ______________________
TITLE ____________________________
DATE _____________________________
PHONE ____________________________

Note: Please respond to the questions based upon your level of jurisdiction.

1. Are there specific building code provisions in effect in your state or city relative to historic buildings or structures?
   Yes ______
   No ______

   (Please forward a copy of such provisions)

1a. Is legislation to put such provisions in effect or to modify any in effect, pending in your legislative body?
   Yes ______
   No ______

   (Please forward a copy of any pending legislation)

2. Are there in effect any special building code administrative regulations or rulings relative to historic buildings or structures. (including actions by Commission, Appeal Boards)?
   Yes ______
   No ______

3. If there is legislation or administrative regulations in effect, please complete the following:

   a) Are historic building provisions and variations regulated by:
      (Check all that apply)
      1) Building Official _________________
      2) Code Appeal Board ________________
      3) Special Preservation Board __________
      4) Other ____________________________

   b) Does your law provide an appeal to a specific preservation board from ruling of the building official? __________

   c) Does your law provide for minimum maintenance standards for buildings determined to be historic and accepted as such? __________

   d) Do any special districts or other regulations affect building code provisions for historic structures (such as an historic district law)? __________

   e) Are there any special exemptions in your law? __________
      (i.e. Special provisions for earthquake design, fire safety, etc.)

   f) Indicate preemptive application of code or regulation
      __________ Mandatory code __________ Mandatory minimum
      __________ Voluntary code __________ Mandatory maximum

   g) Indicate jurisdictional exceptions to code __________________________
We are nearing the completion of our survey of Building Code Provisions For Historic Structures and to date have not received your return questionnaire.

Knowing from experience how other pressing matters may cause questionnaires to be set aside, we again request a few minutes of your time, since it is important to include each state's NCSBCS Representative's response.

For your convenience we are enclosing an additional copy of our original inquiry and questionnaire with a postage paid envelope.

Your support of this effort is greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Melvyn Green, P.E.

Encl.
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1. LIST OF STATE AND TERRITORY BUILDING OFFICIALS SURVEYED

Alabama
Building Commission
State Office Building
Montgomery, AL 36104

Alaska
State Fire Marshal
Department of Public Safety
Pouch N
Juneau, AK 99801

Arizona
Division of Building Code
1645 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Arkansas
Department of Planning
400 Train Station Square
Victory at Markham
Little Rock, AR 72201

California
Dept. of Housing
and Community Development
Division of Codes and Standards
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Colorado
State Division of Housing
1575 Sherman
Denver, CO 80203

Connecticut
State Building Inspector
Public Works Department
State Office Building
Hartford, CT 06115

Delaware
State Building Official
218 West Ninth Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Florida
Bureau of Codes and Standards
Dept. of Community Affairs
2571 Executive Center Circle, East
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Georgia
State Building Administrative Board
P.O. Box 431
Athens, GA 30601

Hawaii
Labor and Industrial Relations
825 Mililani Street
Honolulu, HI 96801

Idaho
Safety Inspection Division
Labor & Industrial Services
317 Main Street, Room 400
Statehouse
Boise, ID 83720

Illinois
Chief of Housing & Bldg. Affairs
Dept. of Local Government Affairs
303 E. Monroe
Springfield, IL 62706

Indiana
Indiana Administrative Building Council
215 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46202

Iowa
Building Code Commissioner
Office of Planning and Programming
523 East Twelfth
Des Moines, IA 50319

Kansas
Div. of Architectural Services
Dept. of Administration
State Office Bldg., 12th Floor
Topeka, KS 66612

Kentucky
State Fire Marshals Office
Plaza Tower Building
Frankfort, KY 40601

Louisiana
State Fire Marshal
109 State Office Building
325 Loyola Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70112
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Maine
Bureau of Public Improvements
State Office Bldg., Room 115
Augusta, ME 04330

Maryland
Div. of Codes Administration
Dept. of Economic
and Community Development
2525 Riva Road
Annapolis, MD 21401

Massachusetts
State Bldg. Code Commission
141 Milk Street, 5th Floor
Boston, MA 02109

Michigan
Department of Labor
300 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, MI 48913

Minnesota
Building Code Division
Dept. of Administration
408 Metro Square Bldg.
Seventh & Robert Streets
St. Paul, MN 55101

Mississippi
Mississippi Municipal Assn.
230 Sun-n-Sand Building
Jackson, MS 39202

Missouri
Div. of Design & Construction
P.O. Box 809
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Montana
Montana Bldg. Codes Advisory
Council
Construction Regulation Bureau
3815 5th Avenue South
Great Falls, MT 59405

Nebraska
Div. of Community Affairs
Dept. of Economic Development
Box 94666, State Capitol
Lincoln, NB 68509

Nevada
Nevada State Planning Board
Nye Bldg., Room 225
Carson City, NV 89701

New Hampshire
Office of Comprehensive Planning
State House
Concord, NH 03301

New Jersey
Bureau of Housing Inspection
Dept. of Community Affairs
363 West State Street
Trenton, NJ 08625

New Mexico
General Construction Board
P.O. Box 5155
Santa Fe, NM 87501

New York
Housing and Bldg. Codes Bureau
Div. of Housing &
Community Renewal
Two World Trade Center
New York, NY 10047

North Carolina
Engineering Bldg. Codes Division
Department of Industry
P.O. Box 26387
Raleigh, NC 27611

North Dakota
Secretary of State
Executive Office
Bismark, ND 58501

Ohio
Board of Bldg. Standards
Dept. of Industrial Relations
P.O. Box 825
Columbus, OH 43216

Oklahoma
Engineering Department
State Board of Public Affairs
Room 306, State Capitol Bldg.
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Oregon
Building Codes Division
Department of Commerce
674 Church Street
Salem, OR 97310

Pennsylvania
Department of Community Affairs
Room 216, South Office Bldg.
Harrisburg, PA 17120
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Department of Community Affairs</td>
<td>150 Washington Street, Providence, RI 02903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>State Budget and Control Board</td>
<td>P.O. Box 11333, Columbia, SC 29201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>State Engineer</td>
<td>State Office Building #2, Pierre, SD 57501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>The Dept. of Insurance Div. of Fire Prevention</td>
<td>202 Capitol Towers Building, Nashville, TN 37219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Division of Housing Dept. of Community Affairs</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13166, Capitol Station, Austin, TX 78711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>State Building Board</td>
<td>Room 124, State Capitol, Salt Lake City, UT 84114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>St. Albans Target Area Program</td>
<td>86 N. Main Street, St. Albans, VT 05478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>State Fire Marshal</td>
<td>Office of Housing P.O. Box 1157, Richmond, VA 23209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Dept. of Labor and Industries</td>
<td>General Administration Bldg., Olympia, WA 98501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>State Fire Marshal</td>
<td>State Capitol, Unit 1, 1800 Washington Street, East Charleston, WV 25305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Industrial Safety &amp; Buildings</td>
<td>Dept. of Industry, Labor and Human Relations, 201 East Washington Avenue, Madison, WI 53702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>State Fire Marshal</td>
<td>301 Capitol Building, Cheyenne, WY 82001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td>Government of American Samoa, Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>Bldg. Permit &amp; Inspection Div.</td>
<td>Government of Guam, Public Works Department, Agana, Guam 96910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Puerto Rican Planning Board</td>
<td>Box 9447, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Department of Public Works, St. Tomas, Virgin Islands 00802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Alabama    | Alabama Dept. of Archives and History  
Chairman, Alabama Historical Commission  
Archives & History Building  
Montgomery, AL 36104 |
| Alaska     | Division of Parks  
323 East Fourth Avenue  
Anchorage, AK 99501 |
| Arizona    | State Parks Board  
1688 West Adams  
Phoenix, AZ 85007 |
| Arkansas   | Arkansas Dept. of Parks and Tourism  
State Capitol, Room 149  
Little Rock, AR 72201 |
| California | Dept. of Parks and Recreation  
State Resources Agency  
P. O. Box 2390  
Sacramento, CA 95811 |
| Colorado   | State Historical Society  
Colorado State Museum  
200 14th Avenue  
Denver, CO 80203 |
| Connecticut| Connecticut Historical Com.  
59 South Prospect Street  
Hartford, CT 06106 |
| Delaware   | Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs  
Hall of Records  
Dover, DE 19901 |
| District of Columbia | Office of Housing and Community Development  
Room 112-A, District Bldg.  
14th & E Streets, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004 |
| Florida    | Division of Archives, History and Records Management  
Department of State  
401 East Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32304 |
| Georgia    | Historic Preservation Section  
Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources  
710 Trinity-Washington Bldg.  
270 Washington Street, S.W.  
Atlanta, GA 30334 |
| Hawaii     | Dept. of Land and Natural Resources  
State of Hawaii  
P.O. Box 621  
Honolulu, HI 96809 |
| Idaho      | Idaho Historical Society  
610 N. Julia Davis Drive  
Boise, ID 83706 |
| Illinois   | Office of Preservation Services  
Dept. of Conservation  
602 State Office Bldg.  
400 South Spring Street  
Springfield, IL 62706 |
| Indiana    | Dept. of Natural Resources  
State of Indiana  
608 State Office Bldg.  
Indianapolis, IN 46204 |
| Iowa       | State Conservation Commission  
B-13 MacLean Hall  
Iowa City, IA 52242 |
| Kansas     | Kansas State Historical Society  
120 West 10th Street  
Topeka, KS 66612 |
| Kentucky   | Kentucky Heritage Commission  
401 Wapping Street  
Frankfort, KY 40601 |
Louisiana
Dept. of Art, Historical and Cultural Preservation
Old State Capitol
Baton Rouge, LA 70801

Maine
Maine Historical Preservation Commission
31 Western Avenue
Augusta, ME 04330

Maryland
Maryland Historical Trust
Shaw House, 21 State Circle
Annapolis, MD 21401

Massachusetts
Massachusetts Historical Com.
40 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

Michigan
Michigan History Division
Department of State
Lansing, MI 48918

Minnesota
Minnesota Historical Society
690 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101

Mississippi
Mississippi Dept. of Archives and History
P.O. Box 571
Jackson, MS 39205

Missouri
Missouri State Park Board
P.O. Box 176
1204 Jefferson Building
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Montana
Recreation & Parks Div.
Dept. of Fish and Game
Mitchell Bldg.
Helena, MT 59601

Nebraska
Nebraska State Historical Society
1500 R Street
Lincoln, NB 68508

Nevada
Division of State Parks
201 South Fall Street
Carson City, NV 89701

New Hampshire
Dept. of Resources and Economic Development
P.O. Box 856
Concord, NH 03301

New Jersey
Dept. of Environmental Protection
P.O. Box 1420
Trenton, NJ 08625

New Mexico
State Planning Office
State Capitol
403 Capitol Building
Santa Fe, NM 87501

New York
Div. for Historic Preservation
Parks and Recreation
Room 303, S. Swan Street Bldg.
Albany, NY 12223

North Carolina
Div. of Archives and History
Dept. of Cultural Resources
109 E. Jones Street
Raleigh, NC 27611

North Dakota
State Historical Society of North Dakota
Liberty Memorial Bldg.
Bismarck, ND 58501

Ohio
The Ohio Historical Society
Interstate #71 at 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43211

Oklahoma
State Historic Preservation Officer
1108 Colcord Bldg.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Oregon
State Parks Superintendent
300 State Highway Building
Salem, OR 97310
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Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission
Box 1026
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Rhode Island
Rhode Island Dept. of Community Affairs
150 Washington Street
Providence, RI 02903

South Carolina
State Archives Department
1430 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29211

South Dakota
Cultural Preservation Dir.
Dept. of Education and Cultural Affairs
Office of Cultural Preservation
State Capitol
Pierre, SD 57501

Tennessee
Tennessee Historical Commission
State Library & Archives Bldg.
Nashville, TN 37219

Texas
Texas State Historical Survey Committee
P.O. Box 12276
Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711

Utah
Division of State History
603 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Vermont
Div. of Historic Preservation
Montpelier, VT 05602

Virginia
Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission
221 Governor Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Washington
Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
P.O. Box 1128
Olympia, WA 98504

West Virginia
West Virginia Antiquities Com.
Office of State Historic Preservation
Old Mountainlair
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506

Wisconsin
State Historical Society
816 State Street
Madison, WI 53706

Wyoming
Wyoming Recreation Commission
Historical Division
604 East 25th Street
Box 309
Cheyenne, WY 82001

American Samoa
Dept. of Public Works
Government of American Samoa
Pago Pago, American Samoa 97699

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
Institute of Puerto Rico Culture
Apartado 4184
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00905

Guam
Dept. of Parks and Recreation
P.O. Box 682
Agana, Guam 96910

Trust Territory
Land Resources Branch
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
Saipan, Marianas Islands 96950

Virgin Islands
Virgin Islands Planning Board
Charlotte Amalie
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801
3. LIST OF AMCBO CITIES SURVEYED

W.R. Wofford, Bldg. Official
800 City Hall
Atlanta, GA 30303

Ottavio Grande, Dir. of
Construction & Bldg. Insp.
222 East Saratoga Street
Baltimore, MD 21233

Francis Jens, Bldg. Commissioner
Building Department
City Hall, Room 808
Boston, MA 02201

Charles Stutzman,
Director of Buildings
Division of Buildings
604 City Hall
Buffalo, NY 14202

Joseph Fitzgerald, Jr., Commissioner
Building Department
121 N. LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60602

Martin P. Walsh, Jr., Dir.
Dept. of Bldg. & Inspections
Room 334, City Hall
801 Plum Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Carlton Rush,
Commissioner of Buildings
Division of Buildings
Room 512, City Hall
Cleveland, OH 44114

George Hodge, Bldg. Supt.
Division of Bldg. Regulations
181 S. Washington Blvd.
Columbus, OH 43204

J. Tom Jones, Bldg. Official
Building Inspection Div.
Dept. of Housing and
Urban Rehabilitation
1500 W. Mockingbird
Dallas, TX 75235

John Stone, Director
Bldg. Inspection Dept.
Division of Public Works
1445 Cleveland Place
Room 204
Denver, CO 80202

Creighton Lederer, Commissioner
Dept. of Buildings and
Safety Engineering
401 City-County Bldg.
Detroit, MI 48226

L. L. Monkres, Chief of Bldg.
Inspection Div.,
Deputy Building Officer
Public Works-Building
Inspection Division
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, TX 77001

Ted E. Kaptain,
Administrator of Buildings
Marion County Bldg. Commission
Building 2101
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Marvin Boutwell,
Chief Inspector, Bldg. & Zoning
Inspection Division
700 City Hall
220 E. Bay Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Jack White, Bldg. Code Engineer
Codes Administration Div.
Public Works Dept., 18th Floor
414 E. 12th Street
Kansas City, MO 64106

Robert J. Williams, Gen. Mgr.
Dept. of Bldgs. & Safety
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Frank M. Bosak, Bldg. Official
Bureau of Construction
Codes Enforcement
Dept. of Public Services
Room 404, City Hall
125 N. Main
Memphis, TN 38103
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Alex P. LeGrand, Insp. of Bldgs.
Dept. of Bldg. Inspection
and Safety Engineering
841 N. Broadway #1010
Milwaukee, WI 53225

Walter England,
Dir. of Codes Administration
Dept. of Codes Administration
P.O. Box 7425
802 2nd Avenue, South
Nashville, TN 37210

Frank E. Robin, Chief Bldg. Insp.
1300 Perdido
City Hall
New Orleans, LA 70112

Jeremiah T. Walsh,
Commissioner of Buildings
Dept. of Buildings
100 Gold Street
New York, NY 10038

Raymond Tate, Deputy Com.
Dept. of Licenses & Inspection
City Hall Annex, Room 720
Municipal Services Bldg.
Philadelphia, PA 19104

M. J. Sienerth, Building and
Housing Safety Director
51 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Paul Imhoff, Supt. of Bldg. Insps.
540 Public Safety Bldg.
5th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Michael Werner,
Acting Bldg. Commissioner
426 City Hall
12th and Market Streets
St. Louis, MO 63103

George D. Vann, Jr., Bldg. Off.
Building and Planning Admin.
Military Plaza
P.O. Box 9066
San Antonio, TX 78285

G. William Curtis,
Dir. of Bldg. Inspection
Bldg. Inspection Dept.
City Administration Bldg.
1222 1st Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101

Alfred Goldberg, Superintendent
Bureau of Bldg. Inspection
Dept. of Public Works
450 McAllister Street
Room 202
San Francisco, CA 94102

Alfred Petty,
Superintendent of Buildings
Building Department
503 City Municipal Building
4th and James Street
Seattle, WA 98108

William Dripps,
Chief, Bureau of Buildings
Bureau of Bldg., Housing & Zoning
614 H Street N.W.
Room 203
Washington, DC 20013
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4. ADDITIONAL CITIES

Albuquerque, NM
Alexandria, VA
Amarillo, TX
Anchorage, AK
Annapolis, MD
Augusta, ME
Birmingham, AL
Boise, ID
Burlington, VT
Cedar Rapids, IA
Charleston, SC
Concord, NH
Des Moines, IA
Durham, NC
Fairbanks, AK
Fort Worth, TX
Hartford, CT
Helena, MT
Honolulu, HI
Juneau, AK
Kansas City, KS
Lawrence, MA
Lincoln, NB
Louisville, KY
Lowell, MA
Madison, WI
Minneapolis, MN
Montgomery, AL
Montpelier, VT
Manchester, NH
Nantucket, MA
New Haven, CT
Oakland, CA
Oklahoma City, OK
Omaha, NB
Portland, OR
Providence, RI
Raleigh, NC
Richmond, VA
Rochester, NY
Sacramento, CA
St. Paul, MN
St. Petersburg, FL
Salt Lake City, UT
Santa Cruz, CA
Santa Fe, NM
Savannah, GA
Sonoma, CA
Syracuse, NY
Tucson, AZ
Tulsa, OK
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5. OTHER ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED

American Institute of Architects
1785 Massachusetts Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Building Officials and
Code Administrators International
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637

Colonial Williamsburg Foundation
Drawer C
Williamsburg, VA 23185

Henry Ford Museum
Greenfield Village
Dearborn, MI 48121

International Conference of Building Officials
5360 Workman Mill Road
Whittier, CA 90601

American Insurance Association
85 John Street
New York, NY 10001

National Fire Protection Association
470 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210

National Register of Historic Places
National Park Service
U.S. Dept. of Interior
Washington, DC 20240

National Trust for Historic Preservation
740-948 Jackson Place N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Old Sturbridge Village
Sturbridge, MA 01566

Southern Building Code Congress
3617 8th Street S.
Birmingham, AL 35222
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## LIST OF LEGISLATION REVIEWED

### STATES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alaska Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td>February 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>SB 927 Chapter 906</td>
<td>September 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Construction Rules and Regulations Section 320</td>
<td>1973 amend. 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>BOCA Code</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SBC 204</td>
<td>adopted 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>&quot;Authority to establish historic districts&quot; Sec. 31:89 a-k</td>
<td>1963 amend. 1969,1971 1973 &amp; 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>&quot;Special Historic Buildings &amp; Districts&quot;</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>N.C. State Building Code Sec. 11x Part 1C</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Basic Code Sec 318.0</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Wisconsin Statutes 101.02 (6) (g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Sec. 37.00 H-A Historic Atlantic District Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>City Code Article 1, Section 40</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>Administrative Code Article 6, Sect. A6.120-127</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Ordinance #121,971</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>Ordinance #2276</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>BOCA Code Sec. 317.0, 317.1, Ordinance 56100, Sec. 91413</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Ordinance #43796 Sec. 42.113-129</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Ordinance #11557 Sec. 91.0701-91.0705</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Administrative Code Chap. 1, Sec. 108, Ordinance 98852, Amended By Ordinances 99846 and 102902 Administrative Ruling #11-75</td>
<td>1974-75 1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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