



Improving the Historic Preservation Infrastructure

Executive Summary of Issue Area

The Infrastructure Issue Area focused on the historic preservation system created by the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470) as amended. The Act establishes two Federal agencies to carry out its provisions, a preservation presence in each State and territory and the District of Columbia, an opportunity for Indian tribes to participate as full partners and receive grants, and a chance for local governments to become partners including a financial set-aside. This governmental structure supports the major players in historic preservation: the private sector.

The Infrastructure Issue Area Experts looked at the historic preservation record since 1966 and declared historic preservation a success. Further study showed, however, that the historic preservation “house” is in need of rehabilitation and forwards ideas for consideration to the **PRESERVE AMERICA SUMMIT 2006**.

Expert Panel Focus and Methodology

The Improving the Historic Preservation Infrastructure Issue area focused on the governmental structure created by the National Historic Preservation Act and its relation to the private sector. Panelists either work directly in preservation or have supervisory responsibilities for preservation activities. The panel divided into working groups that prepared papers on the components of the national preservation program: Federal, State, tribal, local, and nonprofit. The working groups presented their results at a two-day meeting on September 6-7, 2006. In a September 18, 2006, conference call the panel reviewed the meeting's discussion and made assignments to prepare Idea papers on the seven identified issues (see below).

See the Appendix for a list of the background materials reviewed by the panel.

Context of the Historic Preservation Infrastructure Today

The Infrastructure Issue Area Experts looked at the governmental (Federal, State, tribal, local) preservation structure as well as at the needs of private sector preservationists and nonprofit organizations. Historic preservation in America particularly in the private sector is an overwhelming success by any measure. The governmental structure established in 1966, 1980 and 1992 laid the foundation upon which the preservation of America's historic resources has become almost routine. That foundation, however, is showing a few cracks. Not every component has all the tools needed to accomplish its mission. Tribal Historic Preservation Offices are but one example. Building on the analyses of historic preservation starting with *With Heritage So Rich* and continuing through the National Park Service's 1994 *National Performance Review*, the Infrastructure Experts pointed out areas in need of improvement and laid out an agenda for the next decade.

Challenges, Opportunities, and Needs

The diversity of the historic preservation movement is both an asset and a liability. Historic preservation activity is pervasive throughout American life from Department of Defense installation planning to homeowners making improvements. On the other hand, the number of different participants in and out of government at the national, state, tribal and local levels can be “mind boggling.”

The success contrasts with an unfinished agenda of foundational components of the national preservation program. Fundamental tasks, identified in the 1960s, such as an inventory of the nation's resources, await completion. The 1976 vision of the creation of the Historic Preservation Fund (strengthened in 1980) has not been fully realized. Preservationists ready to participate in National Historic Preservation Act programs, such as tribes and local governments, lack the resources to participate fully. Opportunities to fulfill preservation goals exist within the National Historic Preservation Act but are not implemented: a loan guarantee program (Sec. 104), education and training (Sec. 101(j)), nationwide preservation needs assessment (Sec. 101(a)(8)), preservation planning (Sec. 110).

Findings—Infrastructure Consensus

The Infrastructure Issue Area Experts' findings are contained in the following Idea Papers. The Experts covered the breadth and depth of historic preservation in America. The Infrastructure Issue Area Ideas papers constitute an agenda for infrastructure improvement for the next decade.

Summit Comments

The Infrastructure Issue Area held two discussion sessions at the October 18-20, 2006, Preserve America Summit in New Orleans, Louisiana. The Summit participants reinforced the recommendations of the Expert Panel. Each of the seven Infrastructure Ideas contains the Summit participant comments on the Idea in the text in red.

Co-Chairs:

Federal Agency

John Fowler, Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Non-federal partner

Jay D. Vogt, President, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, and Director, South Dakota State Historical Society

Expert Panelists:

Lynn Scarlett, Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior

Bob Young, Southeast Region Director, Department of Housing and Urban Development

Peter Brink, Vice President, National Trust for Historic Preservation

Edward Sanderson, Executive Director, Rhode Island Historical and Heritage Commission, RI DSHPO

Kelly S. Jackson-Golly, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians

Ann Pritzlaff, Colorado Preservation Inc., Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Janet Matthews, Associate Director for Cultural Resources, National Park Service

Janet Oakley, Director of Policy and Government Relations, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials

Terry Klein, Executive Director, SRI Foundation

Joseph B. Thomas, Ph. D., Deputy Federal Historic Preservation Officer for the U. S. Navy

James Glass, Director, Center for Historic Preservation and Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, Ball State University

Dan Becker, Executive Director, Raleigh Historic Districts Commission

Facilitation and Staff:

Aimee Mikolajek, Dept. of the Interior

Nancy Schamu, NCSHPO

Jon Smith, NPS

Hapmton Tucker, NPS

Antonio Aguilar, NPS

PRESERVE AMERICA SUMMIT 2006

Idea #1: Develop and maintain a reliable comprehensive national inventory of historic properties that contains information necessary for management, planning and decision-making and that is accessible to users.

Findings: Knowledge of the location and significance of the Nation's historic properties is essential for informed decision making. Government agencies, Indian Tribes, businesses, and citizens need usable information as the basis for decisions on protection, funding, revitalizing and interpreting historic properties. While the National Register of Historic Places has achieved much in this area, the national preservation program does not have a comprehensive and readily accessible data base on historic properties in a searchable format useful for planning, education, interpretation and heritage tourism. This is a fundamental underpinning of the entire preservation program.

SUMMIT FINDINGS:

INVENTORY IS A FIRST PRIORITY THAT REQUIRES STRONG SUPPORT
EXISTING DATA NEEDS TO BE IN A DIGITAL FORMAT ACCESSIBLE TO ALL AND INTEGRATED WITHIN EXISTING SYSTEMS
INVENTORY WILL NEVER BE "COMPLETE" BUT A MAJOR EFFORT IS NEEDED TO FILL IN GAPS AND MAKE PAPER RECORDS ELECTRONICALLY ACCESSIBLE
SACRED, RELIGIOUS, PRIVACY ISSUES MUST BE HONORED

Strategies:

- Identify a central clearinghouse for a national inventory database and establish a system of dissemination accessible to users.
- Implement procedures and deadlines for undertaking the inventory work including integrating current Federal, State and local data in a national database, developing inventory priorities, and establishing schedules and goals. (The BLM-SHPO data sharing project is a potential model.)
- Affirm the role of the Federal Government as a leader in development of a searchable national inventory through funding, technical assistance, criteria, and guidance.
- Work with Federal Agencies to develop strategies and schedules to undertake a comprehensive inventory of historic assets in Federal stewardship as envisioned by the Preserve America Executive Order and make information accessible, when appropriate. (including the Federal Real Property Council)
- Promote outcomes in the Section 106 process that generate data useful to the creation of a national inventory in a "user-friendly" format.
- Provide funding support for SHPOs and THPOs to integrate existing databases, pro-actively survey historic properties, and offer information in a format useful for planning, education, interpretation and heritage tourism.
- Use partnerships to assist in the completion of a national inventory, including nonprofit organizations, educational institutions and the private sector.

Idea # 2. Enhance the Leadership of the Federal Historic Preservation Program

Brief Statement of the idea: *Evaluate ways to improve the structure of the Federal historic preservation program to achieve greater effectiveness.*

SUMMIT FINDINGS:

A NEED FOR PRESERVATION LEADERSHIP EXISTS

LEADERSHIP ALTERNATIVES NEED EVALUATION FOLLOWING A BUSINESS MODEL AND CUSTOMER SURVEY

LEADERSHIP PROTECTION GOAL TO ACHIEVE THE SAME LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE FOR NHPA AS EXISTS FOR NEPA

Background: Since passage of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Federal preservation programs and partnerships have enhanced protection of cultural and historic resources across the Nation. While much historic preservation occurs through local, grassroots activities, Federal agencies, States and Tribes, have helped ensure that historic and cultural sites are identified and protected. Federal agencies are also guardians of significant historic and cultural properties. The National Park Service has played a central role in administering dozens of historic preservation programs that Congress assigned to it. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, State and Tribal historic preservation offices, oversee the critical regulatory functions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Many other Federal agencies handle preservation-related work, including the Department of Transportation, the Endowments, the Library of Congress, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the National Archives, the Smithsonian Institution, the General Services Administration, and the Department of Defense. The Federal role in historic preservation is broad, far-reaching, and multidimensional.

National Park Service: For 40 years, the National Park Service has served as the “polestar” of the Federal historic preservation program. Congress assigned responsibility for many provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act and related preservation legislation to it based on the professional expertise developed through the management of the national parks, many of which are historical in nature. Earlier, the National Park Service assumed responsibility for implementing the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which included conducting national surveys of historic properties—the National Historic Landmarks Program and the Historic American Buildings Survey. Today, the historic preservation programs are an integral part of the National Park Service’s work.

The National Park Service works directly with local governments, State Historic Preservation Offices, other

State government entities, local governments, American Indian Tribes, Alaska Native villages and corporations, Native Hawaiian organizations and other Federal agencies to preserve the nation’s heritage.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation: The National Historic Preservation Act established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation as an independent Federal agency to advise the President and Congress and to comment on Federal undertakings. The Council takes a leadership role in promoting the value and benefit of historic preservation and administering the preservation review process for Federal projects and programs.

Other Federal Agencies: The National Historic Preservation Act directed Federal agencies to assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties that are owned or controlled by the agency. Today, Federal agencies administer preservation programs commensurate with their mission and the effects of their activities on historic properties.

Non-Federal Partners: The State Historic Preservation Offices and Tribal Preservation Offices carry out the Federal program in their respective jurisdictions and administer other preservation-related programs. Other State agencies, such as transportation agencies, fund preservation activities as they carry out their missions. Local government historic preservation programs administer local designation, local design review, and educational activities. Nonprofit preservation organizations at the national, state, regional, and local levels carry out many economic revitalization, education, and advocacy work and tap into the programs of the public and private sectors.

Findings: Much of the success of the past 40 years can be ascribed to National Park Service leadership in historic preservation. Its name, prestige, and public esteem have provided authority and power to national historic preservation programs. So, too, can the success in preservation be ascribed to the work of other Federal government agencies, such as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the General Services Administration, the Department of Defense, the Department of Transportation, and other Federal entities that manage historic preservation activities and properties. Many of these efforts have come together in the Administration’s Preserve America initiative.

Discussion: At various times over the years, a centralized Federal historic preservation agency has been proposed. However, other organizational options also merit consideration. Each organizational structure presents advan-

tages and disadvantages. In the context of historic preservation, organization structure should be evaluated in terms of several goals and management attributes. Specifically, given the large and dispersed Federal Government involvement in historic preservation, any structure should be evaluated in terms of its effectiveness in: 1) enhancing coordination; 2) nurturing partnerships and local preservation efforts; 3) raising public awareness of historic and cultural preservation; 4) generating and attracting funding for program implementation; and 5) enhancing program efficiencies.

Centralization is one model. Other models include a coordinated federation of programs; decentralized, multi-agency specialization; single-agency oversight of multiple, dispersed programs; and other structural and management combinations.

The panel discussed a number of potential advantages and disadvantages to moving core Federal historic preservation programs outside of the Department of the Interior. Advantages could include: hoped-for access to greater Federal dollars, “one-stop shopping” for the public, hoped-for bureaucratic efficiency, increased visibility of the program, and increased political influence and access, gaining a higher profile. Relocating the program from a land-holding agency with multiple responsibilities could provide clarification of mission and direction at the agency level. Disadvantages include: the risk of “politicizing” the program, potential loss of credibility and authority, dysfunctional effects of large organizational scale, limits of uniformity in the context of varied program missions, the risks involved in amending the National Historic Preservation Act and other Federal preservation legislation, the risk of receiving fewer Federal dollars to support the programs, reorganization and transition costs, possible conflicts of interest if combined with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the high costs of setting up separate administrative functions to support an independent agency.

Although significant accomplishments have resulted from Federal preservation efforts over the past four decades since passage of the NHPA, several challenges persist that raise questions about benefits of organizational change. First is the challenge of coordinating multiple preservation efforts in different agencies to enhance efficiency and effectiveness. Multiple agencies—Federal, State, and local—along with nonprofit organizations and the private sector all undertake preservation activities. As these efforts proliferate, coordination becomes increasingly relevant to leverage resources, define priorities, and exploit program synergies. Second, because so much historic preservation occurs through local and nonprofit efforts, government agencies must continually consider

how to nurture these grassroots activities and minimize barriers to their success. Third is the challenge of assuring continued citizen awareness of and support for historic and cultural resource preservation. Landscape development and change continues at a rapid pace. These trends heighten the vulnerability of historic and cultural sites, elevating the importance of citizen engagement and awareness. Fourth, with roles and responsibilities dispersed among many Federal agencies, funding is also fractured, raising the challenge of assuring funding to achieve the historic preservation goals of each agency and of the nation. Fifth, regulatory, grant, and other Federal programs continue to experience implementation challenges that affect efficiency and effectiveness.

Future: In order to evaluate ways to improve the structure of the Federal historic preservation programs to achieve greater effectiveness, a number of governance options and structures were discussed. These included: 1) ways to reorganize the historic preservation functions within the Department of the Interior, either as a separate bureau within DOI or through reorganization of the programs within the National Park Service, 2) the potential benefits of having a full-time Presidential appointee, either as chair or executive director of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, or as head of a “bureau of historic preservation” within the Department of the Interior, 3) the roles and relationships of Federal programs that are independent, such as the Council on Environmental Quality, the Endowments, and the National Archives, which was pulled out of the General Services Administration in 1985, 4) combining an independent historic preservation agency with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, or with the National Archives, the Endowments, etc., and 5) ways to better integrate and coordinate Federal senior policy officials and Federal Historic Preservation Officers into decision-making.

The panel suggested studying these and other options. These might be evaluated in the context of the five challenges delineated in the Discussion section. Other agency structures could also be reviewed, in order to better understand the advantages and disadvantages of different agency models, such as the experience in forming the Department of Homeland Security, the 1990s proposal to merge the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and the relationship between the National Park Service and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation from 1966 through 1976.

Idea # 3: Enhance effective partnerships with Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian Organizations in the national preservation program while recognizing the unique government to government relationship between Federal Agencies and Tribes.

Findings: National Historic Preservation Act established a foundation in which the national preservation program would be administered in partnership with States, local governments, Indian Tribes, Native Hawaiian Organizations and private organizations and individuals. The act establishes requirements for the development of a program and regulations to assist Indian Tribes in preserving their particular historic properties. In addition, the Act encourages communication and cooperation between Indian Tribes and State Historic Preservation Officers. It is these fundamental principals that lead to the examination of the existing role Indian Tribes have in the national preservation program. The following strategies will create a more inclusive approach to tribal involvement.

Currently tribal involvement is primarily “project driven consultation”. Tribes will respond when given the opportunity to enter into meaningful dialog with an agency with regard to projects that have the potential to effect historic properties significant to them. This process tends to be reactive and, although the results are project specific, it does not take into account the need to include Indian Tribes in the overall agencies’ preservation goals and objectives. In addition, the process does not recognize the deficiencies in available financial and technical resources and, in some cases, may exclude Indian Tribes.

The perceptions within agencies and tribes are crucial when trying to improve tribal involvement. Most State, Federal, local and private agencies and organizations do not understand the diversity in tribal heritage preservation structures. Indian Tribes tend to struggle with consultation due to the diversity in Federal consultation policies and procedures. In some cases, Indian Tribal Liaisons tend to be professional archaeologists. Since many problematic situation are not archaeological matters, these position tend to be less useful when working on non-archaeological matters.

The **purpose** of this idea: Tribal Historic Preservation is much more than archaeology and burials. Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations are vital participates in the interpretation of American history and are excellent resources.

The creation of an Indian Tribal preservation partnership that recognizes the unique nature of tribal programs and Federal programs will promote a more inclusive program and enhance relationships within the national program.

SUMMIT FINDINGS ON PAGE 7

Strategies:

- Modify the national preservation program to enhance tribal participation through the restructuring of the 101(d)(1) Indian Tribal national program and complete the regulations as required. Consider revising the national program to include all types of tribal governmental structures, including those Tribes without “tribal lands” and recognize the diversity in tribal programs, including objectives to provide technical resources to assist in the establishment, promotion and enhancement of Tribal Historic Preservation Programs
- Improve tribal representation in government policy development and project planning by initiating consultation between Indian Tribes and Federal agencies when developing regulations, policies or programmatic agreements, as required under EO 13175. This will clarify the roles of all participants, identify common goals and establish communication systems that meet the needs of all the participants.
- Develop an accountability system for recording and monitoring consultation practices and outcomes.
- Institutionalize Native American advisory boards (example: NAAG and NATHPO) and Indian Tribal Liaisons within agency structures to promote a more proactive approach to tribal relations. Indian Tribal Liaisons should have the financial and technical resources necessary to impact both project outcomes and agency leadership decisions. In addition, these position should serve as resource staff for Indian Tribes and not the “conduit” for government to government consultation.
- Establish guidance principals for “meaningful consultation” at the Executive level, applicable to all Federal agencies to insure Federal agencies are equipped to work with Tribes.
- Promote the modification of existing programs; the NPS Tribal program, NRHP, and Federal agency programs in general to recognize the diversity in tribal preservation and improve assessment of traditional cultural values in decisions regarding historic significance. Require the involvement of tribal experts in the decision making process when dealing with historic properties of tribal significance.
- Promote ongoing relationships instead of reactive

case by case engagement with Tribes by creating efficient and effective lines of communication as early in the process as possible. This effort could include establishing partnership initiatives between SHPOs and THPOs that would involve joint efforts in the National Register process, statewide preservation planning, and public education.

- Promote section 106 outcomes that enhance public awareness of Indian Tribal culture and heritage and that are developed in partnership with Tribes.
- Improve interaction between Federal agencies and Tribes by developing cultural sensitivity training on a national level and make the training mandatory for all staff that has responsibility for tribal programs. Training would include tribal law and governmental structure and training on Federal agency governmental historic preservation structure. This would include a training initiative for Indian Tribal Liaisons to include tribal preservation structures, tribal and Federal laws, and cultural resource views.
- Affirm NHPA's intent to foster a partnership approach to tribal historic preservation through the adequate funding within the Historic Preservation Fund for THPO's in carrying out the functions of the act on tribal lands, comparable to SHPO funding. Include other Tribes by providing adequate funding assistance to Indian Tribes in the development and maintenance of Historic Preservation programs and heritage tourism initiatives.
- Promote alternative sources of agency resources, as well as Bureau of Indian Affairs funding and the Historic Preservation Fund, to insure that Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian Organization are active participants in both the national program and project specific area.

SUMMIT FINDINGS

IMPROVE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL AGENCIES AND TRIBES

NEED FULL MEMBERSHIP FOR A TRIBAL PERSON ON THE ACHP

CONSIDER OTHER CULTURES SUCH AS AFRICAN AMERICAN THAT MAYBE UNDER REPRESENTED

Idea # 4: Foster greater collaboration with local governments and nonprofit and private organizations to expand the national preservation program partnership.

Findings: The NHPA makes numerous references to partnership roles with “individuals undertaking preservation by private means,” “private organizations,” “qualified nonprofit organizations,” “the National Trust for Historic Preservation,” “educational institutions,” “agencies,” “state and local governments,” among others. These entities existed before the Act, and their numbers have grown substantially since the Act’s passage. In addition to the 50 States, the territories, and tribal governments, the United States Census Bureau’s 2002 Census of Governments counts 38,967 general purpose local governments—3,034 county governments, and 35,933 subcounty governments (19,429 municipal and 16,504 town or township governments). Within the geographic area of each of these local governments, one can frequently find multiple nonprofit and private organizations engaged in some aspect of historic preservation. Nonetheless, while the Federal and State governments have during the last 40 years created a number of effective assistance programs, a wide range in historic preservation participation and effectiveness exists today. While the scope of outreach in sheer numbers may seem daunting, therein lies the tremendous opportunity. In the aggregate these governmental, nonprofit, and private entities command an unmeasured but clearly enormous wealth of human, programmatic, and financial capacity and accomplishment that can be more effectively harnessed to synergistically assist the Federal government and local communities meet their preservation vision and goals. Indeed, fostering such partnerships is a major goal of the Preserve America Initiative.

SUMMIT FINDINGS

ALL PRESERVATION IS LOCAL

SUPPORT LOCAL EFFORTS

LOCAL S NEED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

ENGAGE MORE COMMUNITIES

GOOD MODELS: MAIN STREET, PRESERVE AMERICA FOR SURVEY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

INCLUDE ALL CULTURES

STANDARDIZE THE CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

Strategies:

- Provide enhanced incentives, through technical assistance, access to information, and financial support, for local governments and organizations to actively participate in the national program and improve their capacity to extend the preservation ethic in their communities.
- Institutionalize the Preserve America program as a primary means of direct Federal aid to local communities for preserving the country’s cultural heritage assets. Develop a database of Preserve America case studies to assist other communities in modeling successful initiatives.
- Shape delivery of preservation expertise, information, and technical assistance to recognize and enhance local government and nonprofit organization decision-making and autonomy.
- Cultivate sharing of successful local preservation practices and expand access to preservation information through the Internet, et al.
- Reduce redundancy of efforts and administrative burdens by making Certified Local Government (CLG) requirements more uniform from state to state and by extending the Federal-state model of devolved decision-making and responsibility to the local level where CLG expertise exists.
- Establish a similar certification program for nonprofit organizations to assist local governments and State historic preservation programs in implementing the Federal preservation program. Collaborate with private/for-profit cultural resource managers in providing these services.
- Link Federal agency preservation planning with local government preservation plans as appropriate. Where such local plans do not exist, utilize the Federal planning process as an opportunity to assist local communities in recognizing the value of such plans and initiating them.

Idea #5 Effective Decision Making: Support advances in effective and efficient program management, operation, oversight and decision making to produce enhanced protection and preservation of historic resources

Findings: This nation's historic legacy is rich and its historic resources are abundant. Over the past forty years, the Nation has invested substantial funding and human capital in identifying, documenting, preserving, overseeing and managing our historic assets. Nevertheless, it is the very success of the program – the growing commitment to historic preservation and expansion of historic preservation programs and activities – that has overstretched the financial and human resource capabilities of Federal, State and local preservation agencies and non-profit organizations. And, historic preservation investment needs for the next 40 years will continue to outstrip available human and dollar resources.

At the State and local levels the historic preservation workload frequently overwhelms the staff. They focus on getting through the pile in the in box, i.e., “the process,” rather than stepping back and sorting out where their time is best spent. Overworked managers often lack the time and ability to direct staff to focus on preservation outcomes rather than checking off steps in a regulatory process.

A worthy goal for the future is the prioritization of limited resources to focus on important preservation outcomes while limiting time spent on reviews that do not achieve preservation. When the focus becomes the process—following of every step in the regulations—without a long term view of the end product—both time and money are expended with no preservation outcome.

Therefore, prioritizing the expenditure of limited resources is essential to ensuring the most effective and efficient results from a limited investment of people, time and dollars. One approach to managing and prioritizing investments is derived from “performance-based management, which allocates resources – staff, budgets and technology—for tangible results and outcomes rather than focusing on process. Success is measured by the effects or impacts that have been achieved and their sustainability.

SUMMIT FINDINGS

**EFFECTIVE DECISION MAKING IS ESSENTIAL;
IMPLEMENTATION IS MORE DIFFICULT
ALL PRESERVATION IS LOCAL**

Strategies: Efficient and effective decision making can be advanced through a performance-based management approach with a focus on outcomes. The following strategies are recommended:

- Develop (AHP) useful and accessible standards and guidelines to promote “performance-based management” for preservation decision making and a “performance-based management” training component to the AHP 106 training course.
- Convene (AHP) a national panel to rethink archeology and Section 106. This could include
 - Establishing a work plan to develop syntheses of 40 years of information on archeological sites to improve National Register eligibility and ineligibility decisions
 - Analyzing current cultural resource management survey methodologies in the Section 106 process to insure that investments in survey work are sound and will yield a long-term preservation benefit
- Improve collaboration, communication and integrated decision making among Federal senior policy officials through AHP as a means to (1) elevate the significance of preserving our historic legacy; (2) ensure broad and consistent consideration for the effects of programs and projects on historic resources; and (3) encourage assessment of historic resources and initiation of the Section 106 process at earliest stages of project planning.
- Support and promote the development of programmatic approaches for categories of undertakings, properties and effects, rather than case-by-case process approaches.
- Establish a coordinated and collaborative national research program to advance historic preservation
- Develop useful and accessible standards and guidelines to promote consistency and improve the quality of preservation decision making.
- Establish a national clearinghouse to facilitate the sharing of and access to preservation information.

Idea #6: Ensure a professionally trained work force in historic preservation, archaeology, and cultural resource management for employers in Federal agencies, State and local governments, Tribes, nonprofit organizations, and consulting firms

Findings: A work force trained in the principles of historic preservation and archaeology is essential to the identification, preservation, and protection of our cultural patrimony. Many strides have been made in the past 40 years toward developing standards for professional education and training, creating degree programs to provide a professional education for those seeking careers in historic preservation, strengthening degree programs in archaeology and cultural resource management, and creating career development training programs within the Federal government, academic institutions, and other venues. Much remains to be done to assure that all those that administer or carry out preservation and archaeological laws or serve on preservation-related boards and commissions receive appropriate training for their work and to strengthen university programs that provide education for those seeking preservation and archaeological careers.

SUMMIT FINDINGS

TRAINING SHOULD INCLUDE CURRENT TECHNOLOGY

ENGAGE THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN SETTING HISTORIC PRESERVATION JOB CLASSIFICATIONS

Strategies:

- Review and revise existing standards of the National Park Service for qualified professionals (36 CFR, Part 62) to meet requirements of current laws and the needs of employers in the historic preservation, archaeology, and cultural resource management fields.
- Review existing Federal personnel classifications and standards for cultural resource managers, cultural resource specialists, historic preservation officers, and others. Investigate the feasibility of developing standardized classifications that could be used across the Federal government in carrying out the National Historic Preservation Act and other Federal historic preservation and archaeological laws.
- Create a pool of trained professionals by strengthening existing continuing education programs and developing new ones for all Federal agencies with responsibilities for cultural resource management. Such programs should provide training in historic preservation, archaeology, cultural resources management, and the requirements of Federal law for cultural resource managers and specialists and Federal Preservation Officers and Deputy Federal Preservation Officers.
- Encourage expansion of training in preservation crafts and building rehabilitation through job training programs at the U.S. Department of Labor, the Preservation Trades Network, the National Preservation Institute, and community college/university degree programs.
- Promote development of Centers of Excellence in historic preservation in each major region of the country, to be located at universities with existing degree programs in historic preservation or centers for historic preservation, to undertake research and analysis related to historic preservation under contract with Federal agencies, State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, and others.
- Provide easily accessible, authoritative information and opportunities for training and networking for volunteers and para-professionals who work in the historic preservation and cultural resource management fields.

Idea # 7: Fund a sustainable preservation program to accomplish the vision, mission, and mandates of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Findings: Federal agencies, State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs), Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), Tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, Certified Local Governments (CLGs), nonprofit historic preservation organizations, and other groups carry out the vision, mission, and mandates of the NHPA. The ability of these agencies and organizations to successfully accomplish NHPA's vision, mission and mandates is, in part, determined by available funding. SHPOs and THPOs have a very critical role, especially in terms of the mandates of the NHPA. The Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) is the principal Federal funding source for the work of SHPOs, and is matched by State funding on at least a one to one basis. Although the Fund is currently authorized at \$150,000,000 annually, the FY2006 appropriation for SHPOs is \$35,716,000. After reaching a ten-year high of \$46,495,000 in FY2001, the appropriation for SHPOs has declined from this amount in subsequent years. Tribal Historic Preservation Officers received an appropriation of \$3,242,450 in FY06. Taking into consideration the increased number of THPOs, this represents a decrease in average support per THPO from \$79,875 in FY90 to \$55,904 in FY06. As a result of decreases in funding, SHPOs and THPOs have great difficulty assisting and advising Federal agencies in fulfilling their NHPA-mandated historic preservation compliance responsibilities. SHPOs have also had to reduce their monetary and technical assistance to local historic preservation programs, affecting the ability of these local programs to meet their preservation objectives.

The purpose of this idea is to a) have a Historic Preservation Fund that sustains the core activities of SHPOs, THPOs, and CLGs, and b) identify supplemental funding sources for all entities responsible for carrying out the vision, mission, and mandates of the NHPA. All of these agencies, organizations, and groups must be held accountable for their use of any public funds, employing performance measures that clearly demonstrate how their activities benefit the preservation program at all levels and enhance the public's appreciation and enjoyment of our Nation's heritage.

**SUMMIT FINDINGS:
EXPAND FUNDING AT ALL LEVELS
APPROPRIATE STRATEGY NEEDED**

Strategies:

- Share best practices and case studies of preservation achievements resulting from HPF involvement with stakeholders, advocates, and elected officials at the local, state and national levels
- Reach out to Federal agency and Congressional leaders to make the case for their support for increased funding for the HPF
- Establish partnerships to tap non-traditional funding sources, including partnerships with the private sector and nonprofit organizations. Increase and enhance current Federal cooperative agreements with nonprofit organizations that utilize matching funds and non-cash contributions.
- Create a national revolving loan fund to support preservation effort (possibly building on Sec. 104 of the NHPA)
- Institutionalize-funding for the Preserve America and Save America's Treasures' programs
- Encourage agencies to fund historic preservation needs as part of Federal project and program budgets
- Enhance historic preservation activities on Federal lands through the use of new funding sources. For example, when sales of Federal lands occur, monies from such sales could be placed into special accounts for conducting historic preservation activities within adjacent Federal lands or a portion of lease or user fee proceeds for using Federal lands could be directed to historic preservation needs.
- Strengthen the existing rehabilitation tax credit for income-producing properties and institute a homeowner's tax credit
- Employ creative approaches to mitigate damage to historic properties. These approaches might include:
 - Developing national, state, and local "mitigation banks' in consultation with all historic preservation partners
 - Redirecting all or portions of project funds slated for standard mitigation to actions that have greater public benefit and historic preservation outcomes (e.g., completion of historic property inventories, creation of state and local public outreach and education programs, assisting local preservation programs, developing and maintaining archaeological site stewardship programs, etc.)

Conclusion—Rehabilitation Needed

The Nation's heritage merits an infrastructure built on a solid foundation that is ready to meet the challenges of the 21st century. The National Historic Preservation Act laid a strong foundation to preserve our nation's heritage. However, that infrastructure, like a beloved historic building, needs rehabilitation. American preservationists must link arms and dedicate themselves to stabilize and rehabilitate the preservation infrastructure to **PRESERVE AMERICA**.

APPENDIX

Bibliography for Improving the Historic Preservation Infrastructure Issue Area

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. "Sources of Financial Assistance for Historic Preservation Projects." n. d.
- Lee, Antoinette, ed. *Past Meets Future Saving America's Historic Environments*. Washington: 1992.
- Glass, James. *The Beginnings of a New National Historic Preservation Program, 1957 to 1969*. Nashville: 1990.
- National Park Service, *CRM*, 1996, articles by Rowland Bowers, "The National Center for Cultural Resources Stewardship and Partnership Programs"; Cathryn Slater, "The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation at 30"; Judith Bittner, "States Take Preservation Beyond NHPA"; Pratt Cassidy, "Still Local After All These Years . . ."; Hester Davis, "NHPA and the Practice of Archeology."
- National Park Service. "The Historic Preservation Fund Annual Report FY 2005." n. d.
- National Park Service. *Common Ground*. summer 2006.
- [National Park Service]. "Historic Preservation Grants within the National Park Service Cultural Resources Associateship." n. d.
- Sanderson, Edward. "Restoration Needed: Preserving SHPOs in the National Historic Preservation Program." February 2003.
- Sebastian, Lynne. "What Is the Preservation Payoff?" March 7, 2004.