

The Economic Power of Restoration

Restoration & Renovation Conference
January 15, 2001
Washington, DC
Donovan D. Rypkema

Historic preservation doesn't have a value - it has a multitude of values: aesthetic value, cultural value, social and psychological value, political value, environmental value, educational value. In the long term I believe each of those values is far more important than preservation's economic value. Most of you at this conference can explain those other values far better than can I. Frankly I don't know much about those values. What I do know a bit about is the economic value of preservation.

I am going to try to do three things today: first, identify and quantify a number of aspects of the economic benefits of historic preservation; second, suggest where the challenges to the success of historic preservation are likely to come from in the next decade; and third, propose five key roles for historic preservation in this beginning of the 21st century.

These remarks are entitled The Economic Power of Preservation but I am going to define that economic power broadly. Preservation can mean profits to developers, and homeowners, and bankers, certainly. But also, I believe, it can generate profits for neighborhoods, community activists, visitors, and the city at large.

So first to the economic benefits of historic preservation. We have identified a couple dozen of them here in the U.S. I'm going to tell you about eight of them. And I'll begin with the impact of simply rehabilitating an historic building. The Bureau of Economic Analysis has developed an econometric model to measure the local impact of output from a variety of economic activities. Five hundred twenty eight types of activities are evaluated and then consolidated into thirty-nine industry groups. These range from coal mining to household services, from agricultural production to retail trade. Using this data there are a couple of ways of quantifying the impact of production in each of these groups: one is number of jobs created; another is local increase in household income.

Conventional wisdom suggests that manufacturing activities would have the greatest impact. So I would like to compare for you manufacturing to building rehabilitation.

We will begin with jobs. On average for every \$1 Million in output from manufacturing in Ohio, for example, 25.5 jobs are produced. For a Million Dollars in building rehabilitation 38.5 jobs. Now admittedly the 25.5 is an average of seventeen manufacturing sectors. Those of you who can recall your high school math or college statistics will remember that sometimes averages under reflect individual highs and lows. So how many of the 17 components of that average create more jobs per million than building rehabilitation? None. Again in Ohio the average manufacturing firm produces 13 fewer jobs for each million of production than does rehabilitation.

The next measurement is household income - how much does \$1 Million in manufacturing in a manufacturing state like Michigan add to the household incomes of Michigan citizens? \$561,000. How much does a Million Dollars of building rehabilitation add? \$784,000. Now admittedly the \$561,000 is an average of seventeen manufacturing sectors. How many of the components of that average create more household income per million than building

rehabilitation? None. Again in Michigan a million dollars of manufacturing adds an average of \$223,000 less in the pockets of workers than a million dollars of rehabilitation.

So why is there this greater local economic impact? It is a function of labor intensity. As a rule of thumb, in the U.S. new construction will be half labor and half materials; rehabilitation will be sixty to seventy percent labor with the balance materials. So while you might buy an air conditioner from Texas and timber from Oregon, you buy the services of the carpenter, the electrician, the painter and the plumber from across the street. Those tradesmen, in turn, spend their dollars locally on groceries, clothes and new cars. Thus the secondary local effects of labor are significantly greater than that of materials. Labor intensity adds to the local economy. That million dollars of rehabilitation in Ohio adds eight more jobs and \$153,000 more in household income than does the same amount in new construction.

Further, construction jobs are generally skilled and therefore generally well paid jobs, particularly for those without advanced formal education.

So the construction trades have traditionally been a path for young people for learning, apprenticeships, advancement, and the building of their own household assets. So the case can certainly be made that the rehabilitation of historic structures is a highly beneficial local economic activity. But this might be countered with, "Yes, but construction is a finite task and once the work is done the job is gone." There are two responses to that argument. First, with building component life cycles of between thirty and fifty years, a community can rehabilitate two to three percent of its building stock per year and have perpetual employment in the construction trades.

Second, and more important is the nature of what is being created. A rehabilitated building is a capital asset, like a drill press or a railroad car. There is an economic impact in its creation but a subsequent economic role in its long-term use. So I would like to move to some of the uses we have found for historic buildings that have additional economic impact.

One area of significant preservation economic impact is heritage tourism. Heritage tourism is among the fastest growing segments of the visitor industry worldwide and will continue to be so. But that does not mean a heritage tourism approach is appropriate for all or even most places with historic assets. I would estimate that of all the heritage resources in economically productive use in the U.S., ninety-five percent are being used for something other than the tourism industry. Furthermore, heritage tourism is based on a rather fragile commodity, the overuse of which can diminish sustainable opportunity. So is the economic use of historic resources limited to heritage tourism? Certainly not.

Having said that, however, heritage based tourism, properly managed, does represent a significant opportunity for many communities. In Virginia preservation visitors stay longer, visit twice as many places, and spend two and a half times as much money as nonpreservation visitors.

In North Carolina visiting historic sites is far and away the most common visitor activity. And this is a State where much of the business community and political leadership think that their major visitor assets are car races and their professional sports teams - neither of which make more than a minor blip on the visitation statistics. But North Carolina is known for another culturally based activity. For generations in the mountains of western North Carolina has been a vibrant crafts industry. Today that industry - almost entirely made up of one and two person operations - adds over \$120 million annually to the economy of that State. What is the connection between the crafts industry and historic preservation? There they have learned that historic buildings make the ideal place both to make and to sell their wares - the

authenticity of the historic building adds to the sense of authenticity of the crafts product. It is a natural linkage.

Back to heritage tourism for a moment. In Maryland when we looked at heritage tourism here's what we learned: preservation visitors stayed a full day longer in the State than did other visitors; the average daily expenditure of preservation visitors was greater than other visitors; the consequence of these two factors means that the per trip expenditure is decidedly higher. There are two ways to look at this: either we can take in more revenues with heritage visitors or - since there are many instances where sheer numbers of people may not be desirable - we can take in the same amount of money with far fewer visitors. Either way heritage tourism, when it is appropriate, can have substantial local economic benefit. Further, heritage tourism is the singular form of tourism that, when done right, can preserve the local culture and enhance the quality of life for full time residents as well as for visitors. The same is not true for one more amusement park or one more time-share beach resort. Tourism is inherently a volatile industry, but heritage based tourism means that local assets are preserved for local citizens even in the down cycles of visitation.

A while back I attended a one-day symposium at the Brookings Institute in here in Washington of 30 or so people - both academics and practitioners - who are looking at ways of measuring the economic impact of historic preservation. The president of a tourism analysis firm from Toronto looked at visitor numbers slightly differently. He eliminates those people traveling for business, for example, who happen to visit a historic site incidental to the primary purpose of the trip and concentrates on discretionary travelers and what attracts them. For that person who is traveling for pleasure and has as a major purpose visiting historic places, for every \$3 she spends on the historic site itself, \$97 are spent elsewhere - food or shopping or hotels. But she came to town because of the historic resources. The leverage of that historic site, therefore, is incredible.

The next on my list of economic benefits of historic preservation is, perhaps, a less obvious one - small business incubation. The vast majority of net new jobs in the U.S. are not created by General Motors or IBM or Texaco. Around 85% of all net new jobs are created by firms employing less than 20 people. One of the few costs firms of this size can control is occupancy costs - rent. Many simply cannot afford the rents demanded in a new office building or in a shopping center or a new building in an industrial park. For many of these firms historic buildings are an attractive alternative. The twenty fastest growing types of businesses in the US have on average 11 employees. How much space to these people require? Well it depends a little on the specific business type but around 200 square feet per person would be typical. What is the average size of a small historic building downtown? 25' by 100' or 2500 square feet, almost precisely what is needed for this type of small business. Just up the road is Annapolis, Maryland - the most historic of America's state capitals, and there is a wonderful historic district in the downtown there. In that downtown 60 percent of all of the businesses employ five people or less - the perfect match between historic building and small business opportunity.

High tech industries seem to be what everyone wants to recruit today - and probably for good reason. But 70% of all high tech firms employ less than ten people. Some idiots in Duluth, Minnesota tore down a whole block of historic buildings recently in order to build a "high tech center." I don't know; maybe all the planes in Duluth are frozen to the ground year round so they couldn't look at the pattern anywhere else. But in the fast growth high tech areas in Seattle, in Portland, in Boston and Cambridge, in Silicon Alley in Manhattan, where are those types of firms locating? In old industrial and retail buildings, Rennsseler Polytechnic Institute in Troy, New York is one of the great technological colleges in the country. They have a history of graduates forming companies in the high tech fields. The school in the past has

partnered with some and provided business incubation space for others. Well they recently ran out of space on campus to accommodate all of the need - and that need includes direct connection to the school's main frame computers, and a variety of communication and data transfer systems. So they built a new glass and chrome building in the industrial park right? Wrong. In partnership with a local bank and a non-profit preservation organization RPI created a state-of-the art high tech business incubator in a historic building in downtown Troy. Less than a mile from here a group of venture capitalists is creating an incubation space for high-tech businesses they want to invest in. Where are they doing this? In an historic building in Washington's Chinatown. The adaptability of historic buildings is one of their most valuable and under-recognized attributes.

There is one more aspect of small businesses and historic buildings that merits mention, and it is on the quality side of the equation. There are certainly some very high quality new commercial buildings being built in America today - but virtually all of them large buildings. Small businesses rarely find a place in these buildings either because the size is inappropriate or the rent is too high. There are almost no high quality, small buildings being built for tenant occupancy anywhere in the U.S. The rehabilitated historic building provides that opportunity for a small business - high quality at an appropriate scale and an affordable price. Many small firms are recognizing that.

The next area of preservation economic benefit is downtown revitalization. For fifty years we have seen a departure from the central city and its downtown to the suburbs. This has had huge adverse consequences socially, economically, politically, and physically. As a result many towns and cities of every size have embarked on downtown revitalization efforts. Some of these efforts have been going on for nearly thirty years; others are more recent initiatives. Today downtowns are making a great turn around - new economic life in areas that not long ago were nearly dead. But I do not know of a single sustained success story in downtown revitalization anywhere in the United States where historic preservation was not a key component of the effort. That doesn't mean it isn't theoretically possible to have downtown revitalization but no historic preservation, but I don't know about it, I haven't read about it, I haven't seen it.

Once consequence of these downtown revitalization efforts is that for the first time in two generations people of middle class means are moving back into the central city - often into the downtown itself. This is happening in places as diverse as Philadelphia, San Francisco, Atlanta, Houston, Denver and Des Moines. But in nearly every instance the housing they are moving back into is rehabbed housing in historic buildings. Obsolete factories, warehouses, department stores, office buildings are now finding new life as apartments. This is historic preservation that has nothing to do with tourism or museums but is making a huge and sustainable economic impact all over America.

At the same time we have seen departure from our central cities there has also been an out-migration from small towns. For 20 years now the National Trust has had the program - economic development in the context of historic preservation - known as Main Street. Main Street is now active in neighborhood commercial districts in several large cities. It has had an incredible success. Over 1500 communities in over 40 States have had their own Main Street programs. Over the last 20 years in excess of \$12.8 Billion dollars has been invested in these downtowns. There have been 62,000 building renovations, 51,000 net new businesses and 193,000 net new jobs. There is simply no more cost effective economic development program of any type, on any scale, anywhere in the country and I don't care what standard of measurement you choose. And this is economic development that focuses on historic preservation and retaining community character.

Stable residential neighborhoods may not seem to be central to economic development, but in fact they are critical. Declining neighborhoods means loss of tax revenues for local government. Declining neighborhoods mean the departure of the skilled, the educated, the employed and the middle class. Declining neighborhoods see increased crime, declining property values, underutilized public infrastructure, deficient schools. Both the public and private sectors suffer economically when residential neighborhoods decline.

More and more, historic districts have become the strategy to stabilize and reinvigorate urban neighborhoods. The only way I know to communicate this pattern to you is to give you some examples from around the country. In Kansas City, Missouri the city itself is declining in population, but the historic districts are growing. In Rock Island, Illinois, a Mississippi River town, many of the older homes in close in residential areas had been covered up with cheap and inappropriate materials. A concerted effort of a local group to undo the damage has been in place for six or seven years. The neighborhood has taken on a whole new life. If you were to drive through some of these neighborhoods you might well say, "What is historic about this neighborhood?" And, frankly, on a global scale, nothing. But the neighborhoods have a local history that they now celebrate. The overwhelming majority of what we call "historic properties" have no international, in most cases not even national importance. But they have local importance to the people who live there. Both economic development and historic preservation are essentially local in the United States; that's one reason why the two can work so well together. In Indianapolis an area of very modest housing is seeing rates of property value appreciation far greater than surrounding non-historic neighborhoods. In the small town of Staunton, Virginia, historic district properties appreciate significantly faster than the market as a whole. In Oklahoma City a neighborhood that ten years ago was nearly vacant is seeing new life based on a preservation strategy. Columbus, Ohio has created an entire new neighborhood through the adaptive reuse of former breweries and warehouses. None of these examples are the enclaves of the rich or famous, not neighborhoods of mansions. But they are all examples of a consistent pattern of effective neighborhood stabilization through historic preservation.

Related to the issue of neighborhood stability is neighborhood diversity. America is a diverse country, ethnically, racially, economically. From a political perspective there's not much unanimity in the U.S. regarding overall urban policy. But I think there is rather widespread agreement on one issue - our cities would be healthier if we had diverse urban districts - that no one particularly benefits from neighborhoods that are all rich or all poor; all white or all black. And while for over thirty years we have had laws prohibiting discrimination based on race or religion, while anyone with the money to buy can live wherever they choose, our neighborhoods as a whole are not very diverse.

Let me give you an example. Philadelphia, one of America's oldest cities, has a population of one and a half million people. It's about 53 percent white, 40 percent black and the balance Asian and Other. But when the census is taken Block Groups are identified. A block group is small - in Philadelphia only eight or nine hundred people in each one. There are about 1,750 Block Groups in Philadelphia. While the city as a whole is certainly diverse, the Block Groups are not. In a recent analysis we said that to meet the test of a diverse neighborhood, the Block Group had to be less than 80% white and less than 80% black, that is no extreme concentration of any race.

Barely one Block Group in five met that test. 79% of Philadelphia small neighborhood clusters were effectively all white or all black. Not so in the National Register Historic Districts, however. In the 106 Block Groups within historic districts nearly half met the diversity test - people of all races living together because of the appeal of the historic neighborhood. These were not all high-income areas, by the way. The income distribution in

Philadelphia's historic districts mirrors the income of the city as a whole. There is housing available in historic neighborhoods to accommodate a wide range of income levels.

Philadelphia is a city that is losing people. Since 1980 it has lost between 12 and 14% of the population. Some will argue that a city's diversity is what drives people away. Not true in the historic districts. The historic neighborhoods have lost less than 5%. These historic districts only make up 6.3% of the city's entire population but: fifteen percent of the people that moved in from the suburbs in the last five years went to historic areas; twenty one percent of the people that moved into Philadelphia from other parts of the country moved to historic sectors. Historic neighborhoods are home to nearly 24% of the college graduates and over 28% of those with graduate and professional degrees. Even in a city by many measures in decline, the diverse appeal of historic districts is evident.

So there are eight of the ways we have found historic preservation to be an economic generator: jobs, household income, heritage tourism, small business incubation, downtown revitalization, small town revitalization, neighborhood stability, and neighborhood diversity.

So the story of the economic importance of preservation is a positive one. It is a story that is being heard and understood and adopted by decision makers - bankers, elected officials, city managers, economic development professionals, real estate developers, accountants, and business people. Those very people that a decade ago were the most vociferous opponents of historic preservation; or at best dismissed it as a cute avocation for the retired librarian. I do not mean to suggest that the need to continue to make these arguments is now over. This economic power of preservation message still needs to be told.

But I think our biggest challenges in the immediate future come not from our former foes. Today our biggest challenges come too often from our friends in preservation. A battle isn't lost when people yell at you. A battle isn't lost when people talk down to you. A battle is lost when you become a joke. And, I would suggest, we are on the verge of that happening far too often. Let me give you four examples.

In the name of historic preservation this is happening all over America. In what absurdist dictionary written by Salvador Dali on drugs can this be called historic preservation? Maintaining a four-inch brick depth of a façade is not preservation. Either a justification can be made for economic hardship or it can't. If there is no feasible way to save the building, we ought to demand a high quality new building be built. If there is not demonstrated economic hardship we ought not settle for this Halloween preservation - saving the mask and throwing away the building. This is the worst of both worlds - no historic preservation, by any sane definition, and yet encumbering the developer with an extraordinary cost of removing an entire building behind the skin and pasting it back on again. Every time some historic preservation commission accepts - or in most cases mandates - this façadeomy as "historic preservation" it not only makes it more likely to happen again, it also has taxpayers and 7 elected officials shaking their heads in wonder and saying, "this is what preservation is about"? The laughter will soon follow.

My second example is on the other end of the spectrum. The Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation have a clause that says "distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved." Well that used to mean grand lobbies, ornate stairways, decorative banisters, stained glass windows. Today too often every 8" pine, painted mopboard is declared a "distinctive feature" whose retention is mandated. Again, let me give you a concrete example. A building like this one - this isn't the building, I didn't want to embarrass the parties involved - but a building like this - late 19th century. And you all know how this building is

configured on the upper floors - a long, double-loaded hallway with very small rooms and transoms over each door. The property owner and his architect convinced the SHPO and the Park Service that those small rooms simply could not be effectively reused and so were allowed to remove all the walls between them, creating two large, well lighted and usable spaces. But they were required to maintain the hallway - doors, transoms, and all. But the hallway goes nowhere! All because the doors and transoms were identified as "distinctive features". But how can we call a door a distinctive feature if there's no room behind it. It reminds me of this Oklahoma version of façadeomy - a door but no building. A hallway to nowhere - mandated by our friends - makes preservation the subject of laughter.

Example three. I've been involved for the last year with Peter and the National Trust in a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Army to identify the issues and challenges and to look for solutions in trying to deal with the Army's historic buildings. They have 12,000 historic buildings currently and thousands more coming online over the next 20 years. The leadership at the Pentagon recognizes their stewardship responsibilities and is prepared to do what is necessary for their historic buildings. The responsibility for identifying what is "historic" falls into the hands of Cultural Resources Managers. Very nice people, very committed, most of whom are trained as archeologists, botanists, or entomologists. Trouble is, many, many of them use the term "historic building" to apply to everything over 50 years old. I'll admit to sleeping through some classes in graduate school, but I think if "fifty years old" and "historic" were synonyms I'd have come across it somewhere. Now when some commander is told that every temporary wooden storage building built in 1951 is "historic" and has to be saved, historic preservation is going to be dismissed as simply foolishness.

Example four. There has been lots of discussion lately about the preservation of the recent past. And I think that's great. There are certainly plenty of buildings built since World War II that merit preservation - Dulles Airport, the Seagram building, Transamerica Tower, the motel where Martin Luther King was assassinated and hundreds of others. But to suggest that every roadside motor inn, 1950's strip center, Dairy Queen and Esso gas station is somehow "historic" stretches the limits of credibility. Historic preservation has always held with it an implication of quality and significance. When we allow Gresham's Law to apply to what we consider historic, we dilute the importance of those buildings that are important, that are historic, that do merit saving.

We have made great strides in the last 15 years in cities, in neighborhoods, in economic development because historic preservation has demonstrated it should be taken seriously. But when saving four inches of brick constitutes historic preservation, when every mopboard becomes a "distinctive feature", when everything 50 years old is defined as "historic" and when mediocre structures of no architectural, historical, or aesthetic importance are called landmarks, we will have taken a giant step backwards and laughter will be our departure music.

And this risk of now losing this hard won credibility is particularly troubling to me because of the great opportunity for historic preservation as we enter the 21st Century. I believe there are five crucial roles that historic preservation has the opportunity to play in the decades ahead.

First is globalization. Like it or not the 21st Century will see a globalized economy. 1.2 billion people in the world live in poverty, most of them people of color. You will never tax the industrial world enough to end hunger. The only way it can happen is if there is an opportunity to produce and sell goods and services to world markets. The protesters in Seattle and elsewhere are simply wrong. A globalized economy is not only going to happen, but it is critical on any humanitarian perspective that it does. There will be a rapidly growing demand

for goods worldwide. But the manufacture of those goods will require fewer and fewer people. Likewise the need for agricultural products will only increase with world population growth but fewer agricultural workers will be necessary to grow that food.

The areas of the economy that will grow, both in output and in employment are these: Services; Education; Ideas; One-of-a-kind products, individually produced; Culture; Entertainment; Travel. What does that have to do with historic preservation? Three things: 1) every one of those activities can take place within a historic buildings; 2) for each of those growth areas, quality and authenticity will be major variables in consumer choice; and 3) just as with the crafts industry in North Carolina, being in a historic structure adds to the sense of quality and authenticity of the good or service. Historic buildings can house the 21st century economy.

There is a second role for historic preservation in relation to globalization and it is this: for all of the potential benefits of a globalized economy (and there are many) it carries with it the substantial risk of a globalized culture, of which there are few if any benefits. But a globalized economy does not have to lead to a globalized culture. The westernization or the Americanization or the McDonaldization of local and regional cultures will not only have short-term adverse sociological and political consequences but long-term adverse economic consequences. But again, historic preservation can play a critical role. There is no better way to maintain, understand, and appreciate a local culture than the ongoing, evolving use of a community's historic resources. So historic preservation, perhaps only historic preservation, can simultaneously foster economic globalization while resisting cultural globalization.

A third role for historic preservation in the coming years is one that it has been playing all along, and that is community building. In fact I would argue that historic preservation is the singular form of economic development that is simultaneously community development. Not long ago with the creation of the Internet, the growth of telecommunications, and the ability to work around the globe from one's house, there were predictions that the importance of one's physical place would diminish in importance. In fact the opposite has been true. The ability to work anywhere, the ability to electronically be everywhere, has increased our need to be somewhere - somewhere in particular, somewhere differentiated. It is our built environment that expresses, perhaps better than anything else, our diversity, our identity, our individuality, our differentiation. Our historic buildings are the physical manifestation of our community.

We may be dismissive about teenagers, their values, their outlook, but they often understand this better than anyone. Let me tell you about the small town of Rushville, Illinois. There is this school there built in 1919 with an addition built in 1925. The addition was the gymnasium on the lower level and an auditorium space on the upper level. The school board decided the structure no longer worked so they built new schools, added to others, and a year ago the junior high kids who were the most recent users of the school were moved out. But the school board decided that not only didn't the building work as a school - it was unusable for anything and intended to demolish it. When I toured the building I went into one of those little dressing rooms that are usually found behind the stage in high school auditoriums. There written in graffiti on the wall - clearly by a 14 or 15 year old was this: "Those who want to tear this building down have never seen this place as Wonderland." That kid clearly understood what the school superintendent did not - that the evolution of the community was represented in that building and it was a far too precious commodity to be lost. The School Board didn't understand that and the building was torn down.

But if the Rushville School Board didn't understand that, others do. In his book *The Good Society* sociologist Robert Bellah observes, "Communities, in the sense in which we are

using the term, have a history--in an important sense they are constituted by their past--and for this reason we can speak of a real community as a 'community of memory', one that does not forget its past."

The fourth role of historic preservation is its environmental role. I have to credit Dick Moe at the National Trust for bringing this aspect of preservation to the forefront. The relationship between sprawl in the suburbs and abandonment of historic buildings in the city is so obvious, most of us missed it for years. But now this relationship is better understood. No new land is consumed when a historic building is renovated. Construction debris takes up 24% of increasingly expensive sanitary landfill, and much of that is from buildings being demolished. Historic preservation constitutes a demand side approach to Smart Growth. I'm not at all opposed to acquiring greenbelts around cities or development rights on agriculture properties. Those are certainly important and valuable tools in a comprehensive anti-sprawl strategy. But they only reduce the supply of land to be developed - they do not address the demand for the use of that land. The conversion of a historic warehouse into 40 residential units reduces the demand for ten acres of farmland. The economic revitalization of Main Street reduces the demand for another strip center. The restoration of the empty 1920s skyscraper reduces the demand for another glass and chrome building at the office park. Again, I don't mean to be remotely critical of supply side strategies, but without demand side responses, their success will be limited at best. Historic preservation is in and of itself an environmental strategy, one that addresses the demand for uses.

The fifth role for historic preservation is its effectiveness as a vehicle of fiscal responsibility. If Democratic governors, legislators and mayors have gotten onto this Smart Growth movement because of their concern for the environment, Republican governors, legislators and mayors have become advocates for Smart Growth because they are advocates for fiscal responsibility. The huge cost of public resources in providing roads, fire protection, water and sewer, schools and other infrastructure further and further into the countryside while at the same time we are abandoning historic buildings and the infrastructure that's already in place to serve them is the height of fiscal irresponsibility. Preserving historic structures is conservative in the best sense of the word. We are conserving tax payers' dollars, conserving our local heritage, and conserving the natural environment.

So when you go back home, getting your hands dirty restoring that deteriorated white elephant project that no one else would take on, please don't think what you are doing is just fixing up some old building. What you are doing is preparing your community for a globalized economy without being swallowed up by a globalized culture. You are building your community. You are saving the environment. And you are saving scarce public resources.

I know that you've heard them before, but I think, particularly for this audience, the words of John Ruskin are a fitting conclusion. He wrote, "When we build let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone; let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them, "See! This our fathers did for us." What you are doing for historic preservation your descendants will thank you for. And I thank you for allowing me to be here with you today.

Thank you very much.

Donovan D. Rypkema

