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Generate a Charged Debate

Balancing the Benefits and Burdens of Gas Drilling in Pennsylvania

By Jennifer Horn and Erin Hammerstedt

The Story of Pithole, PA

After striking oil in 1865, the population of Pithole spiked from 2,000 to 15,000 within a year. The booming oil economy attracted speculators and laborers to the small outpost in Venango County. During its boom, Pithole boasted a post office, hotels, a railroad and churches. Nevertheless, after the oil strike slowed in 1866 and fires ravaged the wood-constructed town, the city hit bust. By the end of 1866, the population had dropped to 4,000 as the industry slowly slipped away to other oil fields. Although the story of Pithole is an extreme example, it is important to remember Pennsylvania’s history of resource extraction—oil, timber, coal—and the impacts of boom and bust economies as regulatory policies are debated for Marcellus shale drilling sites. To ensure past mistakes are not repeated, Pennsylvania should regulate the extraction of natural gas to guarantee that the residents of the Commonwealth receive the benefits of the booming industry as well as its burdens.

Horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing has made gas extraction from the deep Marcellus shale reserves economically feasible, and popular demand for new industry and employment opportunities has made natural gas very attractive. Although Pennsylvania’s rich natural resources do have the potential to provide enormous economic gain, it is important to balance the positive and negative impacts of natural gas extraction.

At the beginning of the process, a mineral lease agreement is negotiated between a landowner and the producer (i.e. the gas drilling company). Although state agencies like the PA Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) review drilling management plans to lessen potential impacts to the water supply and water extraction sites, there is little opportunity for the affected community to regulate drilling. Private leases between the landowner and producer generate significant revenues for those parties. However, the burden to provide local services for the increasing population, make necessary transportation upgrades, restore water quality, and protect natural and cultural resources falls on the community. In 2010, Preservation Pennsylvania listed the historic resort town of Eagles Mere, Sullivan County, on the Pennsylvania At Risk list. This annual listing of historic places draws attention to threatened sites and structures. The story of Eagles Mere, although very different from Pithole, illustrates the threat gas drilling poses to a historic community’s character.

(Continued on Page 3)
Dear Friend of Preservation,

After a long hiatus, I’m so pleased to bring you the Winter 2011 issue of our quarterly newsletter. In a world of so much technology with everything scanned and in electronic form, we have become used to communicating via e-mail and in short Tweets and Facebook status updates. I love technology and its ability to deliver quick information. About two years ago, we introduced our e-newsletter “News from Preservation Pennsylvania.” It is a great way to let people know what we are doing and to remind them of upcoming dates. But honestly, we miss the old printed newsletter format that you could hold in your hands, if you wish.

A printed newsletter gives us room for articles to be more in-depth and allows us to include more photographs. Along with our annual *Pennsylvania At Risk* publication, we hope our quarterly newsletter will be something you keep for a while or pass along to a friend who might be interested.

The printed version of our newsletter is also an exclusive benefit for members of Preservation Pennsylvania. So with each issue, please accept our appreciation for supporting our efforts to help people preserve and protect the places that matter to them, all across the Commonwealth.

This issue focuses on a variety of energy topics that have the potential to impact our historic resources. We’re expanding a bit on a few of our *Pennsylvania At Risk* listings to provide you with more information about these important and controversial topics. We hope you find them helpful.

In future issues, we will explore funding for heritage programs and historic resources as we adjust to shrinking budgets and fewer grant opportunities (Spring 2011). We’ll also be highlighting our Historic Preservation Award winners (Summer 2011) and then complete the year with our annual *Pennsylvania At Risk* (Fall 2011).

Please let us know what you think and feel free to suggest ideas for future newsletters. Thank you again for your support!

Sincerely,

_A Message from Mindy…_

In addition to our printed newsletters, we also publish a bi-monthly electronic edition.

Our e-newsletters have a variety of topics and features that provide the most up-to-date historic preservation news, grant opportunities, and current field projects.

Please visit our website, [http://www.preservationpa.org](http://www.preservationpa.org) and sign up at the bottom of our homepage!
Burden without Benefit (continued from cover)

In Pennsylvania, hydraulic fracturing is a relatively new technology to extract natural gas. Most gas drilling companies bring in experienced—yet temporary—workers to Pennsylvania. This influx of transient employees inflates local housing prices, driving up the price of affordable rental housing. In addition to putting stress on the local housing market, projected population increases in rural Pennsylvania boomtowns will add to the demand for local services including police, fire, and schools. Without a comprehensive plan in place to address this unexpected population growth, the community will struggle to provide safe roads and a quality education for its youngest residents.

In Eagles Mere, natural gas extraction from Marcellus shale has the potential to affect features that make the historic resort community unique and economically vital. Eagles Mere residents and tourists value the pristine spring-fed lake, forests on the surrounding mountains, and the overall serene, secluded quality of the community. Although natural gas drilling threatens to change the rural landscape, the primary concern of residents is irreparable damage to the water supply. If the quality of Eagles Mere’s waterways are affected—through excessive water consumption or the contamination of surface and/or groundwater—the central lake around which the historic district formed and continues to be focused would be ruined. Like most rural Pennsylvania communities, the residents depend on quality spring-fed wells. Eagles Mere’s survival as a community depends on access to a safe water supply and the presence of a pure, clean lake.

In addition to environmental impacts, active Marcellus shale sites will alter Pennsylvania’s rural landscapes by changing land-use patterns. The life span of a producing well includes exploration, extraction and restoration. During the well’s life span, heavy truck traffic strains existing local roads and bridges. Drilling companies construct new private access roads to provide a constant supply of fresh water for use in the extraction process and to transport contaminated hydraulic fracturing fluid from the site to wastewater treatment plants. Access roads increase erosion and fragment forests and wildlife habitats, compromising the setting of small rural towns like Eagles Mere. Increased truck traffic also alters the serene rural landscape and burdens local resources. Although Pennsylvania’s municipalities can require gas drilling companies to post bonds to fund the repair of public roads, the unplanned increase in traffic damages more than just pavement quality.

The construction of drill pads and gas pipelines also has the potential to compromise historic landscapes and destroy archaeological resources. An average drill pad requires three to five acres of cleared and leveled land. Pipelines are necessary for moving the gas from the drill site to production centers. Although the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) encourages landowners and gas drilling companies to research known and unknown historic resources in the affected area, there is no regulatory framework to protect historic resources from damage by private companies. The Cultural Resources Geographic Information System (CRGIS) is available online to the public, and the resource provides landowners and companies with a starting point for conducting research on recorded cultural resources. However, the PHMC suggests that landowners and producers consult with local planning offices, historical societies and the regional Heritage Area to identify historic resources, unique natural areas, waterways and landscapes. Without a state review of effects to historic resources, construction of drilling pads and pipelines will continue to threaten Pennsylvania’s heritage.

Like Pennsylvania’s oil, coal and timber resources, gas deposits in the Marcellus shale have the potential to provide many Pennsylvania communities with a significant opportunity for economic development and improve the quality of life for residents. However, without comprehensive plans and financial support in place to provide transportation upgrades, affordable housing and local services, communities will continue to shoulder the burden of the gas boom and without receiving a share of its benefits. Through cooperation among landowners, state agencies, lawmakers and the gas drilling companies, a mutual agreement can be reached that provides for the appropriate extraction of natural gas from Marcellus shale while ensuring that quality of life for the Commonwealth’s residents is not only protected, but improved.

For more information:

DEP Marcellus Shale Fact Sheet
http://www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/deputate/minres/oilgas/new_forms/marcellus/marcellus.htm

DCNR Marcellus Fact Sheet
http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/topogeo/oilandgas/marcellus_faqs.aspx
Blowin’ in the Wind:

Wind energy has been designated as an alternative source of energy with the potential to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and greenhouse gas emissions, thus slowing global warming. Wind turbine installations are visibly increasing in number across Pennsylvania’s landscape, since its hills and ridges provide suitable sites for turbines to produce inexpensive electricity. These turbines have an impact on the natural environment by introducing large structures into picturesque landscapes, disturbing natural features and destroying the habitats of plants and animals. In addition to the construction of the turbines themselves, new roads have to be installed, electric transmission lines built, and large concrete pads poured in order to anchor the tall turbine columns. Installation of wind turbines on a large scale, as so-called “wind farms” is typical, but occasionally individual property owners will establish one or two units to generate their own power.

The Question is: Can Wind Power Development Adversely Impact Historic Properties?

In a word, yes. Preservation Pennsylvania recently put the National Register Eligible Dutch Corner Rural Historic District on its Pennsylvania At Risk list due to the possible construction of wind turbines along the ridges that outline this unique cultural landscape. While the construction of the wind turbines will not result in the demolition of historic buildings, it will cause physical impacts to the mountain, introduce new modern structures to the view shed, and significantly increase noise levels in the historic district. An organization called Save Our Allegheny Ridges (SOAR) has been formed to prevent the construction of the wind energy structures.


Also visit SOAR’s web site: [http://www.saveouralleghenyridges.org/](http://www.saveouralleghenyridges.org/)
Questions & Answers About Wind Energy

Are there any cases in the U.S. where historic resources and wind energy development have clashed?

On the outer continental shelf off the coast of Cape Cod, Massachusetts, a wind energy developer has proposed the construction of a wind turbine farm. The project requires permits from several federal agencies, including the Minerals Management Services and the Army Corps of Engineers, which triggers various environmental and historic preservation regulations. Specifically, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (and the regulations that implement Section 106) requires federal agencies to participate in a process that involves public participation, consultation with interested parties, and possibly the involvement of the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation. This process may reduce or mitigate the effect of the project on historic properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. In the Cape Cod case, several shoreline historic districts and various natural resources with traditional importance to Native American tribes may be affected by the project.

For additional Information on Section 106 regulations refer to: http://www.achp.gov
For specifics of the Massachusetts wind energy cases visit: http://www.achp.gov/docs/CaseDigest2010.pdf

Do these federal regulations apply to wind energy projects in Pennsylvania?

The first two words in the answer to all legal questions is: “It depends…” If a wind energy project is proposed in Pennsylvania that involves federal funding, a federal permit, or a federal license, the Section 106 regulations are in effect. The federal agency, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, the developer, the public and other interested parties need to participate in the process to mitigate the effect of the project on historic properties.

What about local regulations?

Projects that include the development of land and/or the construction of buildings or structures fall under a municipal government’s zoning ordinance or subdivision and land development ordinance. The Pennsylvania Wind Working Group has a model ordinance to enable wind energy in Pennsylvania: http://www.pawindenergynow.org/pa/Model_Wind_Ordinance_Final_3_21_06.pdf.

Municipal governments in Pennsylvania can protect historic resources with Historic District ordinances or with historic preservation zoning overlay ordinances. Applicable to the visual and other indirect intrusions of wind energy are the overlay zoning provisions of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 605). These provisions allow local governments to use zoning to regulate, restrict, and prohibit structures at, along, or near properties having unique historic or architectural significance. The Pennsylvania Planning Association has a copy of the PA Municipalities Planning Code on its web site: http://www.planningpa.org/MPCode.pdf.

Wind energy has the potential to reduce both our dependence on foreign oil and green house gas emissions. However it also has the potential to directly and indirectly affect historic resources. If federal regulations are followed and local zoning ordinances are adopted to protect historic properties, wind energy production can proceed without negatively affecting or altering the landscape of the Commonwealth’s past.

Aerial view of Dutch Corner Rural Historic District. Photo courtesy of Jacksons Journeys Photography.
Here Comes the Sun:

By David Kimmerly

Solar panel installations in Pennsylvania have increased dramatically in recent years. This is the result of the increasing cost of fossil fuels and electricity production, as well as state and federal tax incentives for sustainable, renewable and alternative energy production. Installation of solar panels has occurred on structures of all types, including private residences, public buildings and individual businesses. In addition, energy companies have constructed large scale communal solar arrays. This boom in the use of the sun as an alternative energy source will result in reduced fossil fuel consumption, less air pollution and a subsequent decrease in greenhouse gases. However, a downside to solar energy expansion may be the potential to adversely impact historic buildings, historic districts and historic landscapes.

Can Solar Energy and Historic Resources Peacefully Coexist?

Below is a photograph of a solar installation on the National Register listed Hawley Silk Mill in Wayne County near Lake Wallenpaupack. Can you see the solar panels?

Of course not! The developers of the Hawley Silk Mill positioned the solar panels on the roof so that they lie as flush as possible and are not visible from the primary elevation of the building, thereby protecting the architectural integrity of the historic structure. The silk mill is being converted into a mixed use commercial, office and educational facility. The cocoon building on the property has also been converted into a coffee house. The solar panels generate 58,000 kilowatt hours of electricity per year. Additional solar panels are planned and geothermal energy may also be utilized. Learn more about the Hawley Silk Mill and its sustainable approach to business development at http://www.hawleysilkmill.com.
Similarly Welkinweir, also known as the Rodebaugh Estate, is a historic building with a solar installation. Located near Pottstown in East Nantmeal Township, Chester County, Welkinweir is the former residence of Everett and Grace Rodebaugh. The Rodebaughs formed the Green Valleys Association in 1964 for the future preservation of the natural landscape of the area. The estate is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. While the house has many viable locations for solar panel placement, the units that generate electricity were deliberately located on a flat section of the historic house’s roof so that they are not visible from the main facade. Solar energy is not the only form of alternative energy being used at Welkinweir, either. A small hydroelectric generating plant, installed at a dam that creates a pond on the property, is about to go online. The sustainable energy projects at Welkinweir were paid for in part by an Energy Harvest grant from the PA Department of Environmental Protection.

Welkinweir and Hawley Silk Mill both have the potential to sell energy back to the grid of the electric company. This results not only in environmental sustainability, but economic sustainability as well.

What Would HARB Say?

Both of the solar installations at Welkinweir and the Hawley Silk Mill were designed by organizations and individuals knowledgeable about the protection of historic buildings. But what if the situation involved a homeowner who has no appreciation for preserving architectural integrity or understanding of a locally regulated historic district? Historic Architectural Review Boards (HARBs) and historical commissions in Pennsylvania have had to deal with homeowners who want to place solar panels on homes in historic districts. How do these advisory boards deal with the installation of solar panels on historic buildings? The National Association of Preservation Commissions has recently released Sample Guidelines for Solar Panels in Historic Districts, which contains practical advice for the appropriate installation of solar energy equipment in historic districts: [http://www.uga.edu/napc/documentsSolarPanelGuidelines.pdf](http://www.uga.edu/napc/documentsSolarPanelGuidelines.pdf).

The Lower Merion Township HARB recently recommended the approval of the installation of solar panels on the main facade of an historic building. They based their recommendation to approve on a variety of factors, including: solar panel placement on other locations of the home would not generate significant amounts of energy; the current roof was asphalt so the solar installation would not remove or cover historic roofing materials; and the solar panels could be removed in the future without damaging the historic integrity of the building. The Lower Merion HARB also made it clear that this was not a precedent-setting recommendation of approval of all solar installations in the district and that each proposal for a solar installation would have to be made on a case by case basis. As technology improves, the aesthetics of solar installations will also improve.

Special thanks to Grant Genzlinger, Hawley Silk Mill; Michel Lefevre, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Bureau for Historic Preservation; Victoria Laubauch, Executive Director, Green Valleys Association at Welkinweir; and Robert Duncan, Lower Merion HARB for their cooperation and contributions to this article.
What do these three historic properties have in common?

All three historic homes are located in southwestern Pennsylvania and are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. They are all historic resources whose landscapes and settings are essential features in defining their character. And all three of these historic properties have been listed on Preservation Pennsylvania’s Pennsylvania At Risk list because they have been or will soon be impacted by coal mining activities.

A National Historic Landmark, the 1802 Isaac Meason House is one of the premier examples of a Georgian period Palladian villa-type house and landscape in America. The property has suffered tremendously from impacts to its historic setting, beginning with strip mining of coal just behind the house. By the time the property was listed on the Pennsylvania At Risk list in 1992, surface mining was already underway. Through a well-fought, expensive legal battle, property owners were able to limit the mining done on their property to some extent. Although the surface mining did not cause structural damage to the buildings, it did negatively impact the setting around the farmstead and triggered a series of other harmful changes. The land surrounding the Meason House was devalued by surface mining, and as a result of poor zoning regulations, the buildings continued to suffer from modern intrusions on their landscape as strip malls, industrial buildings and automotive service centers appeared around this historic landmark.

The Thomas Kent, Jr. Farm house wrapped in bands and cables during the longwall mining process. Intended to help hold the structure together, the bands also allowed the mining company to attach monitors to track any movement occurring during and immediately after mining. At the Kent Farm, the monitors were checked every three hours. It was thought that if a gap of 2” or more opened up, the front wall of the house would almost certainly collapse. As the cracking approached 1 ¾” this historic house was watched especially closely.

(Kent Farm photos courtesy of Laurine & Murray Williams.)

The introduction and increased popularization of longwall mining, a highly productive underground coal mining technique, poses a greater threat to historic properties than traditional extraction methods. In longwall mining, large mining machines—will multiple coal shearsers mounted on a series of self-advancing hydraulic ceiling supports—move forward underground, cutting coal from the wall face. The machine extracts panels of coal as wide as the mining machinery and up to 12,000 feet long. Coal falls onto a conveyor belt for removal from the mine. As the longwall miner advances along the panel, the roof behind the miner is allowed to collapse into the newly created void. As a result, land immediately above the removed coal seam drops between four and six feet at the surface and the surrounding land slumps and shifts. This movement results in damage to the land and buildings above and often disrupts or eliminates water supplies.

Since 1966, laws have been in place to protect the public interest from damage caused by coal mining. While it still allowed damage in some instances, the Bituminous Mine Subsidence and Land Conservation Act (BMSLCA) originally prohibited mining under homes, churches, schools and other important buildings.
In 1994, however, the BMSLCA was amended. The amendments addressed water supply replacement and enhanced remedies for structural damage, but also removed the prohibition on mining under buildings, requiring instead that mine operators repair or compensate for subsidence damage. Provisions in the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) require federal agencies to consider the impact of their undertakings on historic properties. With de facto authorization from the Office of Surface Mining (OSM), which has delegated its responsibility for compliance with federal regulations to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), the DEP commonly issues permits for longwall mining despite the clear potential for adverse effects to historic properties. The DEP does not engage consulting parties, and rather than truly considering alternatives that could avoid or minimize these harmful impacts, the DEP allows mine operators to jump directly to mitigation, handling “planned subsidence” with “subsidence control and mitigation plans” that either repair or compensate the surface property owner for the damage. Only in very rare cases where it is determined that there will be “irreparable damage” to a historic property—and the property owner does not consent to that damage—does the DEP consider withholding permits to mine. Adversely affecting a protected historic property is commonly deemed by the DEP to be permissible as long as the damage can be repaired. No consideration is given to the workmanship that is embodied in the buildings or the significance that exists in the landscape features and water systems, all of which are impossible to truly “repair.”

The Thomas Kent, Jr. Farm just outside of Waynesburg in Greene County is an example that clearly illustrates the harmful impacts of longwall mining, and the fact that the review process in Pennsylvania is broken. The 1851 brick farmhouse and its associated outbuildings and fields are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The property was listed on the Pennsylvania At Risk list in 1999, as the property owners engaged in a multi-year legal battle to protect their farm. In 2001, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the federal Office of Surface Mining (OSM), the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (SHPO), and the DEP allowing longwall mining to proceed under the farm, provided that appropriate restoration be completed should damage occur beyond what was provided for in the DEP-approved subsidence control and mitigation plan. In other words, despite a monumental legal battle to prevent damage to the farm, longwall mining was still allowed to proceed, and the property was restored afterwards.

It is fortunate that the MOA was in place, because the damage done to the Kent House was well beyond that repaired under a typical subsidence mitigation plan. The property owners said that if they had not had enough money, hired the right attorney, been willing to go head to head with the coal company and dedicated all of their time to ensuring the proper restoration of their property, their house would have been destroyed. Even with 16 ropes and 5 cables to stabilize the house during mining, and monitoring the building every three hours to ensure that it was staying put, more than 15,000 bricks had to be removed and an entire corner of the house reconstructed. Large crews spent months working to repair the damage done by longwall mining, causing tremendous stress and frustration to the property’s owners. Today, the owners of the Kent Farm feel they “basically won” the battle to save their farm and say that the house “cosmetically looks restored,” although they still hear subsidence cracking and worry that the house remains in danger. They say it took a lot of work and cost a lot of money to preserve their house, and they feel badly for people who are unable to save their own historic homes from damage or destruction. Having their house listed in the National Register was a critical component of their success, but their money, time and perseverance were what really made the difference in this case.

In 2010, Preservation Pennsylvania included the Isaac Manchester Farm, alternately known as Plantation Plenty, on its Pennsylvania At Risk list. In January, 2011, Preservation Pennsylvania also nominated the property to the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places list in an attempt to draw national attention to the issue. As this newsletter goes to print, the fate of Plantation Plenty still hangs in the balance. Alliance Resources, LLP owns the rights to the coal beneath the farm, and they have prepared plans for mining on the property. However, they have not yet applied for the necessary permits from the DEP. Please stay tuned as efforts proceed to protect this significant historic property. Because of the wealth they generate, coal companies in southwestern Pennsylvania are very powerful. As a result, preservation-minded members of the public will be instrumental in convincing the Pennsylvania Legislature to amend the BMSLCA and ensuring that the DEP complies with the requirements of the NHPA’s Section 106 so that Plantation Plenty—and many other historic properties facing a similar threat—can be protected.
Factory, Farm, Main Street & Mansion: The Partners in the Field Program

Erin Hammerstedt and David Kimmerly are Partners in the Field representatives for Preservation Pennsylvania. A joint program with the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Partners in the Field is a matching grant program designed to put additional professional preservationists in the communities where they are needed most.

Since this program began in the fall of 2008, Erin and David have traveled to 52 of the Commonwealth’s 67 counties and assisted over 425 historic resources free of charge. Because this is a matching grant program, the burden of paying for representatives’ preservation expertise is never placed on individuals, community groups, nonprofit organizations, municipalities or corporations. Rather, the generosity of preservation-minded donors has made this specialized service available to all residents of Pennsylvania. Thank you to our Partners in the Field program donors! Your investment continues to make a difference in every corner of the Commonwealth.

If you would like to contact Erin or David with a question, preservation project, request for a site visit or invitation to speak, you may reach David Kimmerly at dkimmerly@preservationpa.org and Erin Hammerstedt at ehammerstedt@preservationpa.org.

You Have a Voice! Participate in ProjectPATH Today

Preservation Pennsylvania presents in partnership with PennDOT the Project for Pennsylvania Transportation and Heritage (Project PATH). ProjectPATH offers a searchable database of all active PennDOT projects programmed on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). The searchable database is updated frequently and allows you to access important information about projects in your neighborhood. You may search for a project by location or local name.

Preservation Pennsylvania also offers an email alert system to inform you about transportation projects in your community that may have the potential to affect historic resources. To sign up to receive email alerts, please visit http://www.paprojectpath.org. Once you sign up, ProjectPATH will send you email alerts when PennDOT posts project information for your community.
Are you enjoying your printed newsletter? Would you like others to receive it, too?

Then consider giving a gift membership to Preservation Pennsylvania!

Our quarterly newsletter is created exclusively for Preservation Pennsylvania’s members. Each theme-driven publication examines current issues in historic preservation across the Commonwealth.

All memberships support Preservation Pennsylvania’s commitment to helping people protect and preserve the historic places that matter to them. You may purchase a gift membership on our website, http://www.preservationpa.org, or by calling our office at (717) 234-2310. Thank you for assisting us in our important work!
Share Your Love of Historic Preservation

The success of the Partners in the Field program has prompted an anonymous donor to challenge you, a loyal supporter of Preservation Pennsylvania, to Share Your Love of Historic Preservation by making a generous gift that the donor will match. Every gift and pledge received during the Share Your Love campaign will be matched dollar for dollar up to $125,000! Your participation will help to raise $250,000, two years of funding, for technical assistance in the field.

Current funding for Partners in the Field will expire on June 30, 2011. Making a gift will ensure that free, on-site preservation assistance remains available throughout Pennsylvania.

But these matching funds are only available until May 31, 2011.

Please help us to Share Your Love of Historic Preservation in every county of our Commonwealth! Your fully tax-deductible gift may be directed to: Preservation Pennsylvania, 257 North Street Harrisburg, PA 17101. Please indicate that the gift is intended for Share Your Love. You may also contribute via our website, www.preservationpa.org. Pledges of support are gratefully accepted by phone; you may contact our office at (717) 234-2310. Thank you!

Preservation Pennsylvania is officially licensed as a charitable organization in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and is a 501 (c)(3) nonprofit corporation under Internal Revenue Service regulations. A copy of the official registration and financial information of Preservation Pennsylvania may be obtained from the Pennsylvania Department of State by calling toll free, within Pennsylvania, 1 (800) 732-0999. Registration does not imply endorsement. Questions about Preservation Pennsylvania should be addressed to (717) 234-2310. All contributions are tax-deductible to the fullest extent of the law.