



January 2008

# The Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus: An Advocacy Tool for the 21st Century

Catherine Wood Keller  
*University of Pennsylvania*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.upenn.edu/hp\\_theses](http://repository.upenn.edu/hp_theses)

---

Keller, Catherine Wood, "The Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus: An Advocacy Tool for the 21st Century" (2008). *Theses (Historic Preservation)*. 108.

[http://repository.upenn.edu/hp\\_theses/108](http://repository.upenn.edu/hp_theses/108)

A thesis in Historic Preservation Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of Master of Science in Historic Preservation 2008.

Advisor: David Hollenberg

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. [http://repository.upenn.edu/hp\\_theses/108](http://repository.upenn.edu/hp_theses/108)  
For more information, please contact [libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu](mailto:libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu).

---

# The Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus: An Advocacy Tool for the 21st Century

## **Abstract**

Historic Preservation depends a great deal on national, state, and local legislative action from both a regulatory and funding perspective. To advocate successfully on behalf of a national historic preservation policy agenda, a comprehensive understanding of the nuances of the federal legislative process along with a strong insight into the internal and external dynamics feeding into that process are vital.

At the federal level, many legislators choose to organize into partisan, bipartisan or bicameral groups, commonly called Congressional Member Organizations (CMOs) or caucuses, with the intent to pursue common legislative objectives, coordinate actions and affect policy within their legislative body. The Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus (CHPC) is such a group. The mission of this particular bipartisan caucus, formed at the beginning of the 108th Congress (2003-2004) within the U.S. House of Representatives, is based on the recognition that successful federal historic preservation policy requires coordination and advocacy efforts between federal, state, local, public, and private groups. The assumption is that these coordinated efforts, particularly when executed at the federal level with the help of caucus members and their staffs, can greatly enhance the probability of positive legislative outcomes for historic preservation.

## **Comments**

A thesis in Historic Preservation Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of Master of Science in Historic Preservation 2008.  
Advisor: David Hollenberg

THE CONGRESSIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION CAUCUS:  
AN ADVOCACY TOOL FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Catherine Wood Keller

A THESIS

In

Historic Preservation

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania in  
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION

2008

---

Advisor  
David Hollenberg  
Lecturer  
Graduate Program in Historic Preservation  
School of Design, University of Pennsylvania

---

Program Chair  
Frank G. Matero  
Professor of Architecture

## **Acknowledgements**

I wish to express my sincerest thanks and appreciation to David Hollenberg for his attention, guidance, insight, and support during the research and writing of this thesis. I could not have asked for a more supportive advisor.

To my family who have always supported and encouraged me, thank you for your love. In addition, heartfelt thanks are offered to two dear friends who have stood by my side throughout this journey and nudged me along. To Lea Uhre, thank you for your warm hospitality, unending generosity, and advice during my many research trips to Washington, DC, and to Stacy Carlson, thank you very much for your words of encouragement and fabulous editing skills, which vastly improved the final product.

The research for this paper would not have been possible without the invaluable assistance and insights of a specific group of individuals who graciously agreed to take time out of their busy schedules to be interviewed. I am very grateful to Ron Anzalone, Director, Office of Preservation Initiatives, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; Gustavo Araoz, Executive Director, US/ICOMOS; Carl Eichenwald, Legislative Fellow, Office of Congressman Brad Miller; John Fowler, Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; George Hadjiski, Director, Office of Member and Committee Services, Committee on House Administration; Susan Webb Hammond, PhD., author; Donald Jones, PhD., Director of Programs, US/ICOMOS; Patrick Lally, Director, Congressional Affairs, The National Trust for Historic Preservation; Nellie Longworth, Heather MacIntosh, President, Preservation Action; The Honorable Brad Miller, Member of Congress; Susan West Montgomery, Greg Regan, staff contact, Congressional Arts Caucus; Anna Rose, scheduler, Office of Congressman Brad Miller; Nancy Schamu, Executive Director, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers; Rhonda Sincavage, Program Associate, State and Local Policy, National Trust for Historic Preservation; The Honorable Mike Turner, Member of Congress; and Mike Wiehe, Legislative Director, Office of Congressman Mike Turner.

Finally, I would like to say that I could not have gotten through this enormous task without the technical assistance, moral support, laughter, and general silliness that Alice, Betsy, Caroline, Nicole, Paula and Sara willingly supplied. I am very grateful for the acts of kindness they have shown me and for their friendships. Ladies, thank you very very much.

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>The Congressional Caucus: An Adaptive Response.....</b>	<b>12</b>
Academic Models .....	14
Internal and External Change .....	17
Types.....	20
History through 1994.....	22
Reform and Rules .....	25
Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus .....	29
<b>Setting the Agenda.....</b>	<b>33</b>
Issue Research .....	35
Legislative or Administrative Remedies .....	39
Communicating Legislative Priorities .....	40
<b>Mobilization and Organizational Networking .....</b>	<b>44</b>
Caucuses and the Executive Branch .....	44
Caucuses and Committees .....	46
Caucuses and the Public .....	51
<b>Navigating Legislative Priorities.....</b>	<b>53</b>
Building Support and a Strategy for Floor Action .....	53
<b>Summary of Findings .....</b>	<b>60</b>
CHPC Agenda Setting Practices.....	60
Issue Research .....	60
Creating Legislative or Administrative Remedies.....	62
Communicating Agenda Priorities .....	63
CHPC Mobilization and Networking Practices.....	64
With the Executive Branch .....	64
With Congressional Committees .....	65
With the Public.....	66
CHPC Legislation Enactment Practices .....	67
Building Support and Strategy for Floor Action.....	67

Conclusion.....	68
Recommendations for Increasing the Effectiveness of the CHPC.....	69
<b>Works Consulted .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Appendix A Interviews Conducted .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Appendix B Congressional Member Organizations of the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress .....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Appendix C Legislative Service Organizations Effected by Reforms of 1995 .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Appendix D CHPC Formation Letter 110<sup>th</sup> Congress.....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Appendix E CHPC Membership 110<sup>th</sup> .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Index .....</b>	<b>92</b>

## Tables

Table 1. Comparison of Committee Jurisdictions.....	48
Table 2. Historic Preservation Appropriations 2003-2006.....	58

## Introduction

Historic Preservation depends a great deal on national, state, and local legislative action from both a regulatory and funding perspective. To advocate successfully on behalf of a national historic preservation policy agenda, a comprehensive understanding of the nuances of the federal legislative process along with a strong insight into the internal and external dynamics feeding into that process are vital.

At the federal level, many legislators choose to organize into partisan, bipartisan or bicameral groups, commonly called Congressional Member Organizations (CMOs) or caucuses, with the intent to pursue common legislative objectives, coordinate actions and affect policy within their legislative body. The Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus (CHPC) is such a group. The mission of this particular bipartisan caucus, formed at the beginning of the 108th Congress (2003-2004) within the U.S. House of



Representatives, is based on the recognition that successful federal historic preservation policy requires coordination and advocacy efforts between federal, state, local, public, and private groups. The assumption is that these coordinated efforts, particularly when executed at the federal level with the help of caucus members and their staffs, can greatly enhance the probability of positive legislative outcomes for historic preservation.

Assessing whether the CHPC is currently functioning effectively as an advocacy tool for advancing preservation policy and law through the U.S. Congress will increase the general understanding of the current usefulness of the caucus, and will reveal what, if any, improvements in its operational processes can be made to ensure it functions at maximum effectiveness.

Because the CHPC was formed five years ago, in 2003, this thesis cannot evaluate its long-term performance. It should also be noted that no attempt is made to evaluate the effectiveness of historic preservation policy once it becomes law. Instead, the focus of the research performed for this thesis is on the operational effectiveness of the CHPC as a vehicle for moving historic preservation policy through the federal legislative process.

There is limited academic research on the topic of congressional caucuses currently available, so it was determined that the most effective

method for gathering information would be to conduct personal interviews and examining available documents and reports from the CHPC. Interview subjects were chosen based on whether they could address questions from either an internal (i.e., congressional) or external (i.e., partner organization) perspective. Most interviews took place during the month of February 2008 in Washington D.C. The exceptions to this were interviews with the CHPC co-chairs that due to scheduling constraints, were completed in mid-April. Most individuals met with the author only once, although in a few instances an interviewee was contacted again for clarification of a particular issue or point.

Internal research commenced by meeting with a representative of the Committee on House Administration. This was the logical step to build a research base, since the committee plays the lead role in CMO formation and oversight. The interview provided a useful overview of the history and background of CMOs as well as information regarding administrative reforms made during the 104th Congress and their ramifications to congressional caucuses. Interviews were also conducted with the two CHPC co-chairs, and their key staff. These meetings provided background on the circumstances and events that led to the formation of the CHPC, and were

very helpful in giving the author an understanding of the opportunities and constraints of the legislative process.

Five external preservation partner organizations were also selected by the author for interviews, based on the significant leadership role they play in advocating on behalf of national historic preservation policy. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is an independent federal agency. Preserve America is an Executive Branch initiative. The other three, The National Trust for Historic Preservation, The National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, and Preservation Action are non-profit organizations. The intent of these interviews was to gain an understanding of how these organizations interact with the CHPC, their perception of the caucus's effectiveness and if their relationships could be improved in any way. A sixth organization, The National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites, was chosen specifically because it is the only U.S. professional preservation organization with a global focus. US/ICOMOS promotes strong ties to national, regional, private, and governmental organizations within the United States. However, it has yet to find an advocate in Congress willing to take on U.S. involvement in international preservation issues. The author felt that it was important to include

US/ICOMOS in this research in the event that any insights could be gained that might alter their current situation.

Mission statements from all six organizations can be found below. The author chose to quote each statement as it appears on the organization's website so that the reader has a clear understanding of how each group perceives its mission.

It is also important to note that all quotations without attribution in this thesis are taken from these interviews; respondents requested and were promised anonymity. For reference, a complete list of interviewees and their affiliations can be found in Appendix A.

#### Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) is an independent federal agency that promotes the preservation, enhancement, and productive use of our nation's historic resources, and advises the President and Congress on national historic preservation policy. The ACHP as directed by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 serves as the primary federal policy advisor to the President and Congress; recommends administrative and legislative improvements for protecting our nation's heritage; advocates full consideration of historic values in federal decision-making; and reviews federal programs and policies to promote effectiveness, coordination, and consistency with national preservation policies. (Source: [achp.gov](http://achp.gov))

#### Preserve America

Preserve America is a White House initiative in cooperation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the U.S.

Departments of Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Transportation, and Education; the National Endowment for the Humanities, the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities, and the President's Council on Environmental Quality. The initiative encourages and supports community efforts to preserve and enjoy our priceless cultural and natural heritage. The goals include a greater shared knowledge about the nation's past, strengthened regional identities and local pride, increased local participation in preserving the country's cultural and natural heritage assets, and support for the economic vitality of our communities. Mrs. Laura Bush, First Lady of the United States, is the Honorary Chair of Preserve America. (Source: [preserveamerica.gov](http://preserveamerica.gov))

#### The National Trust for Historic Preservation

The National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) is a private, nonprofit membership organization dedicated to saving historic places and revitalizing America's communities. Recipient of the National Humanities Medal, the Trust was founded in 1949 and provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to protect the irreplaceable places that tell America's story. Staff at the Washington, DC, headquarters, 6 regional offices, and 29 historic sites work with the Trust's 270,000 members and thousands of preservation groups in all 50 states. (Source: [preservationnation.org](http://preservationnation.org))

#### National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers

The National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO) is a professional association of the state government officials who carry out the national historic preservation program as delegates of the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA) (16 USC 470). It is a 501(c)(3) corporation registered in the District of Columbia. The NCSHPO acts as a communications vehicle among the SHPOs and their staffs and represents the SHPOs with federal agencies and national preservation organizations. (Source: [ncshpo.org](http://ncshpo.org))

### Preservation Action

Preservation Action is a 501(c)(4) nonprofit organization created in 1974 to serve as the national grass roots lobby for historic preservation. Preservation Action seeks to make historic preservation a national priority by advocating to all branches of the federal government for sound preservation policy and programs through a grass roots constituency empowered with information and training and through direct contact with elected representatives. (Source: preservationaction.org)

### The U.S. National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites

The U.S. National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (US/ICOMOS) is the only U.S. professional preservation organization with a global focus. It functions as the gateway for U.S. professionals to participate in worldwide heritage conservation. With nearly 700 members (480 international members and 200 national affiliates), US/ICOMOS also promotes strong ties to national, regional, private, and governmental organizations within the U.S. It guides and promotes activities through an extensive membership network of preservation professionals, institutions, and organizations, including specialized scientific committees. US/ICOMOS also organizes an annual international scientific symposium, an international intern exchange program, and occasional special training courses and conferences. In addition, US/ICOMOS publishes a quarterly newsletter and an annual scientific journal. (Source: US/ICOMOS.org)

Completing the universe of interviewees are several individuals who, although not affiliated with any of the six external organizations at this time, were chosen based on their extensive knowledge of preservation public policy and their advocacy experience at the grass roots level.

Qualitative information gathered during the interview process and data acquired from reading earlier professional research, news clippings, congressional documents, and publications produced by many sources, including the CHPC and preservation partner organizations, is incorporated. Conversations with staff and information found in the examination of websites of several other caucuses that advocate for issues related to the public good are also incorporated, but only as a means of comparing their operational processes, identifying potential issues, and/or establishing reference points for defining effectiveness.

An important element of this thesis --- coming up with a definition for what an effective caucus is --- has required combining academic findings presented in earlier professional research with qualitative information acquired through the thesis's interview process. It was determined that the following practices are consistently employed by effective congressional caucuses:

- conducting research to delineate the parameters of a problem;
- creating legislative or administrative remedies for that problem;
- communicating legislative priorities to the appropriate committee or subcommittee for action;
- focusing the attention of the Executive Branch, Congress and the public on these legislative priorities;
- coordinating the exchange of information within the Executive Branch, Congress and the public on any policy activities related to its interests;

- building internal and external coalitions on behalf of its legislative priorities;
- scrutinizing federal legislative policy for negative repercussions to its agenda; i.e., serving as “watch dogs”;
- navigating its legislative priorities successfully through Congress into law with funding attached, when required, or preventing passage of legislation that has negative ramifications.

As a means of assessing the effectiveness of the CHPC, this thesis proceeds through the following methodological stages. Chapter 2 begins with an overview of the internal and external environmental changes that led to the need to form caucuses in Congress. It then examines possible academic model rationalizations, and concludes with a summary of the 1995 administrative reforms leading to the current House rules regarding caucus formation and the genesis of the CHPC.

Using information revealed through this research, Chapters 3, 4 and 5 examine the CHPCs’ application of three key operational processes currently utilized by effective congressional caucuses: agenda setting, organizational mobilization and networking, and achieving legislative enactment. The observations made in these three chapters are based primarily on information learned during interviews.

Agenda setting, the topic of Chapter 3, is examined by reviewing caucus practices for issue research, creation of administrative or legislative remedies and communicating legislative priorities. Chapter 4 studies the



practices employed for mobilization and organizational networking in three settings: the Executive Branch, the Congress, and public partners.

In Chapter 5, an evaluation of the third key operational process --- enacting legislation --- is made by first examining how caucuses focus congressional attention to build support for legislative priorities once they reach the House floor, and second, by reviewing how effective caucuses design and execute successful floor action.

Chapter 6 begins with a summary of findings relating to the CHPC's ability to set its agenda, mobilize and organize its networks, and enact legislation. An assessment regarding whether the CHPC is currently functioning effectively as an advocacy tool for advancing preservation policy through the U.S. Congress is made. This is done by comparing the practices it currently employs versus the practices of effective caucuses defined earlier. Finally, recommendations are made for the implementation of certain practices that, if adopted, would improve the efficacy of the CHPC.

The author believes that the level of sophistication the CHPC employs in its policy-making and advocacy processes will have a direct and positive impact on the preservation community's ability to negotiate effective federal

public policy. An understanding of the strengths and/or limitations of the CHPC's current practices is a useful tool to guide legislative strategic planning through the 21st century --- and that is the ultimate goal of this thesis.

## The Congressional Caucus: An Adaptive Response

A review of the available literature on congressional caucuses reveals that up until approximately ten years ago the topic had attracted scant attention in the realm of political scientists. The only serious in-depth study was conducted in 1998, when Susan Webb Hammond<sup>1</sup> published Congressional Caucuses in National Policy Making. This chapter is primarily and unavoidably based on her work. It offers a concise synthesis of the extensive research she has provided, on topics such as academic model rationalization, contributory changes of the late 20th century taking place

---

<sup>1</sup> Susan Webb Hammond, a professor at American University, is a specialist in American politics, Congress and the Presidency, and the study of bureaucratic decision-making. Professor Hammond has written two books on public policy issues and her work can be found in journals such as *Political Behavior*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, and *Political Research Quarterly*. She is respectfully acknowledged by this author as the most significant secondary source for information regarding the evolution of the congressional caucus system in the U.S. House of Representatives.

inside Congress and the external environment, and caucus type. A history of caucus formation plus the events leading to the reforms of 1995 is also presented. Current Houses rules outlining procedures for caucus formation are discussed along with a brief history of the CHPC itself.

As mentioned earlier, Hammond's study is all-inclusive. She states in her prologue:

...this book seeks to be comprehensive, covering all caucuses and the caucus system.<sup>2</sup> ...The focus is on factors that lead to caucus formation; their establishment, purposes, goals, organization; their issue interests and activities; and their interaction with individuals, other congressional subunits, and the existing party and committee systems. This study seeks to assess not only the impact of the caucus system on Congress as an institution and on the individual member, but also the power and influence of the caucus system and its individual subunits (Hammond 7).

For readers wishing to gain a truly in-depth understanding of the congressional caucus system, it is recommended that Hammond's book and bibliography be consulted for further study.

---

<sup>2</sup> Hammond inserts a footnote in her book (page 231) that points to an extensive note regarding her sources for this information.

## ***Academic Models***

Hammond begins by examining several theories that political scientists might use to explain how congressional caucuses could have evolved within the organizational structure of Congress --- what she describes as distributive, informational, and party theories. First, the distributive theory posits that "self-interested legislators organize committees and other legislative machinery to confer local benefits to legislators in order to gain approval from voters and win re-election" (Hird 13). This theory works for congressional organizations that have parliamentary rights (rules) that can be used to impose strength, will, and/or preferences.

Hammond cites as an example the observation that distributive theory can be used to describe the process a committee engages in when invoking parliamentary rules to control consideration of a piece of legislation on the House floor. "These rules help committee members ...achieve their preferred outcomes" according to Hammond (11). Committees are populated by legislators who have district-based interests that fall under the specific committees' jurisdiction; distributive theory relies heavily on this connection as the means for imposing preference on the legislative system. Since a congressional caucus cannot exercise parliamentary rights resulting in conference of district benefits to its members as a committee can,

Hammond believes distributive theory cannot be used to explain the emergence of caucuses as significant entities in Congress. "...although they [caucuses] seek to influence voting outcomes, they cannot be relied on to achieve policies compatible with committee preferences" (Hammond 12).

Hammond next looks at informational theory as an explanation for the appearance of congressional caucuses. This theory suggests:

...committees develop to provide information and expertise. Committees 'capture gains from specialization' and are granted parliamentary rights because committee members share their information and use their policy expertise to produce policies that are preferred by the majority of chamber members (Hammond 12).

Hammond dismisses this theory as a contributor to the rise of caucuses. She acknowledges that the legislative system is efficient ...linking individual expertise and committee specialization to collective goals (12) but goes on to say:

...but many caucuses were established specifically to gather and disseminate to caucus members reliable information not obtainable elsewhere and to pursue policy issues not being handled by the committee system (12).

Delving a bit further into models, Hammond last looks at party theory, specifically the rational choice party approach, which she defines as:

...based on individuals' goals, but like the informational viewpoint, there is linkage between individuals and the

collectivity; in the party perspective, the collectivity is the party. The actions of parties in Congress can improve the re-election chances of all party members (12).

In the scenario Hammond puts forth, association with the majority party will reap rewards for the individual member because they are part of a powerful collective (13). The rational choice party approach takes the position that political parties function as “legislative cartels”, coordinated by leadership chosen by party members (Hammond 13). Members support the party’s legislative agenda in order to “increase their re-election chances” (Hammond 13). Hammond states, “Parties act as cartels, affecting the committee system and setting the agenda of floor debate” (13). Her research indicates that proponents of party theory credit the party structure within Congress with providing some organizational components that could account for the evolution of the caucus system, but she comes to a different conclusion:

...party perspectives ignore caucuses. Many caucuses are established precisely because the party system has failed in various ways, including addressing issues important to members and providing needed legislative information or coordination regarding legislation (13).

Therefore, according to Hammond, none of these three academic models can fully account for the formation of the caucus system, but she

concedes that there are practices from each theory that caucuses have adopted:

Some caucuses do act like distributive committees and achieve benefits for regions or industries they represent. Some caucuses act much as informative committees do: developing expertise, gathering information, and drafting policies that are later supported by a chamber majority. And some caucuses, made up of members of only one party, work within that party to influence its leaders or to develop legislation that can reduce party divisiveness (13).

To determine the exact origin of the congressional caucus system Hammond believes that one must consider other factors besides those offered in the examination of the traditional academic political theory that she summarizes. She proposes that congressional caucuses instead emerged as an adaptive response system, and can be attributed to both internal and external environmental changes that took place in the latter half of the 20th century and to a shift in the balance of Members of Congress' goals towards policymaking (13).

### ***Internal and External Change***

During Congress' first 200 years, deficiencies in the organizational structure were dealt with by creating:

...new organizational forms, such as the standing committees of the nineteenth century and the articulated party system, with more party leaders and increasingly complex, specialized, and



differentiated party groups, of the early twentieth century (Hammond 18).

Adapting to both internal and external demands as they arose, responses such as these, according to Hammond, were created to address Members of Congress' concerns about insufficiencies in internal systems (18).

Beginning in the late 1960's and lasting through the early 1980's, large changes in the external environment began to place enormous pressure on Congress' internal systems. This increasing demand began to expose inadequacies in organizational and legislative processes. For example, a progressively more efficient telecommunications network made it possible for a large percentage of the population to obtain information through television and radio broadcasts (Hammond 19). Creating easier access to information encouraged more citizen participation in the increasingly complex matters before Congress. Members' offices began to receive larger quantities of mail and phone inquiries, which increased labor and infrastructure requirements. Hammond writes at length about "new systems of political participation, increased constituent demands, and technological change", straining all aspects of Congress' organizational and legislative systems (19). Hammond believes that as the [traditional] "systems in place failed Members, the caucus system emerged" (19). "Members sought new mechanisms to achieve their goals" (Hammond 19). Based on her extensive

research and substantiated by her examination of the work of other political scientists, Hammond makes the case for the formation of caucuses as “a logical response to this juxtaposition of external and internal factors and members' goals” (14).

Other contributing factors, she goes on to write, were the reforms made in Congress during the 1970's resulting in:

...relaxed resources (such as staff) controlled by individual members, and a pattern of increasing organizational decentralization. When party leadership failed to address issue or policy coordination concerns, members had the reason and the opportunity to form caucuses (Hammond 14).

She bolsters her argument even further by stating that research shows that caucuses were “first established, and now persist, because they help achieve the goals of both individual members and the institution” (14). As examples, Hammond points out:

They assist members in achieving career and policy goals, and in carrying out their legislative, oversight, and representational duties. Caucuses also support Congress in its institutional functions and responsibilities, including institutional maintenance (14).

Today's congressional legislator is more issue oriented than his/her predecessor was. Members of Congress still pursue the time-honored troika of goals: “re-election, policy, and power”, but according to Hammond, the balance among these goals has shifted (15). During the same period of

change that brought forth the creation of the congressional caucus system, Members of Congress also began to express more interest in understanding policy issues (Hammond 15). She calls this new breed of legislator “policy entrepreneurs” (16). “Caucuses offer members an opportunity to pursue policy and other goals and to do so earlier in a congressional career than was possible within the formal system” (Hammond 16).

### **Types**

As of the 110th Congress (2007-2008), there are 278 Congressional Member Organizations (CMOs) or caucuses (see Appendix B) formally registered with the Committee on House Administration. Large, long-established caucuses develop leadership structures according to Hammond, which may include:

a chair with a number of officers, written bylaws, or constitutions, executive or steering committees, ad hoc task forces, permanent committees, whip systems, and outside advisory bodies (22).

Smaller caucuses tend to have less well-defined leadership structures.

Six categories or “types” of caucuses have emerged over the years, yet these categories are loosely defined and no caucus is required to form around one. Hammond describes in detail the characteristics of each type (30-35).

The first is a party caucus in which the members generally share the same party and ideology (Hammond 31). Democratic Members of Congress organize themselves into the House Democratic Caucus, while their Republican counterparts are organized into the House Republican Conference. The House Wednesday Group composed of moderate to liberal-minded Republicans, is another example.

A second style is the personal-interest caucus (Hammond 32). The common thread for these is that the caucus members have a shared interest in a particular issue. "Activities are not directly linked to representing constituent interests... [but] instead focus on agendas or information because their large memberships agree on the importance of an issue but not on specific programs" (Hammond 32). They are generally bipartisan and/or bicameral. The CHPC is an example of this category.

The remaining four types of caucuses are more narrowly focused and, as Hammond describes, are typically based on either:

- shared affinities or ethnicities of caucus members, i.e., the Congressional Black Caucus;
- issues of particular concern to a geographic region, i.e., the Western States Coalition;
- state or district issues of concern to specific groups within a congressional district or state, i.e., the Rural Health Caucus; and finally
- industry issues, i.e., the Coal Mining Caucus (33).

Congressional caucuses are voluntary organizations whose membership is limited solely to Members of Congress. Members may form a congressional caucus in order to pursue common legislative objectives, and the caucuses do not have any explicit standing or direct recognition in House or party rules. Caucuses may serve any of several functions, including compiling, analyzing and distributing information; developing and mobilizing support for legislative proposals; advocating positions and issues; and providing representation for specific elements in national as well as caucus members' constituencies.

### ***History through 1994***

The first sentence in Hammond's book sums up her assessment of the congressional caucus system of today --- powerful. She describes how "This informal system has links to, but operates outside of, the two most prominent institutional features of Congress's formal structure: the committee and party systems" (11). With this in mind, how then did the U.S. Congress move from a series of "ad hoc and temporary groups of members" to the "organized, stable, and continuous congressional caucuses" Hammond says we have today (11)?

Although Members of Congress have long worked together informally to affect policy, Hammond contends that the genesis of the congressional

caucus system as we know it today began to appear in the mid 1960's. First known as Legislative Service Organizations (LSOs), caucuses tended to be small in number, loosely organized, ad hoc in nature and unstable (Hammond 39). They were easy to form, simple to operate and, at the time, could function outside the formal approval system. These early caucuses characteristically varied in "membership, range of interests, issue focus, activities, and strategies" (Hammond 20).

An explosion of growth in caucus formation took place in the late 1970's, which continued into the late 1980s (Hammond 41). Members' personal offices, capped at eighteen permanent staff, and looking for ways to augment research and report writing on specialized issues, formed LSOs. Specializing in Members of Congress' specific interest areas, LSOs could devote staff, time, and funds to such research without adding to the workload of Members' already over-worked personal staff. Caucuses applying for LSO status between 1979 and 1995 were permitted by the House rules to "establish a caucus account for staff and office expenses and to be assigned office space in House buildings" (Hammond 21). Many LSOs charged subscription fees to caucus members, ranging from \$25 and going as high as \$5,000/year, commanding memberships as large as 300. Fees, paid out of the Member of Congress' official allowance, were funneled into

accounts that could be used to finance the LSOs' staff, activities, as well as expenses for travel, entertainment, and dinners. This "pot" of taxpayer money was unregulated and outside the jurisdiction of House rules and regulations. Required only to file quarterly financial reports that summarized expenses after money was spent, LSO accounting practices fell below the more stringent standards that Members of Congress' personal offices had to meet. With growing infusions of special interest money, the perception grew that outsiders were lobbying insiders at taxpayer expense through LSOs. Fostered along by the lack of financial oversight and accountability, issues of LSO financial abuse and mismanagement eventually surfaced in the early 1990's when calls for organizational reforms began.

Direct contributions from corporations, trade associations, and lobbyists were discontinued (Thompson). Congressional scrutiny then focused in 1993-1994 on the use of taxpayer dollars to support 28 (see Appendix C) of the approximately 140 caucuses that were using Members of Congress' allowances to fund caucus operating expenses. The issue at hand was that caucus members' fees, paid out of taxpayer funded "official allowances", were fuelling missions related to special interest groups. Caucuses were also utilizing House office space and House resources to execute their operations. Representative Pat Roberts, a Kansas Republican,

and a member of the Committee on House Administration, noted in a 1993 interview that “his staff tallied 10 years of receipts and expenses from 1983-1992 for LSOs and found they had taken in nearly \$35 million, reported spending just \$26.8 million, and had not accounted for \$7.7 million in taxpayer money” (Thompson). So, with growing bipartisan concern, stoked by recent disclosures of gross financial abuses, a push for serious reforms was launched.

### ***Reform and Rules***

In the 104th Congress, newly elected Speaker Newt Gingrich, with bipartisan support, instituted new rules that not only produced an official name change from Legislative Service Organizations to Congressional Member Organizations, but also required that caucuses function for the first time inside Congress’ formal approval system, subject to financial oversight and the rules of the House. These 1995 reforms removed the “special status” designation that the 28 caucuses held, “abolished 96 staff jobs, and freed 16 House offices for other uses” (Seelye) along with a reported cost savings to the taxpayer of “\$5 million annually” (Talbot). None of these organizations were banned or suppressed by these reforms, although a great outcry was made by some of the 28, clearly recognizing the financial ramifications. The 28 caucuses that were affected by the withdrawal of taxpayer money were



still free to operate as they saw fit, as long as they followed House rules for CMOs outlined in the Member's Congressional Handbook. A Congressional Research Service report on the complete House administrative reorganization of the 104th Congress sums up the congressional caucus reforms as follows:

...all activities were to be conducted out of the personal office of a sponsoring Member. Furthermore, Members were to defray [caucus] costs directly from their official funds by employing [caucus] staff on their personal payrolls or paying [caucus] related expenses from their official expense allowances (Rundquist 5).

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines a caucus as a group of people united to promote an agreed upon cause. The U.S. House of Representatives Committee on House Administration elaborates further on this definition, stating in the Member's Congressional Handbook that a Congressional Member Organization is a group of Members of the United States Congress, which meet to pursue a common legislative goal. Informally, one may also hear the terms "Coalition", "Study Group", "Task Force", and/or "Working Group" which can also refer to a CMO.<sup>3</sup> Hammond draws an even deeper distinction in her prologue regarding the parameters of the definition she used to narrow the focus of her study of CMOs:

---

<sup>3</sup> Note: The terms Congressional Member Organization, CMO, congressional caucus or caucus are also interchangeable with these terms when referring to any caucus post 1995 reforms.

They may be partisan or bipartisan, bicameral or unicameral. They provide information to their members, affect agendas, draft bills, and amendments, develop legislative strategy, build supporting coalitions, form voting blocs, and even launch congressional leadership careers (7). [They are] ...voluntary, organized associations of members of Congress, without recognition in chamber rules or line-item appropriations and that seek to play a role in the policy process (8).

The U.S. House of Representatives stipulates specific rules and regulations for the formation of congressional caucuses, which can be found in the most recent version of the Member's Congressional Handbook. Each Congress, caucuses must register electronically with the Committee on House Administration by preparing a letter on official letterhead, with the following information:

- Congressional Member Organization's Name;
- Statement of Purpose;
- Officers;
- Name, Phone Number, and Email Address of staff designated to work on issues related to the CMO (minimum of one per officer)

Member's offices must then submit the letter online in PDF format. The Committee on House Administration sends a response via email once approval is given. At this point, the organization is officially recognized. The Member's Congressional Handbook states that CMOs are subject to all rules of the House of Representatives, as well as regulations put forth by the Committee on House Administration. Membership may include Senators, but at least one of the officers of the organization must be a Member of the

House. In addition, the participation of Senators does not affect the scope of authorized caucus activities in any regard.

The rules and regulations in the Member's Congressional Handbook are very specific regarding CMOs and are quoted as follows:

- CMOs have no separate corporate or legal identity;
- A CMO is not an employing authority;
- The Member's Representational Allowance (MRA) may not directly support a CMO as an independent entity;
- A CMO may not be assigned separate office space;
- Neither CMOs nor individual Members may accept goods, funds, or services from private organizations or individuals to support the CMO;
- Members may use personal funds to support the CMO;
- A Member of a CMO, in support of the objectives of that CMO, may utilize employees (including shared employees) and official resources under the control of the Member to assist the CMO in carrying out its legislative objectives, but no employees may be appointed in the name of a CMO;
- CMOs may not use the Frank, nor may a Member lend his or her Frank to a CMO;
- A Member may use official resources for communications related to the purpose of a CMO. Any such communications must comply with the Franking Regulations;
- Members may devote a section of their official Web site to CMO issues, but CMOs may not have independent Web pages;
- A Member may use inside mail to communicate information related to a CMO;
- Members may prepare material related to CMO issues for dissemination;
- Official funds may not be used to print or pay for stationery for the CMO;

- Members may refer to their membership in a CMO on their official stationery.<sup>4</sup>

The reforms made in 1995 have fostered “efficiency and specialization in the use of resources” according to Hammond (22). Staff sharing and pooling of resources occur among smaller caucuses on a regular basis, spreading out the workload (Hammond 22). Most caucuses function with only one or two staffers. In many situations, aides are existing staff members of caucus chairs, and caucus-related duties, which now take place in Member of Congress’ personal offices, are in addition to a staffers’ already large issue portfolio. Congressional aides “often specialize in certain areas of caucus interest” which creates issue expertise both in breadth and in depth (Hammond 22).

### ***Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus***

In the beginning of the 108th Congress, public policy organizations such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Preservation Action, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, interested in raising the profile of historic preservation issues on Capitol Hill, recognized that successful policy initiatives required coordination and advocacy efforts

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. House of Representatives. Members Congressional Handbook. Washington: Government Printing Office, 2007

between federal, state, local, and public groups. It was also agreed that at the federal level, laws and policies could be greatly enhanced by having Members of Congress and their staffs dedicated formally to the coordinated pursuit of historic preservation initiatives within Congress. A representative of one of the external partner organizations said:

We wanted Members to identify themselves with preservation by involving the grass roots people with Congress. The idea was to have grass roots groups approach Members in their districts to join a caucus. We outside organizations would sponsor events, tours, and luncheons to help educate Congress about historic preservation.<sup>5</sup>

Within the incoming freshman class of the 108th Congress, two Members of Congress who were known as bipartisan supporters of historic preservation were approached by partner organization representatives to organize and co-chair a new caucus. Organizational paperwork was filed with the Committee on House Administration, in accordance with the requirements of the Member's Congressional Handbook, and the CHPC was officially up and running.

---

<sup>5</sup> All quotations without attribution are from interviews; respondents were promised anonymity. A complete list of interviewees and their affiliations can be found in Appendix A.

Caucus co-chair Mike Turner, a Republican representing Ohio's 3rd district, held a deep passion for historic preservation prior to his election to Congress. As mayor of Dayton, Turner had created and implemented a model public/private partnership to address historic preservation and economic revitalization. Through his efforts, the city of Dayton provided the initial funding to purchase between seven and eleven historic homes in six economically depressed neighborhoods and then collaborated with the local homebuilders association to rehabilitate them. Upon completion of each neighborhood project, a home show was organized to highlight the newly renovated historic buildings and educate the public about the economic benefits. According to Turner's mayoral staff, the program was highly successful and spurred economic investment in Dayton during his tenure.

Caucus co-chairman Brad Miller, a Democrat representing the 13th district of North Carolina, also came to Congress with a strong personal interest in historic preservation issues. He and his wife Esther Hall, a consultant with The National Trust for Historic Preservation, were both willing to get involved in the new caucus.

The current organizational structure of the CHPC is indicative of its relative newness. There is no formal mission statement other than the

required organizing document on file with the Committee on House Administration (see Appendix D). Other than the two co-chairs, the caucus has neither officers nor an advisory board. It meets as an official group only at caucus-sponsored events, and communicates entirely via email alerts, letters to caucus members and Dear Colleague notices. The workload of the caucus is jointly borne by two congressional aides, one from each co-chair's personal staff, apportioning their time between this and other duties. Thus far, in the 110th Congress, 115 Representatives consider themselves members of the caucus (see Appendix E), most joining at the behest of preservation groups located within their districts. Legislative goals for each congressional session are loosely formed, based on a combination of two or three priorities pushed by external national policy organizations and individual legislative interests of the co-chairs.

## Setting the Agenda

A caucus' single most significant organizational responsibility is setting its agenda at the beginning of each congressional session. The agenda influences and guides all caucus activity. That said, caucuses also must maintain flexibility to accommodate changes in the external environment and incorporate new information when necessary. Hammond writes:

Caucuses use strategic flexibility (a key attribute for affecting agendas) to their advantage: they can work easily at all levels of government and the private sector and are constantly in touch with district and state constituencies. Because group members are high-level decision makers, they have access to others like them and can draw attention to caucus issues. All of these characteristics give caucuses the ability to respond rapidly and meaningfully to external change and policy opportunities (80).



There are two types of agendas formed by caucuses, the governmental, and the public (Hammond 81). According to Hammond, the governmental agenda is a combination of:

...the congressional agenda - those issues that are subject to debate, hearings, or legislation (bills and resolutions) in Congress – and the administrative agenda – those issues that are given attention by the president or executive branch and by independent agency personnel (81).

The public agenda, on the other hand, contains those “issues which have achieved a high level of public interest and visibility” (Cobb et al 126).

Hammond notes that, along with focusing on the type of agenda a caucus chooses to affect, there is also the choice by which one elicits the affect, through either agenda setting or agenda maintenance:

Caucuses may affect these agendas either by agenda setting or by agenda maintenance. Agenda setting occurs when caucuses change agendas by placing items on them or keeping items off them. Caucuses perform agenda maintenance when they keep issues on agendas. ...For congressional agendas, caucuses may pursue both agenda setting and agenda maintenance because of members' ability to participate directly in congressional decision-making. Caucuses' attention to the public agenda might vary, although it seems likely that members will maintain rather than set agendas, given the greater investment of time and energy required for the latter. Because caucuses and caucus members are interested in policy outcomes, caucuses place a high priority on agenda activities (81).

Of the effective agenda setting practices employed by the caucuses studied by Hammond, the following three were most often utilized:

- research to identify and understand the parameters of a problem;
- creation of remedies such as drafting legislation or proposing amendments to existing legislation; and
- communication of agenda priorities to appropriate subcommittee or committee members and staff for action.

The CHPC is a personal-interest caucus, i.e., it is issue-driven. Therefore, in theory, its agenda setting process should prioritize issues related to the governmental agenda first, followed by expansion into issues on the public agenda, second. The CHPC should set or maintain its agenda, depending on the desired policy outcome. Conducting extensive research, incorporating that research into the creation of administrative remedies, and communicating agenda priorities to appropriate committee members will indicate that the CHPC is following effective agenda setting practices.

### ***Issue Research***

According to the National Trust, a year or so after the formation of the CHPC, it became clear that it was being approached by too many external organizations, often with differing or competing issue priorities. Absent a single dedicated caucus staffer and a national consensus spokesperson for historic preservation policy, the Trust took the initiative and formed a monthly meeting of partner organizations at which policy priorities would first be

agreed upon as a group and then brought forward to the CHPC for inclusion on the caucus agenda. The top tier issues for the current congressional session put forth by the partners' group include:

- appropriations for the Historic Preservation Fund and State Historic Preservation Offices;
- passage of H.R. 1043, the Community Restoration, and Revitalization Act, and;
- the permanent authorization of H.R. 3981, the Preserve America and Save America's Treasures programs.

When asked how caucus agenda priorities are determined, Congressmen Turner and Miller's staff indicated that they are assembled through two means. First, issues are brought to the attention of the caucus from the partners' monthly meetings described above. Second, issues that arise during the congressional session are added to the agenda if they align with the caucus leadership's issue priorities.

Six external policy partner organizations were also asked how agenda priorities are determined and the question yielded a variety of responses. The partner's monthly meeting was cited as an effective means of focusing the CHPC leadership's attention on certain issues. However, all also expressed concern that the caucus did not follow a more organized well-conceived strategy for developing its agenda. Although it was acknowledged that information from monthly partners meetings is forwarded to caucus leadership, one external organization complained that there are no face-to-

face opportunities for the partners to give the caucus co-chairs direct input. "The caucus does not really reach out to us. We have been trying to get a partners meeting with the co-chairs for quite a while. This is where we would present our top tier issues". US/ICOMOS, an international preservation partner, complained of being completely shut out of the agenda setting process, in no small part due to the lack of congressional interest or involvement in international historic preservation issues as a whole. Although major U.S. organizations such as US/ICOMOS, The National Geographic Society, The Smithsonian Institution, The World Monuments Fund and The Getty Institute, are active in international preservation issues, these educational and cultural groups are not represented on Capitol Hill through the CHPC.

One potential source for agenda items that the CHPC has not yet tapped are the thirteen final recommendations from the Preserve America Summit. The Summit, led by First Lady Laura Bush and held in New Orleans during October of 2006, brought together federal agencies, private partner organizations and individuals to examine the successes and challenges of the national preservation program over the last 40 years. Over 70 key issues were identified and discussed by eleven expert panels, which were honed down to thirteen final recommendations meriting priority attention. These

recommendations are recognized by the Executive Branch and the federal agencies responsible for overseeing the implementation of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as the national agenda for historic preservation for the next ten years.

Caucus staff, when questioned as to why they do not look to the Summit recommendations as a source for potential agenda priorities, said that they currently have their hands full. The co-chairs and staff do not see the role of the CHPC as one that seeks out agenda items other than through the two means discussed above. From the perspective of the Executive Branch, the ACHP has the lead for follow up on creating an implementation strategy for the thirteen recommendations made in the final report. ACHP indicated that specific proposals were delegated to federal agencies such as GSA for strategy formulation, and that they in turn are working with a variety of non-governmental partners such as the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. ACHP also indicated that its Chairman, John Nau, speaks individually with Members of Congress when a particular recommendation requires congressional assistance. Three external partner organizations expressed reservations about whether the thirteen Summit recommendations were genuinely reflective of the most pressing national issues. One partner put it this way, "There is no unanimity among us regarding

whether the [Summit] recommendations actually represent a national agenda". It should be noted that two partners, The National Trust and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, occupy seats on the ACHP's advisory board, which provided them an opportunity to vet the final thirteen recommendations with their constituencies prior to a vote by the board. Even so, claims that all partner opinions were not actively solicited by the ACHP in the final process have created disagreement on this issue among external organizations, making the incorporation of any Summit recommendations to the CHPC agenda a challenge, even if the co-chairs were so inclined.

### ***Legislative or Administrative Remedies***

On the subject of creating legislative or administrative remedies, interviews with both congressional staff and partner organizations confirmed that when a situation presents itself, caucus leadership is willing to listen to external preservation partners' advice, except from US/ICOMOS. Ideas for proposed remedies are bounced back and forth and often combined. On occasion, external organizations are asked for input to help draft potential legislative language. Assistance of this type was solicited during the creation of H.R. 3981, the "Preserve America and Save America's Treasures Act" which was introduced in October of 2007 by Congressman Brad Miller and co-

sponsored by Congressman Turner. Partners often provide CHPC co-chairs with sample language of acceptable parameters within which to frame their legislative response. One negative comment made by an external organization representative was that the CHPC rarely initiates legislation. “The CHPC tends to focus on the follow-up of legislation already in process”. When external organizations require the drafting or introduction of new legislation to address an issue, rather than turn to the CHPC, partner organizations often ask an individual Member of Congress with whom they have a pre-existing, strong relationship for assistance.

### ***Communicating Legislative Priorities***

The third significant responsibility in agenda setting is for a caucus to communicate its legislative priorities to relevant subcommittee and full committee members, chairs and staff. Targeted communications serve to educate Members of Congress and staff on issues pending before a committee and function as “preemptive strikes”, providing opportunities for addressing concerns ahead of time, thereby diminishing the chance of objections during a hearing or a vote.

According to all interviewees, co-chairs Turner and Miller have, when required, been willing to make a case for support directly to subcommittee or full committee chairs, using either letters or face-to-face meetings. Ongoing

efforts by co-chairs to foster personal relationships with relevant committee members are credited with helping both CHPC agenda setting and agenda maintenance. “We are at the point now that [the subcommittee staff on] Interior Appropriations waits for a letter from us. The Chairman and ranking members know who we are” said one caucus staffer. One example of the skillful use of caucus co-chair and committee member relationships occurred when a movement was afoot within Congress in 2003 to introduce reforms to the Section 106 provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act, which would have been disastrous. As the representative of one partner organization described, “The whole issue was resolved based on the personal relationship between Turner and Chairman Rahall”. “There is still room for improvement though,” said another partner. The specific instance cited was inadequate CHPC communication with the Appropriations Committee about the importance of an initiative for a comprehensive, searchable inventory of federal, state, and local historic properties. “It was poorly executed; Appropriations reaction to the program was that there was not enough information to support it, therefore the impact of the CHPC on this preservation initiative was negligible” said the partner.

The second group to which the CHPC must successfully communicate its legislative priorities is the Congress as a whole. Five partner organizations



interviewed all agreed that the caucus co-chairs, through staff activities, actively encourage Members of Congress at large to support or co-sponsor bills, using such traditional methods as email alerts and electronic Dear Colleague letters. The CHPC was also given credit for inviting partner organizations to the Hill to conduct two briefings designed to give an overview of historic preservation issues. The two briefings, open to Members of Congress and their staff, were considered highly successful. All of the external partners expressed frustration at the CHPC's lack of interest in scheduling more briefings of this type, especially at the beginning of each congressional session. One suggestion that was mentioned in several partner interviews, including US/ICOMOS, was that specialized briefings on cross over issues, which intersect with preservation, such as world heritage sites, hurricane damage and recovery, adaptive reuse of brownfields, sustainability and the economic revitalization of declining neighborhoods, could also provide a creative means of communicating legislative priorities. "Briefings could be tailored to provide tangible linkage to other issue concerns of both caucus members and non-members," said one partner organization representative. From the perspective of another external partner organization, "The caucus as a legislative advocacy body is fairly ineffective. They are responsive, but mostly reactive as opposed to strategic. I think that they could be a lot more active in educating Members of

Congress about preservation. An active caucus would be one that wanted to do briefings, or events every six months, on some aspect of preservation, at least.”

A second suggestion for improving the CHPC's ability to communicate the importance of its legislative priorities in the House is the practice of inviting Members of Congress to view specific projects. “This helps create a deeper understanding of the issues and provides opportunities for external organizations to highlight preservation efforts in Member's districts,” said one partner representative. Interest in integrating such a practice was expressed by both co-chairs, but as of this writing, no such planning efforts are underway.

## **Mobilization and Organizational Networking**

To move policy goals forward, effective caucuses must work with at least three major networks: the Executive Branch, relevant congressional committees and subcommittees, and public partner organizations.

### ***Caucuses and the Executive Branch***

In the case of the Executive Branch, caucuses are most likely to build a relationship when issues with which they are concerned depend on Executive Branch decision-making (Hammond 131). According to Hammond, meetings between caucus and Executive Branch officials provide opportunities to exchange information, familiarize agencies with issues, place policy goals on the Executive agenda, and bring new programs to their attention (131). By opening channels for dialogue, information sharing, and negotiation, a caucus may generate enough Executive Branch interest in a

particular issue to mobilize Administration resources on its behalf. Hammond goes on to write:

Caucuses vary in the locus of their efforts, interacting with agencies or the White House, with staff or political appointees, or with the president. They seek information and pursue policy goals, which may be a change in regulations, the development of bills and amendments, administration support for caucus positions, or assistance in strategy and coalition building. Executive agencies seek similar assistance from caucuses, such as help on developing legislation, advice on strategy, or voting support (131).

In discussions with the external organizations interviewed, the consensus criticism was that the CHPC does not actively mobilize and coordinate strategy with the Executive Branch on preservation policy issues residing on the congressional agenda. Instead, if coordination is needed, it is accomplished through the networks of external organizations. By cultivating independent relationships with key staff in the White House, The National Park Service, The Department of Interior, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Office of Management and Budget, partner organizations are able to focus Executive Branch attention on certain priority issues.

The only instance known to those interviewed for this thesis where the CHPC has visibly networked with the Executive Branch has been during events associated with at least one identified CHPC priority, the Preserve

America initiative. However, it is even difficult to determine how much credit can be attributed to caucus leadership in this instance, since partner organizations, the ACHP and the Office of the First Lady, have all made this initiative a priority. It is more likely that high-level support from within the Administration, rather than CHPC emphasis, is helping to focus congressional attention on this caucus policy goal.

### ***Caucuses and Committees***

The second network that caucuses develop to influence policy is within Congress itself. Congressional committees with oversight over relevant caucus issues become the caucus members' primary focus. Member-to-Member relationships are relied upon to build committee coalitions in support of caucus policy positions. Individual meetings with key committee members and senior staff provide the caucus with opportunities to exchange views, conduct issue education, place policy goals on the committee agenda, and negotiate. According to Hammond, caucuses can serve as an important access point for internal and external information and function as an early-warning system (165). By staying closely connected, and monitoring committee issues and activity, caucuses serve as watchdogs over policy and strategy.

Whenever possible, caucuses actively recruit Members of Congress who serve on relevant committees to the caucuses' specific policy interests. As mentioned earlier, caucuses tend to be populated by Members of Congress with low congressional seniority, making it important to have numerous caucus members representing each pertinent committee. As caucus members gain congressional seniority within the committee they also gain influence that is useful to the caucuses they serve. They can focus fellow committee members on caucus issues, provide expertise, and address concerns that may be raised by House Leaders. According to Hammond, they can also, "Work with committees to set up hearings, choose topics, and develop witness lists which can affect the parameters of later debate" (170.) Therefore, recruiting senior committee members to join a caucus is invaluable because they can be significant assets in achieving a caucus' legislative goals.

In terms of CHPC membership, Rep. Henry Waxman (D-CA), as Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, is the highest-ranking CHPC member. Spencer Bachus, (R-AL) is Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Financial Services, and J. Gresham Barrett (R-SC) is Vice Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on the Budget. Caucus co-chairs Mike Turner and Brad Miller are, respectively, members of

the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Financial Services.

The CHPC has a good representation of caucus members who sit on the Appropriations, Ways and Means and Natural Resources Committees. The comparison of committee jurisdiction with relevance to CHPC issues is as follows:

<b>Relevant Committees</b>	<b>CHPC Republican Members on Committee</b>	<b>CHPC Democratic Members on Committee</b>	<b>Total CHPC Members on Committee</b>	<b>Maximum Committee Size</b>
Agriculture	1	6	7	47
Appropriations	5	14	19	66
Financial Services	4	8	12	69
Natural Resources	5	10	15	48
Oversight & Gov Reform	4	10	14	40
Transportation & Infrastructure	7	8	15	76
Ways and Means	4	9	13	41
<b>Totals</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>387</b>

Table 1

In the case of the six external organizations, the CHPC received good reviews regarding how much influence they have on committee leadership on behalf of caucus priorities. “Turner definitely takes the lead when it comes to working committee leadership,” said one partner representative. “Turner saved [Section] 106 in the 108th. The Subcommittee on Parks would have radically altered it, rendering it a much less effective tool. [Those alterations

were] pushed back and once that happened we engaged Turner to broker a Member-to-Member compromise with the Chairman of the Subcommittee.” “Congressman Turner’s work, along with the Advisory Council, on the Section 106 issue and the Historic Preservation Fund reauthorization are examples of the caucus stopping an [internal] threat,” said another partner organization.

On occasion, the chief of staff for one or both co-chairs may be enlisted to place a call to leadership staff to emphasize interest or provide more information. Personal letters to committee leadership and staff addressing points of issue or concern and highlighting benefits are resources that are often employed. In addition, Dear Colleague letters and email alerts sent by staff are effective to inform the caucus membership of imminent committee activity.

Several groups mentioned a desire to have the caucus actively coordinate with other caucuses on issues of mutual interest. One external organization felt this way: “It [the caucus] does not function as a well-coordinated unit at this time”. The feeling among external organizations is that as a whole the CHPC does not have a plan to strategize or coordinate inter-caucus networking. In this case, the author disagrees with the partner organization assessment. A recent example of how coordinated inter-



caucus activity has been done to great effect was received by the author in the form of an email alert from Preservation Action. It stated that the Northeast – Midwest Congressional Coalition's "Revitalizing Older Cities Task Force" made a recent strong show of support for the Community Restoration and Revitalization Act (H.R.1043). Congressman Turner, who serves as a co-chair on that Task Force, was instrumental in coordinating the inter-caucus efforts. The result was a letter<sup>6</sup>, circulated by the Northeast - Midwest Coalition co-chairs in early April 2008 appealing to the Chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means for strong consideration of the bill. According to one CHPC staffer, this inter-caucus coordination has also been done in the past with the Travel and Tourism Caucus around heritage tourism issues and the Battlefield Caucus. "Of course we could always do a better job," he said, and used the example of building a better relationship with the Congressional Black Caucus to elicit their support for African American Heritage funding, which is currently included in the Historic Preservation Fund.

---

<sup>6</sup> MacIntosh, Heather. Preservation Action. Email alert received by author. 9 April 2008

## ***Caucuses and the Public***

In the area of CHPC coordination with the public, external organizations lamented that the CHPC has not been more aggressive in requesting the mobilization of the partners' grass roots networks. Instead, one representative of an external partner organization noted, "The identification of a need for mobilizing partner support for a caucus issue has rarely come directly from the co-chairs. We take the initiative ourselves to mobilize our troops". Interviews with congressional staff and external partners confirm that the majority of public networking and mobilization in fact takes place at the behest of the external organizations rather than through the CHPC. Groups mobilize their networks and constituencies to participate in grass roots advocacy on Capitol Hill. Preservation partners organize annual congressional "lobby days" and host issue-specific events that are geared to connecting caucus members with grass roots organizations in their districts and vice versa.

As far as the caucus's ability to network with external partner groups, all parties agreed that there was room for improvement. Several organizations did note that caucus leadership is interested in receiving briefing materials, issue input, and research from their organizations. The CHPC has requested data for use in committee testimony and to respond to

legislative concerns. On occasion, organizations such as the National Trust or NCSHPO have been solicited for recommendations for potential expert witnesses for hearings. External policy organizations suggested that public networking effectiveness could be improved by publication of a caucus newsletter that external organizations could send to their constituencies to publicize caucus legislative efforts and successes and by scheduling frequent meetings between external organizations and CHPC membership to focus caucus attention on constituent priorities.

## **Navigating Legislative Priorities**

The third key operational process that this thesis examines to determine effectiveness is a caucus' success at navigating legislative priorities through Congress and into law, or preventing passage of legislation that has negative ramifications for its policy goals. Once a legislative priority moves from committee for consideration by the full House, an effective caucus does two things: it focuses congressional attention to build support for the caucus' position, and designs and executes a strategy that raises the possibility for successful floor action whether that is to pass or to prevent passage of a provision or bill (Hammond 179).

### ***Building Support and a Strategy for Floor Action***

On the topic of building support and strategy for floor action on legislative priorities, Hammond writes:

[Caucuses] share information on the content of legislation and the strategies of floor debate; prepare talking points for members in debate; organize floor battles and work with floor leaders; are sought out for assistance by those leaders; and mobilize the grass roots for support on achieving floor success (Hammond 208).

By organizing Member-to-Member meetings to present a coordinated message about a policy issue, yet emphasizing different aspects of the legislation in order to connect with individual Members' specific interests, a caucus strategically builds a broad base of support for its initiative or policy. In addition, by widely distributing informational materials on pending legislation, caucuses create educational opportunities for their partners to assist in building support. These informational materials can be used in newsletters, press releases and briefings, floor speeches, or assembled into debating points and included in The Congressional Record to broaden understanding of issues pending floor action. The earlier these practices begin the better chance the caucus has to develop educated voting blocs and mobilize internal coalitions when an issue reaches the floor for a vote. In addition, identifying and alerting members of Congress about a caucus' issue buried deep within seemingly unrelated legislation is another service caucuses provide before or when legislation reaches the floor.

In interviews, CHPC staff indicated that by the time a caucus issue moves to the House floor for consideration, the CHPC co-chairs and staff

have utilized many of the practices outlined above. Congressmen Turner and Miller take the lead to “work the floor” by seeking out opportunities to meet with leadership and other Members to advocate for an issue. This is done through one-on-one meetings and personal relationships. On occasion, the chief of staff of one or both co-chairs talks through the issue with House leadership staff, making the case at that level as well. Caucus staff also maintains regular contact with external partner organizations, providing updates on floor developments or potential situations so that the partners can deploy external resources and reach out to Members with whom they have personal relationships.

To examine how effective the CHPC has been at navigating its legislative priorities through Congress, the author attempted to determine how many legislative priorities since the beginning of the 108th Congress had positive legislative outcomes. The 108th Congress was chosen as the start date for the time period examined because this is when the CHPC began. A request was made to the staff of both co-chairs' for such a list. In response, staff indicated that the CHPC does not maintain records of their legislative goals and outcomes. As an alternative, the author then requested copies of or information about all correspondence --- including Dear Colleagues, letters of support to subcommittee and full committee chairs, and a list of

legislative remedies initiated by caucus members --- to ascertain legislative priority success. Again, staff indicated that neither office has a complete set of files that contain all the historical records associated with each initiative. When pressed for an explanation of why records of this kind are not readily available, the author was informed that it was probably because staff in congressional offices frequently change, and as records pass from staffer to staffer, gaps in recordkeeping occur. These responses from both co-chairs' offices reveal that neither office has a formalized system in place to capture and document all CHPC activity.

Congressman Turner's staff was able to provide copies of one Dear Colleague and an Appropriations subcommittee letter in support of the Historic Preservation Fund for 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007. Each year's letter outlines the importance of funding core programs in the Historic Preservation Fund such as State Historic Preservation Offices, Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, the Save America's Treasures program, and the Preserve America Initiative. The only other type of such documentation received from Congressman Turner's staff was copies of six letters of invitation written between 2004-2007 for events hosted or co-hosted by the CHPC and external partner organizations.

Congressman Miller's office also provided the author with a copy of H.R. 3981, legislation introduced in 2007 that would permanently fund the Preserve America Initiative and Save America's Treasures Program. That was the only information available from Rep. Miller's office. Three of the six external organizations -- The National Trust, Preservation Action and the NCSHPO were also contacted to see if they maintained such records. None of the three responded to inquiries and so no additional information could be gathered.

Given the above efforts, and the presumption that the best source for such information would and should be the CHPC itself, anything beyond anecdotal evaluation of the CHPC's effectiveness at navigating legislative priorities through Congress into law has not been included here.

Absent such documentation, the author determined to measure CHPC effectiveness by tracking the annual appropriations to the Historic Preservation Fund, given that CHPC representatives identified these appropriations as a key caucus issue. One source was located, a Congressional Research Service report on historic preservation funding which included historic preservation program appropriations for FY2002 – 2006. This information can be seen in Table 2.



Program	FY2002 Approps.	FY2003 Approps.	FY2004 Approps.	FY2005 Approps.	FY 2006 Approps.
<b>Historic Preservation Fund (total) <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>\$74,500,000.00</b>	<b>\$68,552,000.00</b>	<b>\$73,583,000.00</b>	<b>\$71,739,000.00</b>	<b>\$115,172,000.00</b>
Grants-in-Aid to States and Territories <sup>b</sup>	\$39,000,000.00	\$33,779,000.00	\$34,569,000.00	\$35,500,000.00	\$35,717,000.00
Tribal Grants	\$3,000,000.00	\$2,981,000.00	\$2,963,000.00	\$3,205,000.00	\$3,941,000.00
Historically Black Colleges Restoration			\$2,963,000.00	\$3,451,000.00	\$2,956,000.00
<b>Subtotal, Grants-in-Aid</b>	<b>\$42,000,000.00</b>	<b>\$36,760,000.00</b>	<b>\$40,495,000.00</b>	<b>\$42,156,000.00</b>	<b>\$42,614,000.00</b>
Save America's Treasures Millennium Program	\$30,000,000.00	\$29,805,000.00	\$32,594,000.00	\$29,583,000.00	\$29,558,000.00
Heritage Partnership Programs [previously included National Heritage Areas] <sup>d</sup>	[13,206,000.00]	[14,280,000.00]	[14,275,000.00]	[14,579,000.00]	[13,301,000.00]
Preserve America Grants-in-Aid					<sup>c</sup>
Endowment grant for National Trust for Historic Preservation	\$2,500,000.00	\$1,987,000.00	\$494,000.00		
HPF Emergency Appropriations	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$43,000,000.00
<b>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</b>	<b>\$3,400,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,643,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,951,000.00</b>	<b>\$4,536,000.00</b>	<b>\$4,789,000.00</b>

Source: CRS Report for Congress RL33617, Jan 22, 2007

<p>a. Appropriations for Historic Preservation programs are part of the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations. The Historic Preservation Fund previously included grants-in-aid to states, tribal grants, grants to Historically Black Colleges &amp; Universities (HBCUs), the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and Save America's Treasures. It no longer generally includes annual appropriations for the National Trust, except for funding the endowment fund, and the authorization for restoration grants to HBCUs has ended, although funding has been reinstated by Congress.</p> <p>b. The term "Grants-in-Aid to States and Territories" is used in conjunction with the HPF budget and refers to the same program as "Grants-in-Aid to State Historic Preservation Offices."</p> <p>c. P. L. 109-54 provided that an amount not to exceed \$5.0 million may be allocated from Save America's Treasures for Preserve America pilot grants.</p> <p>d. Except for the FY2007 request, these funds are included in totals listed elsewhere under National Recreation and Preservation</p>
---

Table 2

The report, using side-by-side comparisons of the yearly appropriations for historic preservation programs, indicates that FY2003 funding decreased in all programs, the year the CHPC was formed. Except for FY2006, from FY2004 to the present, the Historic Preservation Fund total appropriation has never again reached its FY2002 funding level of \$74,500,000. FY2006 total appropriations funding for all programs increased dramatically, to \$115,172,000 --- but this includes \$43 million dollars in emergency appropriations to specifically address Hurricane Katrina-related preservation issues. Absent this special funding, FY2006 would have also been below FY2002 appropriations. Funding for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation however, has increased at a modest rate each year.

Given the overall downward funding trend, and lack of verifiable information to demonstrate that the CHPC operational process has succeeded in enacting policy priorities, it is impossible to conclude that the CHPC has been clearly effective in enacting legislation or increasing appropriations.

## Summary of Findings

A final assessment as to whether the CHPC is effective at coordinating, advocating, and encouraging enactment of historic preservation policy at the national level is difficult to reach. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of this thesis explained the best practices employed by effective caucuses when setting agendas, organizing and mobilizing networks and achieving legislative victories. Those same chapters examined the CHPC's implementation of these three key operational processes. A summary review of the effectiveness of the CHPC's use of each best practice is offered below.

### ***CHPC Agenda Setting Practices***

#### Issue Research

Findings established that the CHPC makes use of research conducted by external partner organizations as a tool for identifying and understanding the parameters of a problem. Two or three legislative issues were brought to

the attention of the caucus by a group of three external partner organizations, The National Trust, NCSHPO, and Preservation Action. These partners have jointly predetermined that these issues should be the caucus agenda priorities for historic preservation. They presented the issues to the CHPC as fully researched, vetted among the partner constituencies, and with their full support.

There is no evidence though, that the CHPC follows a more proactive, thoughtfully conceived strategy for researching issues for its agenda. It rarely initiates face-to-face meetings to receive direct input from its external partner organizations. It has made no attempt to initiate contact with partners such as US/ICOMOS to identify and understand the issues facing U.S. organizations involved in international preservation. Likewise, no initiative has been made to examine for possible inclusion on its agenda, the ACHP's thirteen Preserve America Summit recommendations, considered by the Executive Branch to be the most important national preservation issues of the next ten years. Therefore, due to the lack of proactive effort on the part of the CHPC it is not as effective as it could be in the practice of using issue research to establish its agenda priorities.

### Creating Legislative or Administrative Remedies

Research confirmed that although they did not initiate the legislation, both CHPC co-chairs have signed-on as co-sponsors to several preservation related bills introduced in the 110th Congress by other Members of Congress, such as H.R. 610 the "Preserve Historic America Act" and H.R. 1043 the "Community Restoration and Revitalization Act". Findings confirmed only one example of the CHPC taking the lead specifically in creating a bill as a remedy for a priority issue on the caucus's legislative agenda: H.R. 3981 the "Preserve America and Save America's Treasures Act" was introduced in October of 2007 by Congressman Brad Miller and co-sponsored by Congressman Turner.

There is no evidence that the CHPC follows a more proactive, thoughtfully conceived strategy for creating legislative remedies. Since the CHPC chooses not to seek its agenda priorities from among the recommendations made by the Preserve America Summit or initiate contact with U.S. organizations involved in international preservation issues, potential opportunities to create new legislation are being missed, therefore it is not as effective as it could be.

### Communicating Agenda Priorities

Findings confirmed that once legislation of concern to the caucus moves into a committee's realm, the CHPC has the ability to communicate its agenda priorities directly to subcommittee and full committee leadership. Efforts on behalf of the co-chairs to develop and maintain personal relationships with relevant committee leadership, Members of Congress, and staff have been responsible for navigating a number of CHPC agenda priorities through the committee process although the caucus has also experienced some failures in this area. Due to this inconsistency, it is determined that the CHPC is not as effective as it could be in the practice of communicating its agenda priorities to relevant committees.

As to the practice of educating Members of Congress and their staff about caucus legislative priorities, again the CHPC falls short of being truly effective. Traditional efforts at education such as using Dear Colleague letters and email alerts, are practiced, but findings indicate that a more creative strategy for capturing the interest of Members of Congress is required. In order to be effective, it is recommended that briefings designed to give Members of Congress and staff a general overview of historic preservation issues should be conducted at the beginning of each congressional session. Specialized briefings on cross over issues that intersect

with preservation in the international as well as national arena should be organized every six months. Finally, off-site events highlighting CHPC legislative priorities should be conducted to create a deeper understanding of the issues and provide opportunities for Members of Congress to see and understand the full impact of preservation efforts in their own districts.

### ***CHPC Mobilization and Networking Practices***

#### With the Executive Branch

Findings indicate that there has been only one CHPC agenda priority, the Preserve America initiative, in which the caucus has proactively mobilized and networked with the Executive Branch. The CHPC, in coordination with the White House and the ACHP, has taken an active role in promoting and generating congressional interest in yearly events such as the announcement of Preserve America Communities.

A more proactive, coordinated effort by the CHPC in mobilizing and networking within Congress on behalf of Executive Branch initiatives such as Preserve America and Save America's Treasures would raise congressional awareness of both programs and create opportunities for high profile events, raising the CHPC's visibility and therefore its effectiveness.

### With Congressional Committees

Research substantiated that the CHPC practices techniques for proactive mobilization and networking within relevant congressional committees. A survey of CHPC members and their respective committee assignments indicated that caucus membership representation on committees with jurisdictional relevancy to CHPC legislative priorities was good, particularly on the Appropriations, Ways and Means and Natural Resources Committees.

The CHPC fosters other means of networking with committee leadership, actively employing person-to-person contact when required. This practice is utilized as a method of addressing points of issue or concern and highlighting benefits of legislative initiatives important to the CHPC. The caucus also makes use of other tools, such as personal letters to committee leadership, when making the case for appropriations for historic preservation programs and initiatives. Research also uncovered several examples where the CHPC has successfully blocked the advancement of hostile legislative initiatives in committee or negotiated compromises. In the practice of networking with committee leadership, the CHPC is effective

Examples of the practice of utilizing inter-caucus networking and coordination to strengthen support for legislative priorities before committees



were found during research, although this practice could be enhanced significantly by developing a more formal, strategic approach. Therefore, the caucus is not as effective as it could be in this area.

#### With the Public

Research indicated the need for significant improvement in the practice of communications between the CHPC and external partner organizations. To do this effectively, face-to-face meetings are required, at which caucus membership and partner organizations could exchange information on constituent priorities, perform long-term strategic planning, and coordinate strategy for upcoming legislative action.

There was no evidence of the CHPC requesting the mobilization of partners' grass roots networks. Instead, identifying the need for mobilizing partner support and then initiating that support is coordinated at the discretion of external organizations. Organized communication with grass roots preservation activists moves through partner organizations to their constituencies. Congressional "lobby days" and issue-specific events geared to connecting activists with members from their districts are all coordinated by external partner organizations. To be effective in this practice the CHPC needs to be more proactive and strategic in employing its external resources.

Once suggestion for improving public communication is for the caucus to produce a newsletter outlining recent and upcoming legislative activity, which could be forwarded to partner organizations as well as to caucus members for use in their districts.

### ***CHPC Legislation Enactment Practices***

#### Building Support and Strategy for Floor Action

Research indicates that once a CHPC legislative priority moves from a committee to the full House for consideration, the caucus engages in activities directed at focusing congressional attention on the issue as a means of building a broad base of support. Strategic opportunities to advocate personally on behalf of an initiative to House leadership are sought by the CHPC through Member-to-Member and staff-to-staff meetings. The distribution of informational materials to congressional offices is coordinated by caucus staff and caucus members are asked to give floor speeches, participate in debate, and submit remarks for printing in The Congressional Record.

Without the benefit of an examination of the historical record of the CHPC's legislative inputs and outcomes it is very difficult to make a determination as to how effective it has been at navigating its legislative priorities through Congress. Indeed, it is not even possible to confirm that

sustained funding levels are the result of caucus activity. A review of yearly totals for appropriations related to historic preservation programs would indicate that the caucus may have been successful at protecting funding levels, but has not been effective at securing any significant increases.

### **Conclusion**

CHPC leadership believes that the caucus is functioning effectively. When asked why, CHPC co-chairs and staff stated that, first and foremost, it has created an entry point into the Congress for both the external preservation community and the Executive Branch. They go on to say that the CHPC also serves as a vehicle for identifying individuals within Congress who are committed to historic preservation. Further, it provides Members of Congress with information that assists in educating them in the nuances of preservation issues. Lastly, the caucus functions as mechanism for focusing Congressional attention and providing support on two or three priority public policy issues of concern to external partner organizations during each congressional session.

External partner organizations consistently articulated the hope of a grander role for the CHPC. Under the leadership of two highly motivated co-chairs (instead of one), those organizations felt that the CHPC could become a real catalyst for change, enhancing the probability of positive legislative

outcomes for historic preservation. Limited time, energy, and staff are widely acknowledged as the largest obstacles holding the CHPC back from being truly effective. The departure of caucus staffer Mike Wiehe, considered an internal motivating force, is viewed as a huge loss for the caucus. A summary list of recommendations made to the author by the partner organizations of ways that the CHPC could increase its effectiveness follows:

### ***Recommendations for Increasing the Effectiveness of the CHPC***

- Take a leadership role in increasing issue reach and defining agenda;
- Expand agenda issue research to include suggestions from representatives of international preservation organizations such as US/ICOMOS;
- Expand agenda issue research to include suggestions from representatives of ACHP/Preserve America Summit recommendations;
- Look for opportunities to create inter-caucus relationships to support overlapping policy goals;
- Create regular opportunities for face-to-face caucus/partner meetings to coordinate issues and strategy;
- Facilitate more opportunities for external partner organizations to assist with educating members through themed briefings and site tours;
- Formalize the caucus' role by creating a mission statement;
- Seek temporary solutions to augment caucus staff with the use of Executive Branch detailees or fellows;
- Seek permanent solutions to augment caucus staff with the use of a dedicated "shared" staffer;
- Create a caucus newsletter;
- Assemble a legislative history of the caucus as a means of tracking areas of caucus strength and weakness and then compile data on caucus initiatives and use it to plan future legislative strategies;
- Gather information on how effective caucuses are able to utilize external nonprofit institutes and foundations to provide issue research, report writing, event coordination, briefings and policy analysis (i.e., The Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, The Congressional Hispanic Institute, Americans for the Arts Foundation, The Northeast Midwest

Institute, The Congressional Sportsman's Foundation and The Women's Issue's Caucus;

- Follow up on Preservation Action's offer to dedicate a full-time intern to assist with caucus issues.

Any informal organization, such as a congressional caucus, will always face more difficult obstacles to achieving its goals than a formal entity, such as a House committee. By the mere nature of its informality, a caucus has limited resources and reach. Yet, as the research above shows, more effective implementation of proven, established practices and processes could greatly improve the caucus's effectiveness. Resources are available that with slight adjustments could significantly impact the likelihood of more positive policy and funding outcomes to benefit the cause of historic preservation.

## Works Consulted

"... and a Flap Over Caucuses." Editorial. The Washington Post 9 Dec. 1994: A28.

ACHP.gov. 2008. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. 17 April 2008 <<http://www.achp.gov/aboutachp>>.

Ahuja, Sunil, and Robert E. Dewhirst. Congress Responds to the Twentieth Century. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2003.

Aldrich, John H., ed. Home Style and Washington Work: Studies of Congressional Politics. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1989.

Associated Press. "GOP to Stop Funding Caucuses, Sparking Outcry by Democrats." Columbus Ledger-Enquirer 8 Dec. 1994 : B7.

Associated Press. "Leaders of Caucuses Chafe Over GOP Cuts - Blacks, Hispanics Call Action Backlash." St. Louis Post-Dispatch 8 Dec. 1994 : 13A.

Associated Press. "Money Unaccounted for, Lawmaker Says Millions Provided to Congressional Caucuses at Issue." The Kansas City Star 7 May 1993 : A6.

Austen-Smith, David. "Information and Influence: Lobbying for Agendas and Votes." American Journal of Political Science 37.3 (1993): 799-833.

Barfield, Deborah. "Demos Vow Caucus Fight." Post-Tribune 9 Dec. 1994 : A3.

Birkland, Thomas A. "Focusing Events, Mobilization, and Agenda Setting." Journal of Public Policy 18.1 (1998): 53-74.

Bookman, Jay. "Message Received, Loud and Clear." The Atlanta Journal and The Atlanta Constitution 11 Dec. 1994 : F4.

Boren, Susan. Historic Preservation: Background and Funding. Vol. RL33617. Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2007.

Bowles, Linda. "The Weaning Process." The Washington Times 20 Dec. 1994: A16.

Branch-Brioso, Karen. "Minority Caucuses Join Forces to Increase Influence in House." St. Louis Post-Dispatch 24 Apr. 2002 : A9.

"Caucus Housecleaning Welcome Step by GOP." Editorial. The State Journal-Register 22 Dec. 1994 : A6.

"Caucuses should Pay Own Way." Editorial. Chicago Sun-Times 11 Dec. 1994 : 45.

Cobb, Roger, Jennie-Keith Ross, and Marc Howard Ross. "Agenda Building as a Comparative Political Process." The American Political Science Review 70.1 (1976): 126-38.

Compiled from News Services. "GOP Vote Turns Congressional Caucuses into Pumpkins." St. Louis Post-Dispatch 7 Dec. 1994 : 16A.

"Congressional Caucuses Waste Taxes." Editorial. Syracuse Herald-Journal 9 June 1992 : A6.

Cooper, Kenneth. "House Democrats Say Caucus Funding Cuts would Hurt Minorities." Austin American-Statesman 8 Dec. 1994 : A16.

---. "Plan to Curb Caucuses Draws Plenty of Heat - House Democrats Say Advocacy would Suffer." The Washington Post 8 Dec. 1994 : A7.

Cox, Gary W., and Mathew D. McCubbins. Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Daily News Wire Services. "Dem Group Sees "Ethnic Cleansing" Congressional Caucuses Face GOP \$ Cut." Philadelphia Daily News 8 Dec. 1994 : 48.

Daniel, Steven F. and Tim Shank, ed. Congressional Member Organizations & Caucuses. Bethesda: Congressional Information Service, 1992.

Ezzard, Martha. "Why should Taxes Fund Special-Interest Caucuses?" The Atlanta Journal and The Atlanta Constitution 21 Nov. 1994 : A10.

"First, Congress, Heal Thyself." Editorial. The Miami Herald 4 January 1995 :16A.

Fischer, Karen. "Congressional Caucuses Advocate and Inform." Charleston Daily Mail 12 March 2001 : 1A.

Gerstel, Steve. "Black, Women's Caucuses, Others Fight Back - but GOP Drive to Kill them may Still Prevail." Richmond Times-Dispatch 1 Dec. 1994 : A.

---. "Caucuses Draw GOP Cost-Cutters-Special Congressional Groups for Blacks, Women and Hispanics Face the Ax." The Tampa Tribune 1 Dec. 1994 : 1.

Gibson, Sandra. "NEA Deserved a Fair Vote in Congress." Press-Telegram 20 July 1997 : B5.

Green, Bob. "Cutting Caucuses is a Move with Potent Symbolism." The Dallas Morning News 1 Jan. 1995 : J7.

Greene, Bob. "We the People Don't Need Caucuses." Chicago Tribune 12 Dec. 1994 : 1.

Groppe, Maureen. "Congress has a Caucus for most any Cause - Special Interest Groups Let Lawmakers Explore Interests and Build Clout." The Indianapolis Star 8 Dec. 2003 : A1.

Hammond, Susan Webb. Congressional Caucuses in National Policy Making. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Harrison, Tiana. "GOP'S Plan to Cut Caucus Cash Assailed." The Palm Beach Post 8 Dec. 1994 : A5.

Haught, Robert. "For Every Cause, A Caucus." The Oklahoman 24 Aug. 2007 : A11.

Hird, John A. Power, Knowledge, and Politics. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2005.

Hoffer, Audrey. "In Caucuses, Lawmakers Find Strength in Numbers-State's Delegation Belongs to a Slew of Interest Groups." Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 25 Dec. 2006 : 03.



"It's Hard to Give Up Benefits." Editorial. The Capital Times 1 Dec. 1994 : 10A.

Jacoby, Jeff. "Segregation on Capitol Hill." Alameda Times-Star 2 Feb. 2007.

Kuhlman, Renee Viers. Working with an Advocacy Coalition. Washington: The National Trust for Historic Preservation - Center for Preservation Leadership, 2006.

Longstreth, Richard W. History on the Line: Testimony in the Cause of Preservation. Ithaca, NY: Historic Urban Plans, 1998.

MacIntosh, Heather. The Center for Preservation Initiatives Journal Volume 5, Number 2.

---. The Center for Preservation Initiatives Journal Volume 5, Number 1.

---. The Center for Preservation Initiatives Journal Volume 6, Number 1.

Mansfield, Jerry W. Informal Congressional Groups and Member Organizations: 109th Congress, 2nd Session. Vol. RL32263. Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2006.

Martin, Gary. "Minorities Blast GOP Move to Cut Caucuses." San Antonio Express-News 8 Dec. 1994 : A1.

Masters, Kim. "With an Aim as Big as all Outdoors- the Sportsmen's Caucus Hunts for Power on the Hill." The Washington Post 26 Dec. 1993 : F1.

"Member's Congressional Handbook". Committee on House Administration online. 2007. U.S. Congress. 18 Apr. 2008 <<http://gop.cha.house.gov/services/membershandbook.shtml>>.

"Merriam-Webster On-Line Dictionary." Merriam-Webster Incorporated. 2007. 25 March 2008 <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>>.

Nau, John L. III, ed. The Preserve America Summit Executive Summary. Washington: Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, August 2007.

---. Proceedings of the Preserve America Summit: Preliminary Issue Area Reports. Washington: Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, October 18-20, 2006.

NCSHPO.org. 2008. National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. 17 April 2008 <<http://www.ncshpo.org/about>>.

Post News Services. "DEMS Howl Over GOP Caucus Cuts." The Cincinnati Post 8 Dec. 1994 : 1A.

Post News Services. "Dems Wail Over GOP Decision to Zap Special Caucus Funding." The Capital Times 8 Dec. 1994 : 5F.

Preservationaction.org. 2008. Preservation Action. 17 April 2008 <<http://www.preservationaction.org/about>>.

Preservationnation.org. 2008. National Trust for Historic Preservation. 17 April 2008 <<http://www.preservationnation.org/about-us.html>>.

Preserveamerica.gov. 2008. Preserve America. 17 April 2008 <<http://www.preserveamerica.gov/overview>>.

Price, Joyce. "Hispanic Caucus Head Blasts Fund Cuts- Calls GOP Plan "Mean Spirited". The Washington Times 12 Dec. 1994 : A4.

"Republicans Right to Halt LSO Funds." Editorial. The Advocate 9 Dec. 1994 : 10.

Richardson, Sula P. Informal Congressional Groups and Member Organizations: Selected Questions and Responses. Vol. RL30301. Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2001.

Rohde, David W. Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Rundquist, Paul S., and Lorraine H. Tong. House Administrative Reorganization: 104th Congress. 96-764 GOV, Washington: Congressional Research Service, 1996.

Salant, Jonathan D. "Cost of Congressional Caucuses is Questioned." The Plain Dealer 12 June 1992 : A3.

Seelye, Katharine Q. "Republicans Vote to Bar Spending for 28 Congressional Caucuses." Daily News of Los Angeles 7 Dec. 1994 : N1.

Sincavage, Rhonda. Communicating with Elected Officials. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation -Center for Preservation Leadership, 2006.

---. Developing a Grassroots Network. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation - Center for Preservation Leadership, 2006.

"Staying in Business- Going Nonprofit." The Washington Times 17 Jan. 1995: A9.

"Taking Special Caucuses Out of Public Trough." Editorial/Opinion. Macon Telegraph 11 Dec. 1994 : 6.

Talbott, Basil. "GOP Kills Funding for House Caucuses." Chicago Sun-Times 7 Dec. 1994 : 6.

Thompson, Jake. "Taxpayers Finance Caucuses' Lobbying Tabs for Dinners, Gifts also are Paid through House Groups." The Kansas City Star 17 May 1993 : A1.

Trescott, Jacqueline. "Gingrich to Celebrities: Endow the Arts Yourself." The Washington Post 11 April 1997: B1.

"Trimming Influence GOP Move is all about Power Not Money." Editorial. Post-Tribune 12 Dec. 1994: A6.

Tursman, Judy P. "Arts Lobby Working to Avoid Federal Cuts." Pittsburgh Post-Gazette 11 March 1998 : A.

United States General Accounting Office. Report to the Committee on House Administration: Legislative Service Organizations, Proposed Accounting Standards and Guidelines. Vol. GAO/AIMD 94-49. Washington: GAO, 1993.

US/ICOMOS.org. 2008. United States National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites. 17 April 2008 <[http://www.icomos.org/usicomos/About\\_USICOMOS/About\\_USICOMOS](http://www.icomos.org/usicomos/About_USICOMOS/About_USICOMOS)>.

Weimer, Douglas Reid. Historic Preservation: Federal Laws and Regulations Related to Hurricane Recovery and Reconstruction. Vol. RS22298. Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2006.

Zagaroli, Lisa. "Hayes Forms Caucus to Bring Charity to Fore-Group to Serve as Forum for Focus on Philanthropic Giving." The Charlotte Observer 4 June 2007 : B2.

## Appendix A Interviews Conducted

January 23, 2008	Susan Webb Hammond, PhD. Author <u>Congressional Caucuses in National Policy Making</u>
February 5, 2008	Ms. Nancy Schamu Executive Director National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers  Ms. Anna Rose Scheduler/Caucus Contact Cong. Brad Miller (D, NC)
February 7, 2008	Mr. Gustavo Araoz, AIA Executive Director U.S. National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites  Mr. Donald Jones, PhD. Director of Programs U.S. National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites
February 11, 2008	Ms. Heather MacIntosh President Preservation Action
February 12, 2008	Mr. Patrick Lally Director Congressional Affairs Public Policy National Trust for Historic Preservation
February 12, 2008	Ms. Rhonda Sincavage Program Associate State and Local Policy National Trust for Historic Preservation
February 13, 2008	Mr. John Fowler Executive Director Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

	Mr. Ronald Anzalone Director Office of Preservation Initiatives Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
February 19, 2008	Mr. George Hadijski Director Office of Member and Committee Services Committee on House Administration
February 20, 2008	Ms. Susan West Montgomery Past President Preservation Action
	Mr. Greg Regan Staff Contact Congressional Arts Caucus
February 25, 2008	Ms. Nellie Longworth Founder Preservation Action
February 26, 2008	Mr. Mike Wiehe Legislative Director Congressman Mike Turner
April 15, 2008	The Honorable Brad Miller (D, NC) Co-chair Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus
April 15, 2008	Mr. Carl Eichenwald Legislative Fellow Congressman Brad Miller (D/NC)
	The Honorable Mike Turner (R, OH) Co-chair Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus
	Mr. Mike Wiehe Legislative Director Congressman Mike Turner (R, OH)

## Appendix B

### Congressional Member Organizations of the 110th Congress

- . 21st Century Health Care Caucus
- . 9/11 Health Caucus
- . Addiction, Treatment and Recovery Caucus
- . Afghanistan Working Group
- . Afterschool Caucus
- . The Appalachian Caucus
- . Albanian Issues Caucus
- . Americans Abroad Caucus
- . America Supports You Caucus
- . Bicameral Congressional Caucus on Parkinson's Disease
- . Biomedical Research Caucus
- . Bipartisan, Bicameral Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease
- . Bipartisan Cerebral Palsy Caucus
- . Bipartisan Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus
- . Bipartisan Congressional Pro-Life Caucus
- . Bipartisan Task Force on Nonproliferation
- . Bipartisan Congressional School Health & Safety Caucus
- . Bi-Partisan Congressional Sugar Reform Caucus
- . Cement Caucus
- . Chesapeake Bay Watershed Task Force (CBWTF)
- . Children's Environmental Health Caucus
- . Class of 2006 Caucus
- . Coalition on Autism Research and Education (CARE)
- . Coalition for the Freedom of American Investors and Retirees (CFAIR)
- . Commission on Divided Families
- . Community College Caucus
- . Congressional Air Medical Caucus
- . Congressional Arts Caucus
- . Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus
- . Congressional Automotive Caucus
- . Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus
- . Congressional Battlefield Caucus
- . Congressional Bike Caucus
- . Congressional Black Caucus
- . Congressional Boating Caucus
- . Congressional Border Caucus
- . Congressional Brain Injury Task Force

- . Congressional Brazil Caucus
- . Congressional Cancer Action Caucus
- . Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus
- . Congressional Caribbean Caucus
- . Congressional Caucus for Freedom of the Press
- . Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues
- . Congressional Caucus on Algeria
- . Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues
- . Congressional Caucus on Bosnia
- . Congressional Caucus on Central and Eastern Europe
- . Congressional Caucus on Community Health Centers
- . Congressional Caucus on Drug Policy
- . Congressional Caucus on the European Union
- . Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues
- . Congressional Caucus on Human Trafficking
- . Congressional Caucus on India and Indian Americans
- . Congressional Caucus on Indonesia
- . Congressional Caucus on Infant Health and Safety
- . Congressional Caucus on Intellectual Property Promotion and Piracy
- . Congressional Caucus on the Judicial Branch
- . Congressional Caucus on Korea
- . Congressional Caucus on the Netherlands
- . Congressional Caucus on Religious Minorities in the Middle East
- . Congressional Caucus on Swaziland
- . Congressional Caucus on Turkey
- . Congressional Caucus on Vietnam
- . Congressional Caucus on Youth Sports
- . Congressional Caucus to Fight and Control Methamphetamine
- . Congressional Children's Caucus
- . Congressional Children's Health Care Caucus
- . Congressional Children's Study Working Group
- . Congressional China Caucus
- . Congressional Climate Change Caucus
- . Congressional Coalition on Adoption
- . Congressional Coastal Caucus
- . Congressional Coast Guard Caucus
- . Congressional Community Pharmacy Coalition
- . Congressional Correctional Officers Caucus
- . Congressional Cuba Democracy Caucus
- . Congressional Cystic Fibrosis Caucus
- . Congressional Czech Caucus
- . Congressional Dairy Farmers Caucus



- . Congressional Dialogue Caucus
- . Congressional Dietary Supplement Caucus
- . Congressional DTV Caucus
- . Congressional E-911 Caucus
- . Congressional Entertainment Industries Caucus
- . Congressional Ethiopia and Ethiopian American Caucus
- . Congressional Everglades Caucus
- . Congressional Fire Services Caucus
- . Congressional Fitness Caucus
- . Congressional Former Mayors Caucus
- . Congressional French Caucus
- . Congressional Friends of Animals Caucus
- . Congressional Friends of Canada Caucus
- . Congressional Friends of Denmark
- . Congressional Friends of Jordan Caucus
- . Congressional Friends of Liechtenstein Caucus
- . Congressional Friends of Spain Caucus
- . Congressional Gaming Caucus
- . Congressional Georgia Caucus
- . Congressional Global Health Caucus
- . Congressional Hazards Caucus
- . Congressional Hearing Health Caucus
- . Congressional Heart and Stroke Coalition
- . Congressional High Technology Caucus
- . Congressional Hispanic Caucus
- . Congressional Hispanic Conference
- . Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus
- . Congressional Horse Caucus
- . Congressional Humanities Caucus
- . Congressional Human Rights Caucus
- . Congressional Insurance Caucus
- . Congressional International Anti-Piracy Caucus
- . Congressional Internet Caucus
- . Congressional Israel Allies Caucus
- . Congressional Kidney Caucus
- . Congressional Labor and Working Families Caucus
- . Congressional Life Insurance Caucus
- . Congressional Long Island Sound Caucus
- . Congressional Manufacturing Caucus
- . Congressional Manufacturing Task Force
- . Congressional Men's Health Caucus
- . Congressional Mental Health Caucus

- . Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus
- . Congressional Motorcycle Safety Caucus
- . Congressional Multiple Sclerosis Caucus
- . Congressional Nanotechnology Caucus
- . Congressional Native American Caucus
- . Congressional Navy-Marine Corps Caucus
- . Congressional Nuclear Cleanup Caucus
- . Congressional Oral Health Caucus
- . Congressional Organ and Tissue Donation Caucus
- . Congressional Organic Caucus
- . Congressional Pakistan Caucus
- . Congressional Peanut Caucus
- . Congressional Philanthropy Caucus
- . Congressional Poland Caucus
- . Congressional Port Security Caucus
- . Congressional Prayer Caucus
- . Congressional Pro-Life Women's Caucus
- . Congressional Progressive Caucus
- . Congressional Real Estate Caucus
- . Congressional Romania Caucus
- . Congressional Rural Housing Caucus
- . Congressional Savings and Ownership Caucus
- . Congressional Science Caucus
- . Congressional Scouting Caucus
- . Congressional Second Amendment Caucus
- . Congressional Serbian Caucus
- . Congressional Shellfish Caucus
- . Congressional Shipbuilding Caucus
- . Congressional Singapore Caucus
- . Congressional Soccer Caucus
- . Congressional Soils Caucus
- . Congressional Songwriters Caucus
- . Congressional Sports Caucus
- . Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus
- . Congressional Steel Caucus
- . Congressional Stop DUI Caucus
- . Congressional Study Group on Public Health
- . Congressional Submarine Caucus
- . Congressional Taiwan Caucus
- . Congressional Task Force on Illegal Guns
- . Congressional Task Force on Tobacco and Health
- . Congressional Task Force on U.S.-India Trade

- . Congressional Tibet Caucus
- . Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus
- . Congressional Ukrainian Caucus
- . Congressional United Kingdom Caucus
- . Congressional Urban Caucus
- . Congressional Victims Rights Caucus
- . Congressional Vision Caucus
- . Congressional Water Ways Caucus
- . Congressional Western Caucus
- . Congressional Wildlife Refuge Caucus
- . Congressional Wireless Caucus
- . Congressional Zoo and Aquarium Caucus
- . Delaware River Basin Task Force (DRBTF)
- . Democratic Budget Group
- . Democratic Israel Working Group
- . Distributed Energy Caucus
- . Diversity and Innovation Caucus
- . Electronic Warfare Working Group
- . E-Waste Working Group
- . Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus
- . Friends of Job Corps Congressional Caucus
- . Friends of Kazakhstan
- . Friends of New Zealand Congressional Caucus
- . Friends of Scotland Caucus
- . Future of American Media Caucus
- . Friends of Paraguay Caucus
- . Generic Drug Equity Caucus
- . Global Family Day Caucus
- . Great Lakes Task Force
- . Gulf Coast Rebuilding and Recovery Caucus
- . House Aerospace Caucus
- . House Air Force Caucus
- . House Anti Terrorism Caucus
- . House Army Caucus
- . House Baltic Caucus
- . House Cancer Caucus
- . House Congressional Biotechnology Caucus
- . House Center Aisle Caucus
- . House Impact Aid Coalition
- . House Mentoring Caucus
- . House Mississippi River Delta Caucus
- . House Naval Mine Warfare Caucus

- . House Nursing Caucus
- . House Oceans Caucus
- . House Potato Caucus
- . House Republican Israel Caucus
- . House Rural Health Care Caucus
- . House Science, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics Education Caucus
- . House Small Brewers Caucus
- . House Sweetener Caucus
- . House Trails Caucus
- . HUBZone Caucus
- . Hungarian American Caucus
- . Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Caucus
- . I-73/74 Corridor Caucus
- . Immigration Reform Caucus
- . International Conservation Congressional Caucus
- . International Workers Rights Caucus
- . Iran Human Rights and Democracy Caucus
- . Iran Working Group
- . Land Conservation Caucus
- . Law Enforcement Caucus
- . Lyme Disease Caucus
- . The Middle Class Congressional Caucus
- . Malaysia Trade, Security, and Economic Cooperation Caucus
- . Medical Technology Caucus
- . Military Veterans Caucus
- . Missile Defense Caucus
- . Modeling and Simulation Caucus
- . National Guard and Reserve Components Caucus
- . National Landscape Conservation System Caucus
- . National Marine Sanctuary Caucus
- . National Service Caucus
- . National Security Interagency Reform Working Group
- . New Democrat Coalition
- . Northeast Agriculture Caucus
- . Northeast Midwest Congressional Coalition
- . Northern Border Caucus
- . Northwest Energy Caucus
- . Nuclear Issues Working Group
- . Oil and National Security Caucus
- . Out of Poverty Caucus
- . Panama Trade, Security and Economic Cooperation Caucus
- . Passenger Rail Caucus

- . Patriot Act Reform Caucus
- . Prisoners of War/Missing in Action Caucus
- . Pro-Choice Caucus
- . Protecting Our Private Property Caucus
- . Public Broadcasting Caucus
- . Recording Arts and Sciences Congressional Caucus
- . Reliable Energy Caucus
- . Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus
- . Republican Study Committee
- . Research and Development Caucus
- . Rural Veterans Caucus
- . Salton Sea Task Force
- . Silk Road Caucus
- . Space Power Caucus
- . Spina Bifida Caucus
- . Suburban Agenda Caucus
- . Suburban Transportation Commission
- . Sudan Caucus
- . Task Force on Terrorism and Proliferation Financing
- . Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare
- . Tennessee Valley Authority Caucus
- . Tunisia Caucus
- . Unexploded Ordinance Caucus
- . US-Afghan Caucus
- . US-China Working Group
- . US-Kazakhstan Interparliamentary Friendship Group
- . US-Mongolia Friendship Caucus
- . US-Philippines Friendship Caucus
- . Victory in Iraq Caucus
- . Water Caucus
- . Zero AMT Caucus

Source:

Committee on House Administration.gov. 2008. U.S. House of Representatives. 17 April 2008. <[http://cha.house.gov/member\\_orgs110th.aspx](http://cha.house.gov/member_orgs110th.aspx)>.

## Appendix C

### Legislative Service Organizations Effected by Reforms of 1995

A provision prohibiting the establishment or continuation of any legislative Service Organization (“as defined and authorized in the 103<sup>rd</sup> Congress”) was passed in the U.S. House of Representatives on January 4, 1995, as part of a House Rules package for the 104<sup>th</sup> Congress. As a result, the groups formerly designated as LSOs lost that status and the special administrative arrangements that were accorded them (i.e., financial support, separate House office space and staff, etc.).<sup>7</sup> Below is a list of the 28 groups formerly designated as LSOs that were effected by the reforms instituted by the U.S. Houses of Representatives in 1995:

Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus  
Congressional Arts Caucus  
Congressional Automotive Caucus  
Congressional Black Caucus  
Congressional Border Caucus  
Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues  
Congressional Clearing House on the Future  
Congressional Hispanic Caucus  
Congressional Human Rights Caucus  
Congressional Hunger Caucus

---

<sup>7</sup> Richardson, Sula P. Informal Congressional Groups and Member Organizations: Selected Questions and Responses. Vol. RL30301. Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2001.

Congressional Populist Caucus  
Congressional Space Caucus  
Congressional Steel Caucus  
Congressional Sunbelt Caucus  
Congressional Textile Caucus  
California Democratic Congressional Delegation  
Children and Families Caucus  
Democratic Study Group  
Environmental and Energy Study Conference  
Export Task Force  
Federal Government Service Task Force  
House Wednesday Group  
New York State Congressional Delegation  
Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition  
Older Americans Caucus  
Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation Steering Committee  
Republican Study Committee  
U.S. Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> List compiled from Post News Services article "Dems Howl over GOP Caucus Cuts". The Cincinnati Post 8 December 1994, Metro ed.:1A

**Appendix D**  
**Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus**  
**Formation Letter**

**Congress of the United States**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

February 13, 2007

The Honorable Juanita Millender-McDonald  
Chairman  
Committee on House Administration  
1309 LHOB  
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Vernon J. Ehlers  
Ranking Member  
Committee on House Administration  
1309 LHOB  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Millender-McDonald and Ranking Member Ehlers:

We are writing to request that the Historic Preservation Caucus be re-established as a CMO in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress.

The purpose of this Caucus is to bring together Members of Congress who value America's historic places as definers of our national character. The Caucus will serve as a forum for Members to discuss ways to protect and revitalize America's historic places. Historic preservation touches on heritage tourism, commercial revitalization of distressed downtowns, and the rehabilitation and reuse of historic housing stock.

The co-chairs of this Caucus will be the undersigned Representative Michael R. Turner of Ohio and Representative Brad Miller of North Carolina. Stacy Barton will be Mr. Turner's staff contact for the CMO and Anna Rose will be Mr. Miller's staff contact.

Thank you for considering our request to form this Congressional Member Organization. We look forward to our roles in chairing the Historic Preservation Caucus.

Sincerely,



Michael R. Turner  
Member of Congress



Brad Miller  
Member of Congress



**Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus Membership, 110<sup>th</sup> Congress**

Democrats- 78

Rep. Tom Allen (ME)	Rep. Ed Markey (MA)
Rep. Rob Andrews (NJ)	Rep. Jim Marshall (GA)
Rep. Tammy Baldwin (WI)	Rep. Betty McCollum (MN)
Rep. Melissa Bean (IL)	Rep. Jim McDermott (WA)
Rep. Earl Blumenauer (OR)	Rep. Jim McGovern (MA)
Rep. Rick Boucher (VA)	Rep. Mike McIntyre (NC)
Rep. Nancy Boyda (KS)	Rep. Martin Meehan (MA)
Rep. G.K. Butterfield (NC)	Rep. Michael Michaud (ME)
Rep. Russ Carnahan (MO)	Rep. Brad Miller (NC) [Co-chair]
Rep. Julia Carson (IN)	Rep. Alan B. Mollohan (WV)
Rep. Ben Chandler (KY)	Rep. Dennis Moore (KS)
Rep. Donna M. Christensen (VI)	Rep. Jim Moran (VA)
Rep. Michael Capuano (MA)	Rep. Jerrold Nadler (NY)
Rep. Jim Cooper (TN)	Rep. Richard Neal (MA)
Rep. James Clyburn (SC)	Rep. John Olver (MA)
Rep. Bud Cramer (AL)	Rep. Frank Pallone (NJ)
Rep. Elijah Cummings (MD)	Rep. Donald Payne (NJ)
Rep. Artur Davis (AL)	Rep. Earl Pomeroy (ND)
Rep. Lincoln Davis (TN)	Rep. David Price (NC)
Rep. Susan Davis (CA)	Rep. Mike Ross (AR)
Rep. Peter DeFazio (OR)	Rep. Steve Rothman (NJ)
Rep. William Delahunt (MA)	Rep. Heath Schuler (NC)
Rep. Lloyd Doggett (TX)	Rep. Jose Serrano (NY)
Rep. Bob Etheridge (NC)	Rep. Louise Slaughter (NY)
Rep. Charles Gonzalez (TX)	Rep. John Spratt (SC)
Rep. Bart Gordon (TN)	Rep. Adam Smith (WA)
Rep. Stephanie Herseth (SD)	Rep. Vic Snyder (AR)
Rep. Maurice Hinchey (NY)	Rep. John Tanner (TN)
Rep. Brian Higgins (NY)	Rep. John Tierney (MA)
Rep. Rush Holt (NJ)	Rep. Mark Udall (CO)
Rep. Stephanie Tubbs Jones (OH)	Rep. Tom Udall (NM)
Rep. Jay Inslee (WA)	Rep. Chris Van Hollen (MD)
Rep. Steve Israel (NY)	Rep. Diane E. Watson (CA)
Rep. Patrick Kennedy (RI)	Rep. Mel Watt (NC)
Rep. James Langevin (RI)	Rep. Henry Waxman (CA)
Rep. Tom Lantos (CA)	Rep. Peter Welch (VT)
Rep. John Larson (CT)	Rep. John Yarmuth (KY)
Rep. Rick Larsen (WA)	
Rep. Barbara Lee (CA)	
Rep. John Lewis (GA)	
Rep. Carolyn Maloney (NY)	

## Republicans - 38

Rep. Spencer Bachus (AL)  
Rep. J. Gresham Barrett (SC)  
Rep. Rob Bishop (UT)  
Rep. Marsha Blackburn (TN)  
Rep. Roy Blunt (MO)  
Rep. Joe Bonner (AL)  
Rep. John Boozman (AR)  
Rep. Henry Brown (SC)  
Rep. Dan Burton (IN)  
Rep. Eric Cantor (VA)  
Rep. Mike Castle (DE)  
Rep. Howard Coble (NC)  
Rep. Tom Cole (OK)  
Rep. Barbara Cubin (WY)  
Rep. David Davis (TN)  
Rep. Phil English (PA)  
Rep. J. Randy Forbes (VA)  
Rep. Jim Gerlach (PA)  
Rep. Virgil Goode (VA)  
Rep. Wayne T. Gilchrest (MD)  
Rep. Kay Granger (TX)  
Rep. Tim Johnson (IL)  
Rep. Ray LaHood (IL)  
Rep. Ron Lewis (KY)  
Rep. Jim McCrery (LA)  
Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (WA)  
Rep. Sue Myrick (NC)  
Rep. Mike Pence (IN)  
Rep. Joe Pitts (PA)  
Rep. Todd Platts (PA)  
Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (FL)  
Rep. Mike Turner (OH) [Co-chair]  
Rep. Mark Souder (IN)  
Rep. Cliff Stearns (FL)  
Rep. Fred Upton (MI)  
Rep. Zach Wamp (TN)  
Rep. Joe Wilson (SC)

Source: Anna Rose, Office of Congressman Brad Miller, U.S. House of Representatives. Washington, DC. 5 February 2008

**I**

104th Congress, 3, 25, 26  
 108th Congress, 1, 29, 30, 55

**A**

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 4, 5, 38, 39, 45, 46, 59, 61, 64, 69, 71  
 ACHP. See Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

advocacy, 2, 6, 7, 10, 29, 42, 51  
 agenda setting, 9, 34, 35, 37, 40, 41, 60,

**B**

bicameral, 1, 21, 27  
 bipartisan, 1, 21, 25, 27, 30

**C**

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 47, 48  
 Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus, 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 21, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69  
 CHPC. See Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus  
 Congressional Member Organization, 1, 3, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29  
 CMO. See Congressional Member Organization  
 Committee on House Administration, 3, 20, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32  
 Community Restoration, and Revitalization Act, 36, 50, 62  
 Congressional Black Caucus, 21, 50, 69

**D**

distributive theory, 14, 15

**E**

Executive Branch, 4, 8, 10, 34, 38, 44, 45, 61, 64, 68, 69

**H**

Hammond, Susan Webb, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 29, 33, 34, 35, 44, 45, 46, 47, 53, 54  
 Historic Preservation Fund, 36, 49, 50, 56, 57, 59  
 historic preservation policy, 1, 2, 4, 5, 35, 60

**I**

informational theory, 15  
 issue research, 9, 35, 60, 61, 69

**L**

legislative cartels, 16  
 legislative enactment, 9  
 legislative remedies, 9, 56, 62  
 Legislative Service Organization, 23, 24, 25  
 LSO. See Legislative Service Organization

**M**

Member's Congressional Handbook, 26, 27, 28, 30  
 Miller, Brad 31, 39, 47, 62

**N**

Nau, John, 38  
 National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites, 4, 5, 7, 37, 39, 42, 61, 69  
 National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, 4, 6, 29, 39, 52, 57, 61

NCSHPO. See National Conference of  
State Historic Preservation Officers,  
National Trust for Historic Preservation, 4,  
6, 29, 31

NTHP. See National Trust for Historic  
Preservation

## **P**

partner organization, 3, 4, 8, 30, 35, 36,  
37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 49, 51,  
55, 56, 60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69,

party caucus, 21

party theory, 15, 16

personal-interest, 21, 35

policy entrepreneurs, 25

Preservation Action, 4, 7, 29, 50, 57, 61,  
70

Preserve America, 4, 5, 6, 36, 37, 39, 56,  
57, 61, 62, 64, 69

Preserve Historic America Act, 62

public partners, 10, 44

## **R**

Roberts, Pat, 24

## **S**

Save America's Treasures Act, 39, 62  
Section 106, 41, 48, 49

## **T**

Turner, Mike, 31, 47

## **U**

U.S. House of Representatives, 1, 12, 26,  
27, 29, 7, 17, 31, 32, 34, 92, 93, 97

US/ICOMOS, See National Committee of  
the International Council on  
Monuments and Sites

## **W**

watchdogs, 9, 46