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Threat of Demolition by Drugstore Chain:
Victoria Theatre, Shamokin, Northumberland County

Significance
Listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1985, the Victoria Theatre, known affectionately to generations of local movie goers as the “Vickie”, opened in downtown Shamokin in January 1918. The elaborate Beaux-Arts Victoria Theatre was built for and housed the central offices of the Chamberlain Amusement Company, which operated eight theater houses in the region.

Designed by noted theater architect W. H. Lee, the building met the changing entertainment needs of the day, showing movies as well as accommodating live stage performances. Lee, who began his architectural practice in Shamokin, later moved to Philadelphia. He was responsible for the design of over 200 theaters during his career, including Easton’s State Theatre (1926) and Reading’s Astor Theatre (1928), which was listed in Pennsylvania At Risk in 1992 and was demolished in 1998.

Threat
Local news media reported the sale of the Victoria Theatre and the adjacent JC Penney store to Rite Aid in September 1998. Demolition of the rear section of the building, which was a later addition to the original 1918 structure, began shortly thereafter.

The chain has not indicated any immediate plans for either further demolition or restoration/reuse of the remainder of the building. Local residents continue to be concerned about the fate of one of the last remaining significant historic structures in downtown Shamokin.

Because listing in the National Register of Historic Places provides no protection from privately financed activities, this and other historic properties targeted for demolition by national drug store chains have no protection unless they are included in a locally designated historic district.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation has met with a number of the national chains to look for ways to stop the ever-increasing losses of historic properties in downtowns across the northeast; and Preservation Pennsylvania recently joined the Trust in a meeting with Pennsylvania-based Rite Aid. Although Preservation Pennsylvania and the National Trust are hopeful that an agreement can be reached that incorporates historic significance into the planning by chain drugstores, will it come too late for the Vickie?

Note: Since our report on drugstore chains in last fall’s issue (Vol. 12, No. 3), the Bank of Erie at the corner of East 12th and Parade Streets, Erie, was demolished for a new CVS drugstore. In Homestead, a plan to demolish a block of historic structures, also for a CVS, has been approved by borough council.

The Victoria Theatre was designed by noted theater architect W.H. Lee and opened in downtown Shamokin in 1918.

Purchased in 1998 by a leading drugstore chain, the building is at risk as historic buildings across the Commonwealth continue to be demolished for new suburban-style drugstores.

Significance
In the early years of the 20th century, Cyrus H.K. Curtis presided over a publishing empire, producing popular magazines that included The Ladies Home Journal, Saturday Evening Post, Jack and Jill and American Home. Based in Philadelphia, the company began plans to merge its operations into a single building with the purchase of land at 6th and Walnut Streets in 1909. For the lobby of the new building, Curtis followed a suggestion by Ladies Home Journal editor Edward Bok to commission a large public mural.

The project brought together two of the leading artists of the day. Maxfield Parrish, a native Philadelphian, designed the image of a dream landscape from which Louis Comfort Tiffany created an intricate favrile glass mosaic. Measuring forty-nine feet in length and fifteen feet in height, the mosaic consists of hundreds of thousands of small pieces of colored glass in more than 260 color tones and weighs in excess of four tons. Installed in the building in 1916, Dream Garden has been on public view ever since.

Threat
The Dream Garden mosaic is part of the estate of John W. Merriam, who died in 1994. Merriam had sold the Curtis Building in 1984, but retained ownership of the mosaic. Although Merriam is reputed to have planned to donate the mosaic to a public entity, no provisions were made for this as part of his estate. In July 1998, the Philadelphia Inquirer reported the pending sale of the mural and its proposed removal from the Curtis Building.

“Dream Garden” glass mosaic mural in the lobby of the Curtis Building, 124-148 South 6th Street, Philadelphia. Created by Louis Comfort Tiffany from a design by Maxfield Parrish, the mural has been on public view since its installation in 1916.

Designated a historic object by the Philadelphia Historical Commission in 1998, the mural is at risk of being sold and removed from its historic setting as part of the liquidation of the John Merriam estate.

Following public outcry on behalf of this significant city landmark, the Philadelphia Historical Commission moved to designate the mosaic as a historic object under the city’s preservation ordinance in December 1998. The Merriam estate appealed the designation to Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas in January 1999. Preservation Pennsylvania has joined the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission in an amicus brief in support of the Historical Commission’s motion to quash the appeal.

In the meantime, a vigil is held for the mosaic each Monday at noon outside the Curtis Building. Spearheaded by the Coalition for Philadelphia Art, a citizens group concerned that the city’s art treasures are being lost, the vigil has gathered signatures on petitions and has brought media attention to the fate of Dream Garden. At stake is not only future of the mosaic itself. Legal issues surrounding local historic designation of a privately owned work of public art are being considered, and with that, the potential far broader implications for historic preservation law in the Commonwealth.
Longwall Mining: Thomas Kent, Jr. Farm, Greene County

Significance

The agricultural heritage of southwestern Pennsylvania from the mid 19th century until the onset of the Great Depression is epitomized in the 102-acre Thomas Kent, Jr. Farm in central Greene County. The main complex of buildings sits in a valley surrounded by low cultivated fields. The imposing brick farmhouse, constructed in 1851, retains many of its original architectural features. The house and its rural agrarian setting convey a sense of a working farm and 19th century rural life in the region.

The Kent family farmed the land during the second half of the 19th century, raising substantial subsistence crops of hay, oats, wheat, and corn. Toward the end of the century the family also raised sheep during a time when Greene and Washington Counties became national leaders in sheep production and won gold medals for their high quality merino wool. By the early years of the 20th century, however, agricultural activity waned. The Kent Farm left the ownership of the Kent family in 1900 and shortly thereafter rights to the underlying Pittsburgh coal seam were sold.

Threat

The structural integrity of the Thomas Kent, Jr. Farmhouse is at risk from the effects of longwall mining. This technique for removing coal involves a special machine that removes whole panels from a coal seam. According to a 1998 report in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, panels can be from 700 to 1,200 feet wide and more than three miles long. A mechanical, self-advancing roof support system operates behind the cutting equipment. Behind this, the mine roof collapses as the cutting and support equipment advances through the seam of coal.

The Thomas Kent, Jr. Farm in rural Greene County is threatened by longwall mining beneath the surface. Longwall mining, which leaves behind no support system as it removes wide seams of coal, can cause serious structural problems in buildings, can rupture utility lines, and can compromise water supplies. The Kent farm is only one of many historic properties in the area at risk from this destructive extraction technique.

The traditional room-and-pillar method of mining coal left columns of coal to support the mine roof. The longwall method provides no such support and surface subsidence is inevitable, bringing with it broken water and gas lines, cracked foundations and building walls, contaminated water supplies, and other significant damage as the ground above collapses into the mined area.

Current owners of the Kent Farm, who retired to the area from Pittsburgh, are pursuing legal action to halt longwall mining under their property and prevent destruction of their historic home and outbuildings.

Pennsylvania At Risk is published annually by Preservation Pennsylvania. The list is a representative sampling of the variety and richness of our commonwealth’s historic properties and the types and severity of threats they face.

The listing is compiled from nominations and suggestions made by our members, local heritage organizations, the board and staff of Preservation Pennsylvania, and the Bureau for Historic Preservation, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

In addition to the annual listing, released each spring, Preservation Pennsylvania will occasionally add to the endangered list at other times during the year in response to timely threats to significant historic properties.

In evaluating properties for inclusion on the list, Preservation Pennsylvania looks for the following:

• the property is listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or
• the property is considered a contributing structure in a National Register Historic District, or
• the property is designated historic by local government, and
• the property is faced with imminent, recognized endangerment either from overt action, neglect, incompatible use, or loss of context.

Preservation Pennsylvania welcomes your comments on this year’s list and your suggestions for future listings.
Bridge Replacement: Wycombe Village, Bucks County

The Wycombe one-lane stone arch bridge (left) as it appeared before damage by flooding. The bridge is one of many one-lane bridges still standing and in use in rural Bucks County.

Local residents favor repairing the Wycombe bridge, which could be incorporated into a greenway with a restored village train station (right). Buckingham and Wrightstown Townships are seeking TEA-21 funding for restoration of the station.

Photos: Jeffrey Marshall

Significance

The tiny village of Wycombe sits along Mill Creek on the boundary between Buckingham and Wrightstown Townships. The historic district, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places, encompasses more than fifty historic structures and is a study in late nineteenth century development along the railroad line that extended from Ivyland to New Hope. During the era of greatest growth (1891-1915), the village saw construction of individual homes, double houses, combination shops and residences, and smaller bungalows in a variety of the eclectic revival styles of the day. A train station, hotel, church, school, town hall, and coal and lumber yards were also constructed during this period.

Approaching the village from the northwest, Forest Grove Road winds past houses and a mill and over a one-lane stone arch bridge into the main portion of the village. The bridge was designed by Doylestown architect and engineer Oscar Martin. Built in 1906, it has been a major element in defining and maintaining the historic, rural character of the village.

Threat

Flooding along Mill Creek in the mid-1990s severely damaged the stone arch bridge. One side collapsed, and the structure has since been closed to traffic. PennDOT initially proposed to replace the bridge with a modern, two-lane concrete structure. Village residents, however, would like to see the stone arch bridge retained and repaired. Negotiations between Buckingham Township and PennDOT are ongoing. The outcome of this effort on behalf of the Wycombe Bridge has implications for the many other remaining one-lane bridges throughout Bucks County and, indeed, across many areas of rural Pennsylvania.

In a related effort, Buckingham and Wrightstown Townships have joined to apply for TEA-21 funding to restore the Wycombe Train Station as part of a vision for a greenway that would link the bridge, the station, and the route along the New Hope and Ivyland Railroad.

Demolition by Neglect: Franklin Street Railroad Station, Reading

The Franklin Street Station of the Reading Railroad welcomed passengers to the City and handled freight in and out of Reading from the station's opening in 1930 until it closed in 1981.

Plans for a new transportation center call for demolition rather than reuse of this National Register-eligible structure. Local preservationists would like to see the building incorporated into the city's revitalization plans.

Significance

The Franklin Street Station, located in the 100 block of South Seventh Street in downtown Reading, was dedicated on February 25, 1930. Designed in the Renaissance Revival style with Art Deco influences, the
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New Commercial Development: Downtown Pittsburgh

Significance

The architectural heritage of Pittsburgh’s downtown commercial area spans the Italianate, Victorian Gothic and classical revival styles of the late 19th century through the more restrained Art Deco and Moderne idioms of the 1920s. These were years of enormous commercial growth and financial prosperity in Pennsylvania’s western metropolis.

The businesses that established themselves in the area of Fifth, Forbes, and Wood Streets included banks, theaters, jewelers, restaurants, and clothiers that have served the city and surrounding communities for more than a century.

Threat

“Marketplace at Fifth and Forbes” is touted by Pittsburgh’s mayor as a vision for shopping, dining, lodging and entertainment businesses that will draw both residents and tourists to downtown. A recent article in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette identified 84 buildings slated for redevelopment in an ambitious plan by the city to revitalize this area of the Golden Triangle as a retail hub. 35 of these structures are part of the Market Square city-designated historic district.

For local preservationists, there is deep concern about the design of the new project. Both Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation and Preservation Pittsburgh are actively involved in pushing the city to make preservation of significant streetscapes and buildings part of the plan. The challenge is convincing the city and the developer that incorporating Pittsburgh’s existing historic urban fabric will enhance the project and give it the special character to set it apart from just another mall.

Reading...continued from page 4

The 5,400 sq. ft. station was in use as a passenger depot until its closing in 1981. Since then, the building has been vacant and its condition is deteriorating. A portion of the roof has collapsed creating significant water damage to the interior.

Plans for a new transportation center for the city’s buses is currently being planned and is expected to develop during construction of the new nearby convention center. The site of the Franklin Street Station is targeted for possible demolition as part of the plan for the transportation center and an adjacent parking facility.

A 1998 TEA-21 application proposed reusing the station to take advantage of its central location, its spacious interior, its historic significance, its access to parking, the large number of low-income residents within walking distance, and its proximity to both the proposed new transportation and civic centers. The rehabilitated station would house a weekly seasonal public market, the Reading & Berks County Visitors Bureau, a proposed Schuylkill Heritage Corridor Visitor Center, and educational and interpretive exhibits on the history of the Reading Railroad. Unfortunately, the proposal achieved only a mid-level priority from local transportation officials, making funding unlikely in this round of grants.

With the announced return of passenger rail service between Reading and Philadelphia, the time is ripe for Reading to recommit to this important tie to its railroad past.
History Code Enforcement Capability: Elliott Mine Archeological Complex, Butler and Lawrence Counties

Significance
The Elliott Mine Prehistoric Complex is a cluster of more than twenty recorded prehistoric archaeological sites situated on nearly two hundred acres of glacial terraces overlooking Slippery Rock Creek. The sites contain artifacts typical of nearly every known prehistoric and contact period Native American culture in the Allegheny drainage, from fluted Paleo-Indian projectile points (ca. 12,000 years BP) to gunflints.

Native people were evidently attracted to the location by the presence of innumerable natural resources associated with both Slippery Rock Creek and extensive areas of lush wetlands on the property. There is good evidence of at least one Late Woodland (ca. 1200 AD) village site in the complex, and such sites typically contain the remains of house structures, cooking fires, storage pits, middens, and human interments.

The Elliott complex has the potential to document the entire sequence of aboriginal occupation in the Slippery Rock valley, and tell us a great deal about the evolution of Native American cultures over the last 12,000 years.

Threat
A gravel mine that will consume most of the site complex over a ten year period was proposed for this property in 1995. Since there are acres of marsh on the property, the US Army Corps of Engineers was originally regulating the mining permit under its authority to protect wetlands. Corps involvement would have brought Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act into play. The resulting review could have resulted in plans to avoid the sites or to conduct extensive archaeological investigations prior to their destruction. However, as a result of a 1997 Federal court decision in Virginia known as the Tuloch Rule (National Mining Association vs. US Army Corps of Engineers, Cit. No. 97-5099), the Corps no longer believes it has authority to restrict the mining of wetlands and has withdrawn from the Elliott Mine project.

Both the archaeological sites and the wetlands on the property will now be mined under a Commonwealth Non-Coal Mining permit, and the only consideration given to the archaeological complex comes from the Pennsylvania History Code. However, with the passage of Act 70 – the 1995 amendments to the History Code – protection from Commonwealth-permitted threats to archaeological sites were eviscerated, shifting the responsibility for protection from the permitting agency (Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection) and its applicants to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC). The legislation also imposed severe time and funding limitations on conducting archaeological investigations.

Mining of the property is expected to begin this spring. The PHMC has reached agreement with the owner to conduct limited investigations at two of the largest sites in the complex. The owner, who is cooperating and assisting with these investigations, is open to the possibility of a long term agreement with a university field school to investigate the other sites on the property prior to their being mined. However, if an interested university and funding cannot be found, most of the irreplaceable archaeological sites at this complex will disappear over the next decade.
Federal Government Plan to Demolish National Register-Eligible Site: Cyclorama Building, Gettysburg

Significance

Designed in 1958 and opened in 1962, the Cyclorama Building at the Gettysburg National Military Park is the work of internationally renowned architect Richard Neutra. The building was constructed for the Park as part of the National Park Service’s massive and influential Mission 66 program. Mission 66 was a ten-year master planning and construction program undertaken in the late 1950s and early 1960s by the Park Service to meet increased visitation to the National Parks following World War II.

The Cyclorama Building embodied a vision of Mission 66 to create a new building type, the visitors center. Neutra, who was a leading proponent of modernism, was one of only five major architects selected to design high profile buildings as part of this changing view of site interpretation and the need to provide visitor amenities.

The building was also constructed to house an 1884 panorama painting of the 1863 Battle of Gettysburg. The location of the building was chosen to match most closely the vantage point of the Cyclorama painting, so that visitors viewing the painting could then proceed to the observation platform and experience the same vistas across the battlefield.

The Cyclorama Building was declared eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in September 1998.

Threat

The Cyclorama Building is proposed for demolition as part of a new General Management Plan for the Gettysburg National Military Park. The National Park Service plans to build a new visitors center at another location within the park. The current visitors center and Cyclorama Building will be demolished and the area landscaped to reflect how it appeared at the time of the 1863 battle.

Preservation groups are divided on the future of the Cyclorama Building. Battlefield groups are, for the most part, in favor of its removal. The Society of Architectural Historians and the American Institute of Architects have argued for its preservation and an understanding of the building’s role as part of the continually evolving heritage of the battlefield.

Also called into question in recent months is the National Park Service’s handling of the Section 106 review process, as mandated by the National Historic Preservation Act. As a designated interested party in the Section 106 process, Preservation Pennsylvania is involved in discussions regarding how decisions are made about the future of this significant historic building.
Local Government Plans to Build Parking Garages in Historic District: Harrisburg Historic District

Significance
Bounded by the Susquehanna River, Forster Street, Third Street, and Hanna Street, the Harrisburg Historic District is a twenty-block area that contains the original core of the city. This predominately residential district includes approximately five hundred structures, most of which were built in the 19th century as the city grew into an industrial and political hub.

After the town became the state capitol in 1812, fine homes for wealthy lawyers, politicians, judges, bankers, and industrialist were built facing the river along Front Street. Throughout the rest of the district, Victorian-era row houses alternate with earlier structures. Together they offer an eclectic, yet harmonious 19th century urban landscape that continues to attract residents and businesses.

The district is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and is protected by a local historic district ordinance.

Threat
In late 1997, the City of Harrisburg announced plans to build three new parking garages to meet the ever-increasing needs of workers who commute into the city from surrounding areas. Two of the three garages were proposed within the historic district. One was to be built over a two-block area that includes the site of Preservation Pennsylvania’s headquarters at 357 North Street, the other along a section of Second Street and immediately adjacent to some of the district’s most distinctive Front Street properties.

Opposition to the plan from residents and from local and state preservation groups was swift. The City’s mayor was sympathetic but also stressed the need for parking to entice businesses to locate in the city.

In a move to prepare the way for the garage that threatens Preservation Pennsylvania’s headquarters, the owner of an adjacent block of buildings applied to the Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB) for a demolition permit. The owner proposes to demolish the entire block for surface parking, but area residents see this as a step toward the construction of the high rise parking structure planned by the city. The HARB denied the demolition permit. The owner appealed the decision to City Council, which also refused to grant their request. The owner has now filed an appeal with the Court of Common Pleas.

Meanwhile, in early 1998, plans were unveiled for the second garage within the district. This massive structure, although planned for an existing vacant lot on Second Street, would tower above the historic mansions and churches on Front Street.

Preservation Pennsylvania, working with our neighbors and preservation supporters, will continue to oppose the North Street garage and encourage design improvements on the Second Street facility.
At the federal level, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, mandates review by federal agencies of all undertakings posing a potential threat to historic resources. The Section 106 process, which involves the State Historic Preservation Office and the President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, is a cornerstone of preservation practice in the United States.

At the state level, Pennsylvania has legislation, known as the Pennsylvania History Code, that mandates similar concern and care for our heritage by state agencies. The basis of the History Code lies in the state constitution which affirms in Article I, Section 27 that the “people have a right to clean air, pure water, and the preservation of the natural, scenic, historic, and aesthetic values of the environment.”

These values were translated into specifics in the 1978 Historic Preservation Act, which was amended in 1988. The 1988 Act reestablished the power and authority of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC). It also mandates interagency cooperation and gives organizations and individual citizens the right to legal recourse to protect and preserve Pennsylvania’s historic resources.

However, the History Code has yet to achieve even a modest level of effectiveness in protecting the Commonwealth’s historic resources. A 1996 report published by the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County notes, “State agencies have failed miserably to embrace and internalize this statute into their day-to-day routines, as the law requires. Instead, they, like most of us, have come to believe that PHMC alone should shoulder this mandate.”

Since Preservation Pennsylvania published the first Pennsylvania At Risk in 1992, many of the threats to historic properties can be traced directly to a lack of compliance with the History Code. As we present the 1999 listing, we call on all state agencies to comply fully with the Code. We also call on preservationists across Pennsylvania to be aggressive in using the power of the History Code to demand greater compliance and accountability from our state agencies, and we pledge to make compliance a priority issue for Preservation Pennsylvania.

The following sections of the History Code provide a blueprint for compliance and accountability. Our challenge is to use this tool to make state agencies meet the requirements of the law.

Title 37 PA C.S. PL.414 No. 72, May 26, 1988
The following sections are key for preservationists in advocating for state agency responsibility in the protection and preservation of our irreplaceable heritage.

Section 102
Declaration of Policy
It is hereby determined and declared as a matter of legislative finding and policy that:
(1) Section 27 of Article I of the Constitution of Pennsylvania makes the Commonwealth trustee for the preservation of the historic values of the environment.
(2) The conservation of Pennsylvania’s historic and natural heritage and the preservation of public records, historic documents and objects of historic interest, and the identification, restoration and preservation of architecturally and historically significant sites and structures are duties vested primarily in the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.
(3) The irreplaceable historical, architectural, archaeological and cultural heritage of this Commonwealth should be preserved and protected for the benefit of all the people, including future generations.
(4) The preservation and protection of historic resources in this Commonwealth promotes the public health, prosperity and general welfare.
(5) The rapid social and economic development of our contemporary society threatens to destroy the remaining vestiges of our historic heritage.
(6) It is in the public interest for the Commonwealth, its citizens and its political subdivisions to engage in comprehensive programs of historic preservation for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of all the people, including future generations.

Section 510
Approval of Construction Affecting Historic Resources
The Commission shall be consulted on the design and proposed location of any project, building or other undertaking financed in whole or in part by Commonwealth funds which may affect the preservation and development of a district, site or building listed on or eligible for the Pennsylvania Register of Historic Places.

Section 512
Enforcement of Historic Preservation Laws and Policies
The Attorney General, the Commission, any political subdivision, person or other legal entity may maintain an action in an administrative tribunal or court for the protection or preservation of any historic resource in this Commonwealth.

*The “Commission” refers to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC).

**The Pennsylvania Register of Historic Places has not been implemented. Instead, the PHMC has focused their efforts on listing and determining properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
Pennsylvania’s Endangered Heritage

The following properties have been included in past listings of Pennsylvania At Risk. Those with * have had a positive preservation outcome; those with ** have been lost. The other properties remain at risk.

1992
Astor Theater, Reading**
Bedford Springs Hotel, Bedford
Brith Shalom Synagogue, Easton
Carrie Furnaces, Swissvale, Allegheny County
Danville West Market Street Historic District, Danville
Deshong Estate, Chester
East Broadtop Railroad, Rockhill Furnace, Huntingdon County
Eastern State Penitentiary, Philadelphia
Highway Routes 23 & 30 expansion projects, Lancaster County
Lackawanna Avenue Historic District, Scranton**
Legionville Campground, Harmony Township, Beaver County
Lynnewood Hall, Cheltenham Township, Montgomery County
Meason House, Dunbar Township, Fayette County
Native American Ossuary, North East, Erie County*
Park Home, Williamsport
Selma, Norristown, Montgomery County
Star Barn, Lower Swatara Township, Dauphin County
Stegmaier Brewery, Wilkes-Barre*
United States Naval Home, Philadelphia

1993
Borg Warner Complex, York*
Church of St. Michael the Archangel, Pittsburgh
Colonial Theater, Lebanon
Delaware Canal
Erie City and County Library*
Glassworks and Greensboro, Greene County, and New Geneva, Fayette County
King of Prussia Inn, Montgomery County
Knowlton, Philadelphia
Memorial Park, Lock Haven
Mountain Springs Hotel, Ephrata, Lancaster County
Palace Hotel, Windber, Somerset County**
Path Valley Pennsylvania Turnpike Rest Stop, Franklin County***
S.S. Grand View Point Hotel, Bedford County
St. Severin Church, Drifting, Clearfield County
Searights Tollhouse, Fayette County
Victory Building, Philadelphia

1994
Armstrong Cork Company Complex, Pittsburgh
Bangor Swimming Pool, Bangor, Northampton County***
Enola Low Grade Railroad Line, Lancaster County
Howard Childs Gateway House, Pittsburgh
Knox Building (Cascade Theater), New Castle, Lawrence County
Morriss Mansion, Simpson, Lackawanna County***
Naval Hospital, Philadelphia
Phoenix Iron & Steel Company Foundry Building, Phoenixville, Chester County
Walnut Street Bridge, Dauphin & Cumberland Counties

1995
Allegeny River Boulevard, Allegheny County
Allentown National Bank, Allentown
George Carroll House, Erie*
Leap the Dips, Lakemont Park, Altoona
Lock and Dam 7, Monongahela River, Greene and Fayette Counties
John McCullough House, West Pennsylvania Township, Cumberland County
Moland House, Warwick Township, Bucks County
Oley Township Historic District, Berks County
Penn Square, Callowhill Historic District, Reading
Plymouth Flats Archeological Site, Plymouth Township, Luzerne County
Siegmud Lubin Studio, Philadelphia***

1996
Auto & Aeroplane Mechanical School, Harrisburg***
Bangor Swimming Pool, Bangor, Northampton County***
Enola Low Grade Railroad Line, Lancaster County
Howard Childs Gateway House, Pittsburgh
Knox Building (Cascade Theater), New Castle, Lawrence County
Morriss Mansion, Simpson, Lackawanna County***
Naval Hospital, Philadelphia
Phoenix Iron & Steel Company Foundry Building, Phoenixville, Chester County
Walnut Street Bridge, Dauphin & Cumberland Counties

1997
Cambria Ironworks, Johnstown
Camp Letterman, Gettysburg
Capital Area Greenbelt, Harrisburg
Coal Oil Johnny House, Venango County
Church Street Station, Market-Frankford Elevated, Philadelphia
Jackson Koehler Eagle Brewery, Erie
Logan House, Philadelphia
Markle Banking & Trust Company, Hazleton
Roger Hunt Mill & Miller’s House, Downingtown, Chester County
Scanlon Observatory, Pittsburgh**

1998
Special Report on Endangered School Buildings. Featured schools include:
Broad Street School, Jersey Shore, Lycoming County
Downingtown Junior High School, Downingtown, Chester County
Hazleton High School, Hazleton
Hershey Consolidated School, Derry Township, Dauphin County
Meadville High School, Meadville, Crawford County
Ridley High School, Ridley Township, Delaware County
Roosevelt School, Clayshurg, Blair County
Sterrett, McCleary, and Letsche Schools, Pittsburgh