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Abstract
Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, State Historic Preservation Offices have been required to create and implement Statewide Historic Preservation Plans on a recurring cycle. Despite this longstanding requirement, State Plans have been overlooked in academic research and there have been few comprehensive evaluations of the planning process, the written plans, and their implementation. This thesis begins to fill that gap in research and suggests further areas of study for future researchers. Through interviews with staff at the National Park Service, an online survey of SHPOs in U.S. states, territories, and Freely Associated States, and follow up interviews with seven states, this thesis analyzes current practices of State Planning, including common challenges to planning, areas of success, and innovative practices. This thesis recommends best practices for SHPOs’ creation and implementation of Statewide Historic Preservation Plans, as well as ways for the NPS to assist states in their planning processes.
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Introduction

Historic preservation regulation in the United States operates at the local, state, and federal levels. Though local and federal preservation practices and policies have been extensively studied, state-level preservation has tended to be overlooked. States serve as a bridge between hyperlocal preservation practices at the municipality level and broader preservation practices at the national level, such as establishment of national policies and management of national historic sites. State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) serve their states by consulting on Section 106 reviews and federal and/or state rehabilitation tax credit projects, overseeing the nomination process to the National Register of Historic Places and state historic registers, assisting Certified Local Governments, and creating a comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan (State Plan). SHPOs have been required to create State Plans on a recurring basis for nearly sixty years, yet the plans have gone practically unnoticed in academic research and writing.

This invisibility in academia is mirrored in the limited guidance provided to SHPOs for the creation and implementation of their State Plans. The basic requirement to produce State Plans is found in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, while regulations and policies can be found in the Code of Federal Regulations and the Historic Preservation Fund Grants Manual; guidance documents created by the National Park Service provide more detail. However, despite these existing guidance documents, and as revealed in the survey undertaken for this thesis, SHPO employees still report feeling isolated, overwhelmed, and/or unprepared to complete the State Planning process. Furthermore, about 21 percent of surveyed preservation professionals who are charged with completing their State Plan report that they do not believe the State Plan is an
effective tool for preservation in their state, and 37 percent believe it is only somewhat useful. As many SHPOs are known to be often overworked, underbudgeted, and understaffed, the task of creating a recurring State Plan can be unwelcome and daunting. Challenges in the creation and implementation of a State Plan should inspire creativity and innovation to craft better, more effective plans, but instead, challenges are too often accepted as an impossible obstacle to overcome.

As evidenced in municipalities nationwide, planning can be an effective tool to analyze previous actions, understand current opportunities and issues, and act to better serve the community. Other statewide and regional planning has in many cases had demonstrable effects, so it is not merely the case that Historic Preservation Plans at a state level are too expansive to be meaningful. Successful plans also influence the actions of their partners, from local preservation organizations to other governmental agencies, broadening the positive impact of a well-crafted and well-implemented State Plan. State Plans can be effective, but they need to be activated with innovative strategies and monitored. David Banks, the current State Plan reviewer for the National Park Service, stated in an interview with the author that he believes the dissemination of best practices for State Plans would be an asset to SHPOs and fill a gap in the currently available NPS guidance documents.¹ The comparative analysis in this thesis of selected state plans and identification of best practices is intended to serve as a first step into further analyses of ways to increase state historic preservation plans’ effective use.

¹ David Banks, interview with the author, October 4, 2021.
This thesis analyzes the current practices of Statewide Historic Preservation Planning through qualitative research methods including survey and interviews, in the absence of academic analysis of the statewide planning program, in order to identify best practices for preparing, writing, implementing, and monitoring statewide preservation plans. The methodology consists of four parts:

1. Conduct online research to compile and analyze existing guidance documents and best practices evaluations regarding Statewide Historic Preservation Plans as well as create a regulatory summary of the background and requirements of State Plans;

2. Gather qualitative data from State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) though an online survey about the process of creating, writing, implementing, and monitoring their plans;

3. Based on survey responses, interview a small sample of offices to get in-depth information about their State Planning process, particularly areas in which they have found solutions to common State Planning problems;

4. Synthesize the online research, survey responses, and interviews to recommend best practices for State Plans.

This thesis demonstrates how many SHPOs, despite limited time, staff, and budget, can craft a State Plan that effectively guides their office, their partners, and the public in preservation-related efforts. Furthermore, through identification of common challenges, disappointments, and successes of preservation planning at the state level, this thesis provides the foundation for further study of state planning as well as creation of strategies at the state and national level to overcome planning obstacles.
Limitations

Due to the time constraints of the thesis process, this research will not thoroughly examine the current or previous State Plan(s) for every state, of which there are hundreds. Nor will this thesis analyze Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) plans, as they are sufficiently different from State Plans in content and purpose. This study will not serve to rank the “best” Statewide Historic Preservation Plans; the goal of this research is to identify best practices, not the best planners. Finally, this thesis will not examine potential alternatives to the State Plan. Rather, understanding that the State Plan is currently required by law, this thesis hopes to make the State Plan as effective a tool for preservation as possible. Realistically, this goal of raising the effectiveness of the State Plan will need further study and research to be fully achieved. Suggested areas for further research are summarized in the final section. This thesis is also grounded in the following assumptions:

1. Statewide Historic Preservation Plans are reasonably effective, and their use will continue to be required under federal law.

2. A smaller sample of surveyed SHPOs (39 out of 59 states, territories, and Freely Associated States (FAS)) can be representative of statewide preservation planning practices nationally.

3. Statewide Historic Preservation Plans are generally similar enough to foster meaningful comparisons.

---

2 Rather than a tribal version of a State Plan, THPOs submit an initial program plan as part of their application for a Partnership Agreement with the NPS and annual reports of their accomplishments to maintain eligibility for HPF formula grants and Tribal Project Grants.
Definitions of Terms

Statewide Historic Preservation Plan (State Plan): A Statewide Historic Preservation Plan is a statement of public policy that guides decision-making about preservation of cultural resources, addresses preservation challenges throughout a given state, and establishes goals and objectives for the State Historic Preservation Office and its partners. Statewide Historic Preservation Plans are required on a regular basis (at least every 10 years) under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and an approved plan is required for a state to receive funding through the Historic Preservation Fund.

State: In the Code of Federal regulations, “state” refers to a state, territory, or possession of the United States. For the purposes of this thesis, unless otherwise specified, “state” will refer to states, territories and Freely Associated States, though the preservation planning process for territories and FAS differs somewhat from that of states.

Freely Associated States (FAS): Freely Associated States are independent nations that have signed a Compact of Free Association with the United States; these nations include the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau.

State historic preservation program or State program: A state government organization or program meeting the requirements that section 101(b) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, specifies.

---

3 36 CFR § 1.4.

4 20 USC § 1003(21)(B).

5 36 CFR § 61.2.
State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO): The office within each state, territory, and FAS whose staff, under the State Historic Preservation Officer, administers the state historic preservation program.  

Statewide Historic Preservation Planning: An Overview

Legal Basis and Requirements

Federal regulations dictate the creation of Statewide Historic Preservation Plans; regulatory sources are critical to consider, as they are the foundational guidelines for State Plans and constitute the core of the state planning program (Figure 1 and Table 1). The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) created the requirement for State Plans, giving a broad mandate for State Historic Preservation Officers to create and implement a comprehensive preservation plan, to be developed and updated on a regular, recurring basis. This mandate is situated within another mandate, requiring state preservation programs to designate a State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), gather a qualified State Historic Preservation Review Board, and maintain adequate public participation in the State preservation program. So, because of these two regulations,

---

6 Though SHPO is also used to denote State Historic Preservation Officer(s), for the purposes of this thesis SHPO will always refer to the State Historic Preservation Office. When the State Historic Preservation Officer is referenced, they will be referred to as such.


8 For outlines of typical State Planning processes and structure, see Appendices A and B.


State Plans are required for each State preservation program and are to be approved by the National Park Service (NPS) and the Secretary of the Interior (the Secretary).

Figure 1. This simple flowchart depicts the relationships between existing elements of the legal framework for State Plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Impact on the State Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| National Historic Preservation Act         | 1966 | • Creates the State Historic Preservation Officer & defines their authorities and responsibilities  
                                             |      | • Creates requirement for State Plans  
                                             |      | • Broad mandate for State Historic Preservation Officers to create & implement comprehensive preservation plans |
| Historic Preservation Fund                 | 1976 | • Established in an amendment to the NHPA  
                                             |      | • To qualify for HPF grants, a state’s application must align with their approved State Plan |
| Code of Federal Regulations (36 CFR § 61)   |      | • Require SHPOs to carry out a historic preservation planning process and develop a statewide plan to guide preservation  
                                             |      | • SHPOs’ failure to meet HPF grant requirements is cause for "appropriate action" by the Secretary |
| Historic Preservation Fund Grants Manual   | Updated 2007 | • Details NPS’ minimum requirements for State Plans  
                                             |      | • Defines preservation planning |
| Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation Planning | 1983 | • Criteria (under CFR) for NPS to review State Plans  
                                             |      | • Largely resource-focused, using outdated "RP3" style of planning |

Table 1. This table summarizes the legal framework of State Plans and each document’s impact on State Planning.

The NHPA also established the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF).\textsuperscript{11} The Secretary, through the NPS, administers matching grants to states to assist in their preservation programs. Under the NHPA, grants cannot be given to states unless their application aligns with their comprehensive State Plan, which in turn must be approved by the Secretary and the NPS. Interestingly, the law also states that the review and approval of comprehensive preservation plan will consider its relationship with the state’s

\textsuperscript{11} 54 U.S.C. §303101.
outdoor recreation plan. However, SHPOs rely on HPF grant funding, and to access this funding they must have an approved State Plan.

The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) codifies these broad NHPA requirements, requiring SHPOs to “carry out a historic preservation planning process” and develop a statewide plan to guide preservation decision making. The CFR also reiterates the Secretary’s program of grants for states and tribes to assist with preservation projects and programs, pending approval by the Secretary. However, the regulations go further than the NHPA, stating that the failure of a state preservation program to meet the requirements for HPF grants is a cause for comment and “appropriate action” by the Secretary of the Interior. Statewide preservation planning is not optional; federal regulations offer the incentive of grant funding for complying with planning requirements, but also allude to penalties that they may use if a state fails to comply. In this case, the penalties implied are the potential decertification of the SHPO, which has never happened to date, or the withholding of HPF funds until the regulations are satisfied. Importantly, the CFR also notes the criteria that the Secretary and NPS will use to assess state compliance: the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation Planning (Standards), as well as any additional guidance documents the National Park Service may create or provide.

---

12 54 U.S.C. §302901
13 36 CFR § 61.4(b)(1).
14 36 CFR § 61.5
15 36 CFR § 61.3.
Nesting further within this regulatory hierarchy, the *Historic Preservation Fund Grants Manual (HPF Manual)* builds on the other regulations, detailing the NPS’ minimum requirements for plans to meet the legal mandates. The *HPF Manual* is the first regulatory document to provide a definition for State Plans’ preservation planning, describing it as, “the rational, systematic process by which the SHPO develops a vision and goals for historic preservation throughout the State.”\(^\text{16}\) Notably, the NHPA and CFR do not define “preservation planning,” and the *Standards’* definition only states that, “Preservation planning is a process that organizes preservation activities (identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of historic properties) in a logical sequence.”\(^\text{17}\) The vision and goals are to be based on analysis of historic resource data as well as the user needs, and the SHPO should achieve the vision both in its own actions as well as through its influence on others’ actions. The State Plan should be used by the SHPO and other groups and individuals in the state to guide decision-making, coordinate statewide preservation activities, and communicate statewide policies, goals, and values to constituents and decision-makers.\(^\text{18}\)

Required elements of the State Plan as explained in the *HPF Manual* include a summary of the plan’s development and public participation, analysis of data about the state’s historic resources, issues and opportunities affecting historic resources, goals and objectives for the state, a time frame for the planning cycle, and a bibliography. As with

---


existing guidance documents, the issue of public participation is given extra consideration. Plans are required to encourage public and professional participation and are meant to be widely distributed to the public. The manual specifically states that it is not sufficient for SHPOs to consult only with other preservation professionals or preservation organizations in the development of the State Plan and goes on to list a wide range of groups that SHPOs should consider involving in their planning process, such as Tribes, federal and state agencies, underserved communities, state and local elected officials, and the real estate community.

Though the HPF Manual describes the minimum requirements for the State Plan, it still remains broad in its requirements and recommendations. This is unsurprising, as it is meant to guide states that vastly differ in size, historic resources, population, and SHPO staff capacity, to name only a few differences. For example, the Plan is instructed not to be a detailed resource-specific document, but should rather be concise, maintaining the “appropriate level of detail” to communicate its findings and conclusions.\textsuperscript{19} The manual fails to describe what exactly the Secretary or National Park Service will deem “appropriate” levels of detail; this is perhaps appropriate, as it allows the HPF Manual’s requirements to remain relevant even as practices of State Planning shift over time.

As previously mentioned, the legally-required standards for State Plans are the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation Planning, which were created in 1983. The Standards are not specific to statewide preservation planning. Similar to the HPF Manual, the Standards define preservation planning as a process; however, the

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
Standards’ definition is much more narrowly focused on historic resources, describing planning as a process in which the identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment of historic resources is organized into a logical sequence.\textsuperscript{20} The publication details three standards:

I. Preservation planning establishes historic contexts;

II. Preservation planning uses historic contexts to develop goals and priorities for the identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment of historic properties; and

III. The results of preservation planning are made available for integration into broader planning processes.\textsuperscript{21}

The Standards were published seventeen years after the creation of the National Historic Preservation Act, when many states were still establishing and consolidating their state preservation offices. As Banks observed in an interview, the Standards are largely academic and resource-focused, and therefore more applicable to city or individual resource preservation plans, not larger statewide plans.\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore, planning based solely or primarily on historic contexts is not sufficient to meet the contemporary expectations of the NPS plan reviewers. Thematic historic contexts are helpful, but State Plans are expected to go beyond the analysis of historic resources, discussing and analyzing topics such as preservation’s stakeholders, the intersection of preservation and economics, and preservation’s political capital in the state. The HPF

\textsuperscript{20} National Park Service, “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation Planning,” 44716.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 44717.

\textsuperscript{22} David Banks, National Park Service, interview with the author, October 4, 2021.
Manual and Standards have not been updated since 2007 and 1983, respectively, to reflect these expectations.

Literature Review: Existing Guidance and Previous Evaluations

One of the primary justifications for this research also presents an impediment to an extensive literature review: there are few studies or resources that critically discuss the creation, writing, implementation, or evaluation of Statewide Historic Preservation Plans. To date, the author has identified only three reports directly evaluating the State Planning process, all of which have been removed from public accessibility since at least November 2021. Because of the lack of critical evaluations and academic resources, this literature review also includes informational resources, many of which have been created by the NPS to help guide State Historic Preservation Offices.

Evaluative Works

The NPS Interagency Resources Division conducted the first report directly analyzing State Planning practices in 1992; although not available online, information regarding the report has been obtained through the NPS’ 2014 report. The 1992 research worked with 33 SHPO staff in 29 states to analyze critical issues for State Plans. These issues included SHPO funding, staff capacity, and lack of staff expertise, all of which were commonly reported by SHPOs in 2022 as well.\(^{23}\) SHPO staff that were interviewed

in 1992 also called for some of the same types of assistance as contemporary SHPOs, including increased funding, training, and innovative case studies.

The second report was conducted by the consulting firm SMS, Inc. in July 2012 for NPS and the Hawaii SHPO, analyzing best practices in State Plans that could serve as an example for Hawaii. At the time of this thesis’ publication, this report is no longer accessible on the NPS website. SMS examined 52 existing State Plans, focusing on states that emphasized measurable goals and objectives in their Plan. The team assessed common elements of State Plans, such as justifications for the Plan and planning process, inventories of resources in the state, opportunities and threats to preservation, and lists of preservation tools. Across the Plans they reviewed, goals tended to fit into one of four common categories: expanding the existing resource inventory, increasing public awareness and support, promoting preservation as an economic tool, and developing or maintaining partnerships. SMS identified Georgia, Texas, and Colorado as three states engaging in best practices for goal-setting. However, the team did not conduct research beyond reading and analyzing the State Plans; as so much of a Plan’s effectiveness hinges on its implementation as well as its written document, analysis using only the written Plan seems incomplete.

The third NPS-related analysis of the State Planning program was conducted in August 2014 by Lindsey E. Morrison, a NPS intern. Morrison’s project sought to identify strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities in NPS’ current programming for State Plans and allow NPS to better understand the challenges SHPOs face in planning. As with the

---

SMS report, this report is no longer accessible on the NPS website, meaning there are currently no evaluative reports of the State Planning program available to the public and, presumably, to the SHPOs. Morrison surveyed 57 states and territories, garnering 65 responses from 45 states and territories. Her research reported that almost two-thirds of states had asked for extensions to their planning cycle, 70 percent of states were asked to expand their sections on public engagement, and 51 percent of states had not adequately interpreted their cultural resource and/or public survey data.\(^{25}\) States reported the same challenges that were reported in 1992 and again in 2022: limited staff, high workloads, limited public engagement, and inadequate funding. 89 percent of Morrison’s respondents expressed interest in NPS-led training about plan development and implementation. Morrison concluded with four goals for NPS to address SHPO challenges, including increasing knowledge of State Plans’ purposes through written guidance, increasing interactions between NPS and SHPOs through trainings and information sharing, encouraging creative thinking by sharing innovative case studies, and improving the profile of State Planning by establishing regular reports to the Secretary about SHPOs’ needs and effectiveness.

Two other documents, while not evaluations of State Planning directly, merit mentioning. Lyssa Djuna Papazian’s 1992 thesis, “Getting a Seat at the Table,” addressed the State Plan as a way to integrate the preservation field with land-use planning concerns, building alliance with planning professionals.\(^{26}\) Though her thesis does not


analyze State Planning practices, it is the only thesis focused on the State Plan that the author found among 15 universities’ and colleges’ thesis databases; thus, it is notable as one of few, if not the only, published academic work related to State Plans.

The other evaluation-based document is a 1994 Performance Review of HPF partnerships, conducted by the NPS Advisory Board. State Planning is one of the areas that the performance review analyzed, and recommendations included eliminating extra NPS reviews of State Plans, simplifying NPS plan approvals, and redirecting resources towards SHPO training and technical assistance.\textsuperscript{27} NPS was also encouraged to regularly disseminate what they have learned from reviewing State Plans. However, though this document does somewhat analyze State Planning, it is primarily from the perspective of NPS and is of limited use for SHPOs.

\textit{Informational and Guidance Resources}

Aside from regulatory requirements and the few reports mentioned above, the available resources discussing Statewide Historic Preservation Plans are typically informational or guidance resources created to assist SHPOs in their planning efforts. Most contemporary resources were developed by NPS in 2014 after the publication of Morrison’s \textit{SHPO Perspectives} report; some of these resources (and their associated webpages on the NPS website) have had slight revisions since 2014, but even with updates, many guidance resources remain essentially unchanged. According to David Banks, the creation and availability of guidance documents has varied widely depending

on who is in the NPS plan reviewer position.\textsuperscript{28} Interestingly, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO) does not provide any guidance or analysis documents.

Many of such guidance documents and webpages are simply basic overviews of State Planning. For example, the webpage entitled “Statewide Historic Preservation Planning,” on the NPS Preservation Planning Program site conveys baseline information about State Planning: its requirement under the NHPA, its purpose as a statement of public policy for each state, and key features of a completed State Plan such as a statewide focus, public participation, and analysis of trends affecting historic preservation.\textsuperscript{29} As the name of the webpage suggests, “Federal Requirements for Statewide Historic Preservation Plans,” gives a succinct overview of the federal laws, regulations, and policies that undergird the State Planning process.\textsuperscript{30} The information from the previous two webpages is repeated and expanded upon in the “Statewide Historic Preservation Plans Basic Requirements Overview,” which goes on to summarize the requirements found in the \textit{HPF Manual}.\textsuperscript{31} All three of these webpages do provide

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} David Banks, Interview with the author, October 4, 2021.
\end{itemize}
accurate and potentially useful information about State Plans and the State Planning process, but the information they provide is not (or should not) be anything that SHPO staff do not already know. Rather than provide new or detailed guidance, these sources are more useful for disseminating information about State Planning to the general public or to SHPOs’ preservation partners.

NPS’ “Planning Tips for Developing a Statewide Historic Preservation Plan,” originally published as a separate document in 2014 and republished as a new webpage in 2021, reiterates some of the same information as the previously mentioned webpages, but goes on to illustrate, for the first time in any of these documents, a flowchart of the State Planning process and considerations for each step. The “Guidance for Developing Statewide Historic Preservation Plans” webpage essentially repeats the information available in the *HPF Manual*, though it does have a helpful list of ideas for different types of public participation. This is more convenient to access and read, but does not provide much more guidance than what is available elsewhere.

NPS has also created a few thematically-focused guidance documents for SHPOs, mostly focusing on public participation and diversity. The first of these is a simple 2014 document suggesting three topics or themes for preservation planners to consider in their upcoming State Plans. The suggested topics included the 50th anniversary of the NHPA,

---


which occurred in 2016 and could serve as a call for reflection on the history of preservation in each state as well as preservation’s accomplishments over those 50 years; underrepresented communities, including new ways to recognize and preserve the legacy of underrepresented groups and establishing or strengthening the partnerships between preservationists and underrepresented communities; and disaster and resiliency planning, including planning for climate change, identifying vulnerable resources, and pre-planning adaptation strategies.\textsuperscript{34} Though the 50\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the NHPA has long since passed, the topics of representation in preservation and disaster planning continue to be important considerations both to SHPO staff and to NPS plan reviewers.

Another thematic document created by the NPS in 2014 focuses on diversity. The “Toolkit for Strengthening Diversity in Preservation Planning,” recommends essential questions for SHPOs to consider as they move through the phases of State Planning, as well as specific, action-oriented recommendations to incorporate diverse communities into the State Planning process. For example, in the “Build a Vision” section, guiding questions discuss how new partners can expand and enhance the shared vision for statewide historic preservation, and recommendations for public participation encourage SHPOs to consider geography, work schedules, religious observances, and public transit access when setting public meeting locations and dates.\textsuperscript{35} This guidance seems especially useful as SHPOs across the country are striving to incorporate Diversity, Equity,


Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) principles into their work. Unfortunately, when the NPS website and resources were updated in fall 2021, this toolkit was no longer provided as an online resource.

The third thematic document focuses on effective public participation. Lawson, Ryan, and Hutchison’s 1993 guide, *Reaching Out, Reaching In*, describes the underlying principles and practices of public participation programs as well as the internal staff work associated with public outreach. The report was commissioned by the NPS and was written jointly by an NPS intern, a preservation planner from the Maryland SHPO, and a consultant specializing in community relations for planning projects. Using Maryland’s 1986 public outreach strategies as an example, the guide walks SHPOs through methodologies for designing and engaging in public participation activities.36 The guide’s final section also discusses internal challenges such as limited resources, the loss of a staff position, and factions among advisory committees.

Though there are some thematic focuses, most of this somewhat limited array of guidance resources attempt to cover the entire range of required and suggested elements of a State Plan. Among the resources created by the NPS, information and suggestions tend to be duplicated throughout the documents and webpages. Though none of the resources were created to evaluate current State Plan processes, a few did briefly suggest best practices and highlight success stories from various states.

---

Territories and FAS are not required to complete State Plans in order to receive HPF funding in the same way that states are, but they are encouraged to do so in order to guide their preservation actions. NPS has created a specific webpage with recommendations, entitled “Recommendations for Historic and Cultural Resources Planning in Pacific Territories and Associated States,” which takes the policies from the *HPF Manual* and suggests related actions. For instance, in reference to Chapter 6 Section G.2.b of the *HPF Manual*, NPS’ suggested actions for territories and FAS are to clearly communicate the Plan’s purpose to the public, fellow professionals, and stakeholders in meeting announcements, press releases, handouts, etc.\(^{37}\) Parts of this webpage are essentially restating information that SHPO staff should already know from the *HPF Manual*, but the suggested actions could be helpful for any SHPO, regardless of its status as a state, territory, or FAS, particularly for staff who are new to the preservation planning team. Tips such as creating a project schedule or referencing theme studies for historic resource data are not groundbreaking, but they can be a helpful reminder of basic best practices for State Planning.

David Banks also provided the author with a PowerPoint presentation that he uses when working with SHPOs. It describes some of the specific requirements for State Plans, such as including a summary of their planning process and development; it also goes beyond this to provide detail about what exactly NPS reviewers are looking for in

State Plans.38 Furthermore, the presentation goes on to describe items that are not required but are suggested, such as disaster preparedness, as well as instructions regarding HPF tracking via an online portal.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Preservation Planning (Guidelines), much like the Standards, are technically available to guide SHPOs’ planning efforts but are out of date and reflect planning practices that have not been used by SHPOs for decades.39 The Guidelines were designed to fit the Resource Protection Planning Process (RP3) style, which uses historic contexts as the foundational documents for an area’s preservation plan. Though some of the principles about goal-setting are still relevant for contemporary planning styles, large sections of the Guidelines are solely focused on developing historic contexts.

White and Roddewig’s Preparing a Historic Preservation Plan is oriented towards local preservation planning, but its larger discussions of elements of effective preservation plans are broadly applicable, and the resources could be used as an informational and guidance resource for SHPO planning teams.40 Douglas Eadie’s Taking Command of Change is similarly focused on a topic that is different from but related to State Planning: SHPO strategic development.41 Despite this difference in focus, tips and

---


guidance regarding vision-setting, identifying external conditions affecting preservation, and selecting strategic issues can all be translated over to State Planning.

_The Landscape of Planning: Other State and Regional Plans_

It is also important to note that State Plans do not exist in a vacuum; to be effective, they should consider, interact with, and be referenced in other large-scale plans. The SHPO holds a particular position between local actions relating to historic resources and the broad development of policy and guidance at the national level; in addition, the SHPO engages with state-level activities alongside other state agencies. Because of their position as a bridge between every level of preservation work, the SHPO and the State Plan are potentially relevant for a multitude of other types of plans. These plans are numerous, including statewide and regional historic preservation nonprofit plans, National and State Heritage Area management plans, historic site management plans, National and State Park plans, natural resource area plans, transportation master plans, outdoor recreation plans, county and municipality land use plans, emergency management plans, and tourism and economic development plans. This broad landscape of plans, as well as other state or region-specific plans, are all potentially relevant to historic preservation, and therefore potentially relevant to the State Plan. Realistically, SHPOs cannot actively read or engage with every possible plan in their state, but it is important to acknowledge that outside users of the State Plan may also be guided by one or many of these other plans.

As an example, in Maryland alone some of the specific plans that relate to preservation activities include:
• Preservation Maryland’s Strategic Plan
• Management plans for three National Heritage Areas: Appalachian Forest, Baltimore, and Journey Through Hallowed Ground
• Maryland Department of Transportation’s Maryland Transportation Plan and the Statewide Transit Plan
• Maryland Department of Natural Resources’ Land Preservation and Recreation Plan
• The Maryland Office of Tourism’s Tourism Marketing and Development Plan
• The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Chesapeake Bay Comprehensive Water Resources and Restoration Plan
• The Environmental Protection Agency’s Chesapeake Bay Watershed Implementation Plans

These plans tend to cover large areas, including entire states and regions, much like State Plans. Though it is outside the scope of this thesis to analyze the creation, implementation, and effectiveness of other large area plans as compared to the State Plan, that is a potentially fruitful area for future research.

Methodology

Because of the limitations of existing literature regarding State Plans, establishing a methodology for this thesis proved to be challenging. Though interesting information
could be gleaned from reading every state, territory, and FAS current and previous State Plans, the sheer number of those plans in combination with the time limitations of this thesis meant that it was not a realistic option. Furthermore, as mentioned previously, simply reading State Plans does not provide one with a comprehensive understanding of SHPO experiences in preparing, writing, and implementing State Plans.

As initially conceived, this thesis’ methodology was to conduct an online survey of SHPO staff and then examine three or four states through interviews and in-depth case studies regarding their State Plan process, challenges, and successes. However, the online survey generated a much larger response than anticipated. Because of the amount of data available from the survey as well as the richness and breadth of responses, I chose to shift the methodology away from in-depth case studies. Instead, in the next chapter I will summarize the interviews I conducted with Cory Kegerise and David Banks, both of whom helped establish my understanding of the State Plan, expectations for completed State Plans, and challenges SHPOs face in preparing and implementing the Plans. 42

This in turn led me to write at length about the survey responses, organized by topic, and include illuminating vignettes from various interviewed states as they relate to the topics discussed.

The SHPO survey was conducted online through a Google Form. Invitations to complete the survey, along with explanations of the thesis and the survey’s purpose, were emailed to State Historic Preservation Officers and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officers from all 50 states as well as the District of Columbia, five territories, and three

---

42 As previously mentioned, David Banks serves as the NPS reviewer for State Plans. Cory Kegerise serves as a Supervisory Grants Management Specialist for the NPS and works with States in the planning process.
email addresses were collected from the NCSHPO website and, in some cases, emails for SHPO staff members were provided by Cory Kege. The survey was opened on February 2, 2022, and closed on February 19, 2022. Two reminder emails were sent out on February 10, 2022, and February 16, 2022. Three late responses were accepted on February 23\textsuperscript{rd}, February 24\textsuperscript{th}, and February 26\textsuperscript{th}. The survey generated a total of 43 responses from 39 different states, territories, and FAS; four states provided two responses from different SHPO staff members (Figure 2).

Figure 2. The 43 respondents to the SHPO survey. States in green indicate one survey response; states with green and gray stripes indicate two survey responses.

States selected for follow-up were frequently mentioned by other states in response to the question, “Are there other states that you look to as models for preservation planning?” and/or self-reported their states’ successes in areas that other
states found challenging. Seven follow-up interviews were conducted between March 4, 2022, and March 25, 2022 (Figure 3). All interviews were held virtually through video conference platforms, as they provided an easily accessible and cost-effective format to connect with respondents across the country.

Survey responses (Appendix B) were anonymized for publication; names, states, and any state-related information were removed from the individual survey responses. This was done both as a way to protect individual SHPO staff members and to foster a safe space to offer honest, unfiltered responses in the survey.\textsuperscript{43} To analyze survey data

\textsuperscript{43} Though every effort was taken to anonymize the survey responses, the author recognizes that some individuals may still be able to deduce or presume the identities of surveyed individuals. The author asks that readers maintain the respondents’ privacy regarding their survey responses.
while maintaining confidentiality, states, territories, and FAS were categorized by region, population size, and land area (Figures 4-6). This not only provides confidentiality, but also provides additional lenses to analyze potential trends among states’ responses. When an individual state’s survey response is noted, it will be referred to by its region. SHPO staff selected for follow-up interviews agreed to forego anonymity in their interview responses and will be referred to by name in the vignette sections.

Figure 4. States categorized by region. Regions are roughly based on the NPS’ National Historic Landmark Administrative Regions (https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalhistoriclandmarks/contactus.htm).
Figure 5. States categorized by land area.

Figure 6. States categorized by population as of July 1, 2021.
**NPS Interviews**

*David Banks*

The author spoke with David Banks (via telephone call), a Preservation Planner with the State, Tribal, Local, Plans & Grants Division of the NPS, on October 4, 2021. Mr. Banks has been in his current role for five years and is responsible for providing assistance to SHPOs as they create their State Plan, reviewing draft Plans, and providing NPS approval of the State Plans. He is the third person to hold this position with the NPS and noted that changes in the position have affected the available guidance for State Planning. The first staff member in this position created many guidance documents about preservation planning, which were subsequently removed by the next person to hold the position. Mr. Banks noted that though there are some guidance documents online (see the Literature Review), most states simply call him to discuss guidance and assistance.

Mr. Banks also noted the issues of change over time in regard to the *Standards*, which are more focused on physical resource preservation rather than broad statewide goal-setting. Additionally the *Standards* reflect the previous influence of NPS “RP3” planning, which was developed in the late 1970s for historic resource identification and management.\(^{44}\) This format relies heavily on historic contexts and is helpful in understanding a state’s resources but does not provide essential information for statewide preservation such as public engagement, political capital, or funding. Though Mr. Banks noted that State Plans no longer use the RP3 format, the *Standards* have not been updated to reflect this change.

\(^{44}\) “The State Plan,” *Arkansas Archaeological Survey*, Updated 2017. [https://archeology.uark.edu/who-we-are/50moments/stateplan/](https://archeology.uark.edu/who-we-are/50moments/stateplan/)
Mr. Banks provided baseline information about State Plans, including timeframes, general planning processes, and typical State Plan formats. He stated that most SHPOs use a five-year interval for their planning cycle, though he has encouraged states to move to ten-year cycles with shorter five-year updates. He also described that, while states’ plans can vary, they all generally cover the same information and contain the same foundational documents, such as lists of state and national laws affecting preservation, lists of preservation partners, and lists of SHPO programs. He also noted that, in his perception, states rarely cover new issues in their plans, even from one plan to the next within a state. This is partially due to the format of the State Plan; for instance, lists of partners and laws are unlikely to change drastically between plans, and general goals or visions for a state may remain quite similar over time, even if more specific objectives change.

He also noted a few things that he would like to see more of, and in more State Plans. Implementation plans were first on this list; though not required, Mr. Banks has been pushing for more SHPOs to create implementation plans as a form of accountability for their goals and objectives. Though many states have a section of their State Plan covering implementation, he would like to see more “fleshed out” implementation plans. Incorporating the Plan’s goals and objectives into SHPOs’ employee work plans was noted as one way to increase accountability; this is reiterated in SHPO survey responses and follow-up interviews. Annual check-ins with SHPOs’ partners were also recommended as a way to encourage accountability for the Plan’s goals outside the SHPO and as a way to track implementation.
Mr. Banks would also like to see clearer goals in the State Plans. As he put it, a State Plan should “slap people with the goals and objectives,” meaning that they are upfront, clear, and easy to understand. Any reader of a State Plan should be able to identify the source of a goal or objective; in other words, readers should be able to tell which issue, threat, opportunity, or public response discussed in the Plan revealed the need for such a goal or objective. Goals should also have measurable objectives that describe how the SHPO and/or its partners can work towards meeting those objectives, and thus implement the Plan. Some description of the state’s political climate and the local, state, and federal laws and regulations that affect a state’s preservation program should also be noted within the Plan, as they set a framework for what types of goals and actions are realistic for the state.

Beyond our initial conversation, Mr. Banks also provided feedback on the survey before it was sent out, assisting with the specific language and phrasing of the questions. Through email, he provided a PowerPoint presentation that he uses when assisting SHPO planning staff and tracked down older NPS guidance documents, though they were not accessible due to COVID-19 restrictions.

Cory Kegerise

The author spoke with Cory Kegerise (via Microsoft Teams), a Supervisory Grants Management Specialist with the State, Tribal, Local, Plans & Grants Division of the NPS, on January 28, 2022. In his current role Mr. Kegerise works alongside states in oversight, review, and assistance during State Plan creation; he also has previous work experience in both the Maryland and Pennsylvania SHPOs, providing a nuanced lens of
State Plan creation and implementation. When asked to describe the State Plan, he characterized the Plans as having unrealized potential; the task of addressing resources, issues, and interested groups across an entire state is difficult. He also described these challenges as being increased by the decentralized nature of the preservation movement and preservation activity. Because “preservation” is so widely distributed across different groups, different missions, and different project types, the preservation community can be difficult to unite around a set of goals and themes.

Like Mr. Banks, Mr. Kegerise noted the difference between current State Planning practices and those of the 1980s that he had read during his time in Maryland; he described State Plans of that era as being much more detailed and containing greater levels of accountability, which could potentially make them more useful. The Plans he was able to access from that era had discrete tasks and to-do lists for the SHPO, nonprofits, developers, etc., which clearly showed where each group fit into the Plan and their responsibilities in carrying out the Plan.

Mr. Kegerise also provided clarity regarding some of the inner workings of State Plans. For instance, he explained that a major current focus for NPS reviews of State Plans is public and stakeholder engagement strategies, as the NPS views public engagement as one of the most valuable elements of the Plan. This information helps frame the SHPOs’ survey responses, described in the following section; many SHPOs referenced future goals and current successes around public engagement, suggesting the NPS focus on engagement has successfully trickled down to SHPO activities.

Furthermore, he described that, to his knowledge, many SHPOs struggled to find professional consultants who were knowledgeable about the State Plan and preservation;
multiple SHPOs echoed this in their survey responses, describing their disappointment in previous planning consultants. Mr. Kegerise also noted that NCSHPO has a discussion forum that SHPOs can use to contact one another regarding technical assistance for their planning process, such as RFPs for hiring consultants. This was reiterated by survey respondents, though some SHPOs desire greater cross-SHPO contact.

Mr. Kegerise suggested some questions for the SHPO survey, all of which were included in some form. He recommended asking states about their current place in their planning cycle, their use (or non-use) of consultants, and their opinion on the usefulness of the State Plan. Responses to these, as well as the rest of the survey questions, can be found in the following sections. He also described a number of potential avenues for future research, which are included in the final section of this thesis.

Survey Responses

Matrix A (Appendix D) compiles the results of the online SHPO survey. Though respondents were asked for their name and their state for the author’s tracking purposes, names and references to states have been removed from the matrix to retain respondents’ confidentiality, which many requested. For the full list of survey questions, see Appendix C.

Current and Previous Roles, SHPO Experience, and Experience with State Plans

The survey began with basic questions about respondents’ experiences with SHPO employment and State Plan creation; this was intended to provide insight into the roles, knowledge, and experience of staff who are creating and contributing to State Plans.
throughout the country. The majority (84 percent) of respondents reported that they are the primary manager of the State Plan for their SHPO. Responses were nearly evenly split regarding respondent’s job within the SHPO, with 33 percent acting as the State Historic Preservation Officer or Division Director, 30 percent serving as the Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer or Deputy Director, and 37 percent working in another role at their SHPO. A slight majority of respondents (53 percent) have not acted in any previous roles at their SHPO or another SHPO.

Nearly two-thirds (63 percent) of respondents have worked on previous State Plans, either for their current office or another SHPO (Figure 7). This is welcome news, as it indicates that most SHPOs have people with practical experience at the helm of their State Planning efforts. It also adds nuance to the existing guidance literature (see Literature Review). As 37 percent of respondents indicated that they have not worked on another State Plan, “base-level” guidance that reiterates regulations, policies, and basic tips for planning does serve a useful purpose. However, most staff creating State Plans do have experience creating, writing, and implementing these plans. Though this was not part of the information gathered in the survey, SHPO staff may also have experience with other types of plans, providing them with experiential knowledge to draw from. Furthermore, the vast majority of respondents (approximately 84 percent) have been working on their SHPO State Planning team for at least two years; about 40 percent of respondents have worked on State Plans for ten or more years (Figure 8). Because of their working knowledge and experience with State Planning, these SHPO staff are likely to need more specific, in-depth guidance documents, as well as fresh ideas about how to
improve their State Plan. As indicated in this thesis’ literature review, those sorts of guidance are currently lacking.

Figure 7. A pie chart depicting survey respondents’ previous experiences with State Planning.
Most respondents (58 percent) reported having teams of five or more people working on their State Plan; in contrast, 12 percent of respondents reported that they are the only staff member responsible for the State Plan at their SHPO (Figure 9). This variation in team size does not appear to be directly correlated with particular regions. The majority of respondents in every region except for the Southeast reported teams of five or more people; one-third of respondents in the Southeast reported that they were the only team member. Team sizes tended to increase as state size or population size increased, but small teams of one or two were still reported in every category except states with land areas between 75,000 and 100,000 square miles, states with populations
between 1 and 3 million, and states with over 12 million people. 100 percent of respondents from states with the largest populations reported planning teams of five or more people.

![Figure 9: A pie chart depicting team sizes among respondents’ SHPO State Planning teams.](image)

Respondents were also asked about their personal and team training and/or education in planning. City and regional planning education is historically and academically separate from historic preservation, though the two fields overlap and interact regularly. SHPO staff, depending on their educational background, may not have had any formal instruction about creating a comprehensive plan before they joined the office. These questions were also partly inspired by the author’s conversation with Cory Kegerise; he mentioned states that he knew struggled to find professional consultants
who were both competent planners and understood the tenets, laws, and practices of preservation.

A near majority of respondents (46 percent) reported having neither training nor education in planning. One-third (33 percent) of respondents had acquired training in planning but had no planning education, and 21 percent of respondents were both trained and educated as planners (Figure 10). When asked if any of their fellow SHPO planning team members had planning training or education, 49 percent said their team as a whole had none. 42 percent reported that some of their team had training or planning education, but not the majority of the team; only 9 percent reported the majority of their team had planning training or education (Figure 11). Responses to later survey questions revealed that multiple states were hindered in their planning efforts by issues with staff expertise in planning. As one state reported, their office has struggled to find either planners with relevant preservation knowledge or preservationists with relevant planning knowledge. This gap between preservation knowledge and planning knowledge was also reported by states who recently lost long-time staff planners. While having a preservation planner who has long-term experience with State Plans is a clear benefit, the loss of those planners either to retirement or layoffs creates a void in a SHPO that can be difficult to fill, particularly given the previously-mentioned planning-preservation educational divide.

No respondents reported their entire team as trained or educated in planning. This alone is not concerning, as there is value in having team members with different strengths and backgrounds guiding the State Plan, particularly given the broad range of
preservation activities that the State Plan covers; it is not necessary for the full team to have a planning background.

Figure 10. A pie chart depicting survey respondents’ professional training and/or education in planning.
Respondents were then asked about their office’s experience with hiring consultants to assist in the plan’s creation and/or implementation. The survey did not provide defined categories for this question, but responses tended to be in one of the following four categories. The majority of respondents (51 percent) said their State Plan did not use consultants, or they were unsure if their state had ever hired a consultant (Figure 12). A further 14 percent reported that they had previously hired a consultant but did not do so in their most recent plan. Their reasons for moving to in-house work included increased staff capacity, fluctuations in available funding for consultants, and negative experiences with previous consultants. Eight respondents (19 percent) said their SHPO regularly hired consultants for their State Plan. This number was initially surprising, given how many SHPOs reported struggling with staff capacity to create the...
plan, but makes more sense when Kegerise’s previously-mentioned comments about finding qualified consultants as well as issues of funding for consultants are considered. Finally, 16 percent of respondents reported that their SHPO hired a consultant for the first time for their most recent State Plan. Many of these states cited lack of internal staff capacity or the loss of staff positions that previously handled the State Plan as the reason for hiring consultants.

![Hiring State Plan Consultants]

*Figure 12. A pie chart depicting survey respondents’ use of consultants for State Planning.*

Among states who have used consultants, 43 percent reported that their consultant assisted with public outreach and engagement efforts; consultants were also reported as helping with general plan development, goal-setting, composition, and graphics. Public outreach can be a long and involved process, so it is unsurprising that consultants are often tapped to take this pressure from SHPO staff. Consultants can also act as a more
neutral facilitator at public meetings, particularly when communities are likely to be divided over preservation decisions. A few states also mentioned that hiring consultants for public outreach helps reinforce to the public that this is not merely the SHPO’s plan, but rather is a plan intended for everyone to participate in and contribute to.

Midwestern states tended to hire consultants more regularly than other regions, with 50 percent of respondents reporting regular consultant use; interestingly, the Midwestern region was the only category of states (by region, land area, or population) in which the number of respondents reporting regular use of a consultant was greater than the number of those reporting no use of a consultant. No states in the Southeast or Intermountain region reported regularly hiring a consultant, though 17 percent and 43 percent of respondents from those regions, respectively, noted that their team hired their first consultant for their most recent planning cycle. SHPOs in the southeast were least likely to use a consultant, with 83 percent of respondents reporting that their SHPO did not regularly hire consultants. By land area, at least 50% of every grouping of states reported that they never hire consultants. Notably, a quarter of states with land areas between 25,000 and 50,000 square miles and half of states with areas over 100,000 square miles reported that they hired their first consultant for the most recent Plan. Similarly, two-thirds of respondents from states with populations over 12 million people reported hiring their first consultant.

Vignette: Hiring a Consultant in Texas

When the Texas SHPO was considering hiring a consultant for their upcoming State Plan, the team realized they needed to take the advice they had given to so many
citizens – hire professional experts for work you do not know how to do. As Amy Hammons, the Texas Main Street State Coordinator, explained, “We aren’t community planners, and we needed help to get public input.”45 After conferring with other SHPOs about typical Requests for Proposals (RFPs) to gauge standard practices, the SHPO sent out an extensive RFP. Staff aggressively promoted their RFP, sending it to all the consultants they were familiar with as well as posting it to Facebook and LinkedIn.46 Ultimately, they received five proposals. The SHPO knew it was asking for a lot of help with its public engagement and plan writing, and was drawn to Nick Kalogeresis and his team of Chicago-based consultants at the Lakota Group because of their background in preservation planning and their willingness to bring in sub-consultants who were experts in Texas heritage and disaster planning. The Lakota Group had previously consulted on three municipal preservation plans in Texas, but this was their first time consulting on a State Plan. Despite this, as Kalogeresis noted, he and his team were deeply familiar with State Plans, as they read the relevant State Plan(s) as a matter of practice for guidance when working on municipality or county-level plans. The Texas SHPO was also drawn to the Lakota Group’s strategy of listening and consensus-building in community engagement. As Kalogeresis described it, “We like to let the community tell us what’s important to them, and we try to take a backseat at public meetings.”47

45 Amy Hammons, Texas Historical Commission, interview with the author, March 23, 2022.

46 Based on interviews, it does not seem that SHPOs typically need formal approval to expand solicitation beyond firms in their state, though most prefer firms from their state or neighboring states since those firms are more likely to be familiar with that state’s historic resources.

Process of Planning

SHPOs were asked about the steps in their state’s planning process as well as where their state is currently in the planning cycle as a way for the author to better understand each SHPO’s perspective in their survey responses; a SHPO that recently submitted a completed plan is likely to have a different perspective from a SHPO who is starting a new planning cycle. This question also allowed for analysis of potential regional, population size, or land area trends regarding planning cycles. If similar states are aligned in their planning cycles, it could be easier to foster cross-state collaboration and support in the planning process.

In their descriptions of the SHPO’s planning process, most states’ answers followed the basic three or four step process of evaluating the previous plan, conducting public outreach, and analyzing outreach and historic resource data. However, some states provided additional or distinct steps in their planning. For example, a few states mentioned that they conduct research into current trends of preservation and forecasted operating environments in their state; this enables them to create a plan that is up-to-date with the larger preservation field and is poised to address factors that may affect the plan’s implementation. One state specifically mentioned issues of diversity and climate change as points which their SHPO chose to highlight, despite the two issues not being a major focus amongst public survey responses. As the respondent wrote: “Our plan will reflect the public will, but as a leader in preservation, SHPO believes it's important to introduce new issues to the statewide discussion.”48 Some states conducted multiple

48 Quotations throughout this survey section, unless otherwise noted, are taken directly from the author’s online survey of SHPO staff. Quotes in vignette sections are referenced in footnotes.
surveys as part of their public outreach, focusing on the general public, state agencies, THPOs, and/or preservation professionals. Interestingly, one response noted that their planning process did not involve retrospective evaluation of the previous plan’s achievements; the respondent did not explain this further. A final unusual response mentioned their office’s use of GIS overlays and real estate data to find areas of endangered resources in which the SHPO could focus future work.

Most of the offices responding to the survey (about 47 percent) had recently published a new State Plan or were waiting for NPS approval before publishing. Nearly a quarter of SHPOs (23 percent) had just started a new planning cycle or were waiting for the start of a new cycle. A little over 11 percent and 18 percent of SHPOs were actively creating their State Plans, either in the outreach and data gathering phases or in the analysis and drafting phases (Figure 13).

![Figure 13. A pie chart depicting survey respondents’ current phases in the State Planning cycle.](image-url)
The Northeast, Southeast, and Midwest regions roughly mirrored the national trends, with the majority of states either in the beginning phases of a planning cycle or having recently completed a State Plan. Respondents in the Intermountain region and the West/Pacific region tended to have roughly equal numbers of states in each of the planning phases. Notable outliers by land area were states between 50,000 and 75,000 square miles, 80 percent of whom had recently completed a plan, and states over 100,000 square miles, 50 percent of whom were in the outreach phase. States categorized by population size tended to mirror national trends, except for states with populations over 12 million, of which 50 percent were in the outreach phase. These tendencies of similar states to be in the same phase of planning demonstrates a potential springboard for increased SHPO State Planning collaboration, which could be encouraged by NPS actions.

Vignette: Internal Management of the Planning Process in Pennsylvania

For their most recent State Plan (2018-2023), the Pennsylvania SHPO shifted its internal Plan creation structure. Previously, one staff member did almost all the work of writing and creating the Plan, and when he retired the office needed to restructure their efforts. According to Shelby Splain, the Education and Special Initiatives Coordinator for the SHPO, she noticed that her colleagues dreaded the Plan and the intense work involved in creating it and decided to spread the Plan’s work across the office.\textsuperscript{49} They created a steering committee whose members each served as the chair of a working group and together created the Plan’s schedule and guiding principles. From there they created

\textsuperscript{49} Shelby Splain, Pennsylvania SHPO, interview with the author, March 16, 2022.
working groups: Outreach, Partners, Analysis, and Graphics; members of the working
groups were assigned based on staff’s skills and interests. For example, the Graphics
working group was responsible for collecting images for the Plan, creating the Plan
outline, and working with their agency’s graphic designer. Splain reported that though
there was still some staff burnout, the new Plan creation strategy worked much better
than the previous method and, by giving every member of the SHPO a role, it garnered
more staff buy-in to the Plan and its objectives.

Impediments to Planning

SHPOs were asked two questions about impediments and issues that limit their
ability to successfully create and implement the State Plan. The first question asked them
to simply list and describe all the issues they faced, the second asked them to identify the
one (or in some cases, two) issues that they consider the most important to address in
their state.

When listing all their impediments, respondents most often cited staff capacity
(44 percent of responses), funding (35 percent), public outreach or engagement (28
percent), and issues in the planning process or internal management (19 percent). Issues
with implementation, staff’s technical expertise, geography, consultants, and natural
disasters were all mentioned as well; two respondents reported no impediments to their
planning (Figure 14).
In terms of staff capacity, most responses discussed the fact that SHPO staff tasked with preservation planning duties have other primary duties within their office; State Planning may be less of a priority than regulatory or time-sensitive duties. Additionally, State Plan work is no small task. Undertaking the State Planning process is a time-consuming, lengthy project, which one respondent described as a “significant additional workload on top of my normal duties.” As this quote indicates, the Plan is not seen as part of this particular SHPO respondent’s normal duties, despite it being a continual, cyclical process. Another respondent noted how a lack of staff time for State Planning increased issues with the Plan’s budgeting: “The funding wouldn't be an issue if we had much more staff time that we could allocate towards the process.” Staff capacity also hinders promotion and implementation efforts for State Plans. As one respondent explained, the return of staff’s focus to their daily duties once a plan is approved steals
energy from promoting the plan, which then hinders its implementation by the SHPO’s partners. The staff member went on to write: “The lengthy plan development period is mentally exhausting, yet the work needs to continue almost immediately in terms of promoting and implementing the plan. Continuing the momentum through the promotion and implementation phase tends to be the biggest challenge for our state.”

Issues of staff capacity go beyond simple calculations of time allocated to different tasks. Overwhelmed and burned-out SHPO staff will not only be less likely to produce the best plan or implement its goals; they are also less likely to believe in the purpose of the State Plan or its ability to shape preservation in their state. One respondent noted their greatest impediment is a psychological barrier that they and their staff face when creating the State Plan, stating, “…the plan is basically a pointless task that has little impact on the daily work and is not particularly worth doing well.” This is dispiriting, even if it is not surprising. State Plans, though they may not be viewed as such by struggling SHPOs, do have the potential to impact preservation in the state, such as increasing the number, quality, and effectiveness of Certified Local Governments (CLGs) in a state; increasing the numbers and diversity of state and National Register nominations; increasing the numbers of Programmatic Agreements for Section 106; or enriching interpretive themes in the states’ historic sites. State Plans can be a vehicle for capitalizing on and highlighting the “daily work” of SHPOs.

As referenced above, funding and budgetary issues are linked to many other planning impediments. In addition to staff capacity, lack of funding was reported as hindering SHPOs’ ability to hire consultants, create or attend public engagement events, follow up with individuals after public engagement events, and create programming to
promote their completed plan. One of the surveyed SHPOs stated that their office spent nearly $30,000 just on their consultant, printing, and postage, even with in-house publication.

Public outreach was cited both as an issue of SHPO effort and public response. Multiple SHPOs noted that public outreach efforts were further hindered in their latest planning cycle by the COVID-19 pandemic; in some states, geography also affects staff’s ability to reach in-person events. Furthermore, multiple states argued that the general public has reached a point of burnout with online survey requests. One state reported that their office had tried multiple avenues of public outreach, including in-person meetings, bilingual meetings, and online surveys both in English and translated to other languages; none of their efforts had produced the desired result.

When asked to prioritize the issues, staff capacity remained at the top (33 percent), but public outreach and internal management both moved up in the list of issues (26 percent and 19 percent, respectively). Less-reported responses included funding, plan implementation, staff’s technical expertise, geography and natural disasters. As with the previous question, two respondents reported no major impediments (Figure 15).
Figure 15. A graph depicting the frequency that each impediment appeared in survey responses when respondents were asked to prioritize the impediments their SHPO faces.

The top four impediments nationally (staff capacity, public engagement, funding, and internal management) continued to be the major impediments across state categories. The Northeast and Intermountain regions as well as states with populations under 1 million people tended to report difficulties with public engagement as a greater impediment than other regions or population categories. No respondents from state with populations between 7 million and 12 million reported issues with public outreach; this is an outlier amongst all categories of states. Respondents from nearly all categories maintained staff capacity as either the most-reported or second most-reported issue, with at least 30 percent of survey responses mentioning it; states with populations under 1 million are the sole outlier, with only 13 percent of responses mentioning staff capacity.
States with land area between 75,000 and 100,000 square miles reported funding-related impediments far more than any other state category (71 percent of responses).

**Addressing Reported Issues**

Following their discussion of planning impediments and issues, SHPOs were asked to report any strategies their office has implemented to address those issues (Figure 16). 42 percent of respondents reported either that no strategies had been implemented or that strategies that their office attempted had not been successful. Most did not elaborate beyond this; based on the reported impediments, it is likely that SHPO staff do not feel they have the capacity to experiment with new problem-solving strategies, nor do they have the flexibility in their budgets to try any costly solutions to their problems. Of the 25 respondents who reported strategies they had implemented, most were focused on public outreach and engagement (48 percent), including virtual meetings, online surveys, social media, raising awareness of the SHPO and its work, and activating established preservation networks to assist with engagement. Hiring consultants, advocating for increased funding, and changing internal management processes each constituted 12 percent of the reported strategies. A further 12 percent of responses mentioned that the SHPO was currently developing strategies to address impediments.
Vignette: Setting Up Systems for Success in Washington, D.C.

David Maloney, the Associate Director for Historic Preservation and State Historic Preservation Officer for the Washington, D.C. Historic Preservation Office (HPO), described how his office recently shifted their State Plan format and schedule to increase efficiency and save staff time. As he described, the State Plan when he joined the HPO in the 1980s was much more minimal and generally less professional than contemporary State Plans; as historic preservation in the United States has grown and professionalized, the State Plan has become more of a program activity for SHPOs.

Washington, D.C. is, of course, in an unusual situation as a federal district. However, their approach to planning can be widely applicable. The D.C. HPO is required by law to provide annual reports to the D.C. Council; this annual report focuses on facts and numbers, such as the number of permits the HPO reviewed that year. Maloney views
the reports as an opportunity for the HPO to take credit for its accomplishments, particularly with public officials, as well as a way to steadily gather data on accomplishments to be reported in the next State Plan. Roughly 20 years ago his office hired an intern to create a report format that was both visually appealing and flexible enough to be re-used every year. The success of this report framework sparked an idea to use a repeatable framework in the State Plan. Not only would a pre-existing framework make the writing process more efficient, but it would also allow the HPO to have a “perfectible” product that could be improved over time and convey continuity among the Plans.

The D.C. HPO used a series of plans over three planning cycles to establish and edit their new plan framework, which includes sections on D.C.’s history, preservation achievements since the last plan, preservation challenges, the current goals, objectives, and actions, and an implementation plan. Maloney mentioned the history section as one of the easiest to repeat, as most of the information does not need to change between plans. It is important to note that the re-use of the State Plan framework and history section is not the same as simply “putting a new cover on an old plan.” The pre-set structure is a tool to ease staff workloads, enabling in-depth analysis of previous State Plans and new public engagement and historic resource data that changes with each plan.

Another element that adds to the ease of re-using frameworks is the HPO’s final accomplishments reports. The HPO publishes these reports when a plan expires; this serves as a way of evaluating the previous plan, touting preservation’s accomplishments to the public and public officials, holding the HPO and partners accountable for achieving their stated goals, and as a record of accomplishments that can be easily folded into the
next plan. When asked about the applicability of annual reports for other SHPOs, Maloney stated that the idea could be widely applicable, but the key is to make the reports easy to create; annual reports are meant to aid in State Planning efficiency, so any report that is too onerous for SHPO staff to create goes against this purpose.

Simultaneous with the adoption of a new State Plan framework, the D.C. HPO also shifted to a new phased planning schedule. Previous planning cycles in D.C. had been four years long (4 years is the minimum allowed by NPS; the typical maximum is roughly 10 years), but this did not provide the office enough time for evaluation of previous plans and creation of new plans, nor did it align with the D.C. Comprehensive Plan cycle. Maloney stated that his office wanted to be more intentional with the State Plan and not feel as though they had to rush through evaluation and writing, and the office needed built-in reminders to move through the planning cycle. Under the new five-year cycle, the HPO built in a year at the end to evaluate the previous plan and a year at the beginning of the cycle to create the next plan. The annual reports will serve as the office’s “alarm bell” to move between planning phases. Maloney described this system as, “pre-setting systems that allow you to become more efficient and are set up to provide you with the information you need.”

For instance, the HPO has created a monthly reminder email for staff to record their public engagement efforts; this log of engagement can then be referenced in plan evaluations.
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Disappointments in Planning

SHPOs were also asked about their office’s biggest disappointments in State Planning, i.e. strategies or goals the SHPO tried that did not turn out as it had hoped. While this question is somewhat similar to the question of planning impediments, it turns the focus from external and/or internal barriers to SHPO actions; the question implies that SHPOs are active in their planning work and have some sort of target goals or strategies to improve their State Plans. The answers to this question also helped shape the direction of follow-up interviews; areas in which many states have had disappointing outcomes are areas that are ripe for consideration and implementation of best practices.

53 percent of responses mentioned public outreach as a major disappointment in the State Planning process; this was by far the most-mentioned type of disappointment (Figure 17). Some of these disappointments involved strategies that were hindered by the COVID-19 pandemic, but most simply involved constituents not showing up to meetings or responding to surveys. As one respondent put it, “The lack of public participation has been very disheartening every time.” One state also mentioned fears that virtual engagement sessions, as required by COVID-19 precautions, were not able to be as diverse or equitable as their office had hoped. Similar to what states mentioned in their impediments section, multiple SHPOs have noticed a decline in responses to online public surveys. Most linked the change to the loss of “newness” in virtual surveys, such as SurveyMonkey, over the past decade. As the general public got used to online surveys and more companies and organizations began to use them, the public was less incentivized simply by the novelty of the survey.
The second most-reported disappointment was implementation of the plan by the SHPO, by its partners, and by the public. Disappointment in the SHPO’s implementation was often related to staff capacity for monitoring the plan and its goals or to a lack of belief in the usefulness of the State Plan. Plans were reported as “sitting on shelves” and viewed merely as a form of compliance with the NPS. Goal-setting was also an implementation-related issue, including goals that were not realistically aligned with SHPO’s staff capacity and responsibilities as well as goals that were too broad to be practical. One SHPO described its State Plan’s goals as “broadly stated platitudes in which we can fit any activity.” While the State Plan’s goals should be broad enough to be
applicable to multiple organizations across the Plan’s life, they also need to be narrow enough to spur their implementation through specific projects.

Many respondents also reported disappointment in partners’ and the publics’ lack of implementation of the State Plan’s goals. This was often linked to a lack of accountability; SHPO’s partners, whether state agencies, non-profits, or municipalities, are not motivated to adhere to the State Plan because the NPS only holds the SHPO accountable for its creation and use of HPF funds for implementation. Additionally, these partners have their own missions, and often their own written plans, to which they are more motivated to align themselves and their work. This is especially disappointing when SHPOs put in major efforts into public engagement and partner co-development of the State Plan, only to have those partners subsequently ignore the plan.

Other reported disappointments included issues such as the internal process of State Planning, unforeseen expectations from the NPS in regard to the State Plan, consultants who did not meet expectations, funding requests that went unheeded, and lack of diversity in engagement. Three states reported no disappointments in their recent State Planning activities.

Limited public engagement was by far the most-reported disappointment in every state category except for states with land areas between 25,000 and 50,000 square miles and states with populations under 1 million, which reported greater disappointment in plan implementation and consultants. The Intermountain region (86 percent), states with land areas over 75,000 square miles (71 percent and 83 percent), and states with populations between 1 and 3 million (89%) were the highest reporters of disappointment in public engagement. The Northeast, states with land areas between 25,000 and 50,000
square miles, and states with populations over 12 million all reported disappointment in plan implementation in at least 33 percent of responses.

**Vignette: Optimizing Engagement through Public Survey in Indiana**

The Indiana SHPO set records in 2011 and again in 2018 for public input to its online survey. According to Steve Kennedy, Assistant Director of Administration, Financial Incentives and Planning and CLG Coordinator, the Indiana SHPO decided to try online surveys for public outreach rather than public meetings, as previous Plans’ public meetings had low turnout and inconsistent public input. An intern was tasked with examining survey questions from 16 other SHPOs, which were sent to the planning committee to consider their options for survey length, themes, and types of questions. Halfway through the 2011 survey period, the SHPO staff noticed that there was little response and took action to actively drive traffic to the survey. For their next planning cycle in 2018, the staff took a proactive approach; every two weeks their division’s communications staff captured the survey responses and examined the numbers of responses by county. The SHPO staff then chose counties to target for the next two weeks. Staff gathered lists of relevant community members in those counties, such as county historians, town mayors, parks superintendents, librarians, and historical society staff; Kennedy stated that the goal was to gather about 40 email addresses for each county, as 40 emails could usually garner about 20 responses.

Staff then used a template to email the people on their lists. These emails appealed to people’s sense of pride, noting the numbers of responses statewide as
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51 Steve Kennedy, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, interview with the author, March 16, 2022.
compared to the numbers of responses from that county. The emails also asked for the survey to be shared widely throughout the recipient’s community. According to Kennedy, the SHPO has been able to find the “magic person” for a few counties, meaning a well-connected local “go-getter” who, through their personal connections, is able to gather many responses from a low-population county.\(^{52}\) Gathering these lists and sending emails takes approximately one to two hours per county, and in some cases counties need two or three targeted pushes. Despite that, Kennedy stated that their survey efforts are still more efficient and more fruitful than the office’s previous public meetings. Furthermore, the office’s use of some of the same survey questions in 2011 and 2018 has allowed the SHPO to compare responses and better analyze changes in public opinion over time.

\textit{Vignette: Using Consultants for Public Engagement in Texas}

As mentioned previously, Texas consulted with the Lakota Group for their most recent Plan, and they took the lead on establishing a “brand” for the Plan’s public workshops and digital town halls, including a consistent design across the project website, press releases, and workshop exhibits. For the eight in-person workshops, which were the core of the SHPO’s public engagement, the consultant team created state-level promotional materials as well as individualized promotional materials to use at the local level and marketing materials for specific audiences, such as nonprofits. Kalogeresis expressed that he and his team wanted to create a flexible experience for meeting attendees, offer participants a variety of ways to comment, and give people opportunities to think critically rather than simply sitting at a presentation. Workshops began with a

\(^{52}\) Steve Kennedy, interview with the author, March 16, 2022.
local welcome and case study of successful implementation of a previous Plan’s goal in that community, and then Kalogeresis gave a brief note of information on the State Plan and its purpose for the community. After that, participants were free to walk through the exhibits, participate in activities, and communicate with their fellow attendees. Exhibits covered topics such as background information about the State plan, larger perspectives on preservation in Texas, and disaster preparedness. Activities included a disaster recovery survey, voting on the draft priorities and initiatives for the Plan, and mapping historic resources that are important to attendees. According to Kalogeresis, one of the best signs of a successful workshop came from an attendee, who told him as they walked out of the meeting, “This was fun!”

_Vignette: Implementing Goals in Oregon_

Oregon’s implementation of their Plan goals and objectives involves both internal work and external strategies. Internally, Ian Johnson, Oregon’s Associate Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, described the SHPO’s work as “regularly re-engaging with the Plan.” Much of their implementation work is rooted in monitoring work. As an Oregon state agency, the SHPO is required to complete quarterly follow-ups on its work plans and enter its goals into a statewide system. In addition, Johnson holds bi-weekly meetings with his staff members; one of the routine questions at those meetings is “Tell me what you’ve done to accomplish the Plan?” SHPO staff work plans and project lists are explicitly tied to the Plan, ensuring that the objectives are enmeshed in the daily work
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54 Ian Johnson, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, interview with the author, March 10, 2022.
of the office. Johnson observed that it is important for his staff’s workplans to balance larger projects with smaller ones; smaller projects are an easy way to keep up morale amongst staff. For example, one item on a staff member’s work plan was to update the twelve different compliance letter templates. This task was easy to phase and complete over a short period of time and ends up saving the whole team time later on, as they no longer have to make small corrections every time they send a letter and they receive fewer calls asking for clarification after sending a letter. Furthermore, this task fit into the objectives listed in Goal 1 of their Plan.

As for outside monitoring, Johnson stated that much of it depends on the SHPO’s relationship with each partner. For example, the SHPO has an annual check-in meeting with the State Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation (SACHP) to assess and refine the Plan’s objectives related to the National Register. The Oregon SHPO Outreach Coordinator’s work is linked to the Heritage Commission’s work, so it is easy for the SHPO and the Commission to align their goals and reassess them throughout the life of the Plan. Other, more subtle relationships involve the SHPO responding to what it hears from partners outside of meetings directly related to the Plan. For instance, the SHPO leads an Intergovernmental Resource Council, through which it is able to stay up-to-date on the work of tribes and other state agencies and make note of projects implementing Plan goals.

*Vignette: Crafting Targeted Goals in Washington, D.C.*

In their most recent Plan, the D.C. HPO published 12 goals, each with specific objectives and targeted actions to achieve those objectives; the use of targeted actions
was a lesson from Maloney’s experiences with comprehensive planning. In the D.C. Plan’s implementation section, each objective is linked to two to four targeted actions as well as the “action agents” responsible for them. When relevant, objectives are also linked to specific goals and objectives from the D.C. Comprehensive Plan. Though their 46 targeted actions may seem like an overwhelming number of items to accomplish, Maloney explained that responsibility for the actions is spread across the HPO and its partners. Internally, the targeted actions are linked to the HPO’s existing plans for their work; the HPO establishes their office’s goals for the next five years and incorporates those into the Plan. As for their partners, Maloney stated that the key is simply asking in stakeholder interviews, “What is on your agenda for the next five years?” Specific partner projects, along with deadlines for completion, can then be placed in the Plan as targeted actions. For example, when the HPO interviewed the D.C. History Center, they learned the History Center was shifting its organization from serving their members to serving the public and that they were asking the D.C. Council for permanent funding. This was incorporated as a targeted action in the most recent plan. Interviews and gathering information about future agendas allows the HPO and its partners to consider how their programs align and how they can mutually support one another’s goals; framing targeted actions within partners’ existing goals also increases accountability and implementation.
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Successes and Innovative Practices in Planning

States were asked to provide descriptions of their biggest success(es) in State Planning, as well as any innovative practices their offices had implemented related to the State Plan (Figure 18). Interestingly, public engagement was by far the most common area of success (49 percent of responses); this was a surprise as public engagement was the most common disappointment amongst State Plans and was also seen as a major impediment in planning. This suggests public engagement plays a key role not only in State Planning, but also in SHPO staff’s perceptions of their State Plan. Multiple states reported that they were able to solicit responses from all or nearly all the counties in their state, providing at least some measure of geographic representation in their engagement data. States also mentioned strategies such as video calls for engagement and collaboration with partners or gathering input at the annual statewide preservation conference. A few responses highlighted efforts towards better engagement with THPOs and incorporating THPO priorities into the State Plan’s goals. A few states also discussed ongoing engagement and education efforts with the general public and with elected officials. These educational efforts aim to increase awareness and understanding of historic preservation, the SHPO’s role, and the importance of planning for preservation, with the long-term goal of garnering more public and governmental support for historic preservation in the state.
Successes related to plan implementation were the second-most reported category, followed by success in management of the planning process and “other” responses, which often focused on using technology to assist in the planning process. One distinctive response related to implementation discussed how inviting local preservation organizations, consultants, and cultural resources management professionals to write their success stories and including those in the plan positively influenced the State Plan’s implementation. These success stories served as achievable examples for other communities in the state and facilitated inter-community connections to share preservation strategies; as more communities felt empowered to engage in preservation, more of the State Plan’s goals were put to use.
Four states reported that simply completing the State Planning process was a major success for their office. As one respondent wrote: “The whole SHPO Team really put in the time and effort despite being overwhelmed much of the time….Finally having a great product and Plan was a big success. I was proud of the work that was accomplished.” Respondents also frequently mentioned that circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic made State Planning difficult, and the completion of the planning process was a cause for celebration in their office. Other areas of reported success included creating achievable goals, hiring qualified consultants, diversity of engagement, and staff technical expertise in preservation planning. One state reported that they could not think of an area of success related to their State Plan.

In every state category, public engagement was the most reported or tied for the most-reported form of success in State Planning. In the Intermountain region and states with land areas over 100,000 square miles, public engagement was tied with success in implementation; in respondents from states with populations between 7 and 12 million, outreach was tied with “other” responses.

When asked about innovative practices in State Planning, 51 percent of respondents said their SHPO did not implement any (Figure 19). Part of this response could be related to hesitation to label a state’s strategies as “innovative,” and future surveys may want to consider alternative wording when seeking to learn about unique or especially helpful State Planning practices. Among the 21 respondents who did report innovative practices, public outreach and “other” responses were tied, each mentioned in 38 percent of the responses. The responses categorized as “other” typically involved digitization of records to enable easier historic resource data analysis, Unmanned Aircraft
System or drone technology for monitoring resources, and digital diagnostic tools.

Technology was also involved in many of the public outreach-related responses, with many states reporting the use of virtual meetings, digital town forums, and online engagement through surveys and social media. Outreach innovations also involved new formats for public meetings, such as open houses or activities-based meetings rather than presentation-based meetings. A few states also noted relationship-building with Tribes; these were often paired with statements hesitating to call Tribal outreach “innovative,” but states were clear that they felt their recent efforts to host open-ended interviews and listening sessions with Tribes represented important work. Four states (19 percent of “innovative” respondents) discussed work related to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) principles, such as targeted interviews and focus groups with DEI stakeholders, creating a section of the State Plan focused on DEIB, and leveraging state Diversity Officers and Environmental Justice Offices to assist in more diverse public engagement. Other responses about innovation centered on consultant-led strategies and efforts to engage in more in-depth evaluation of previous State Plans.
Vignette: Innovative Engagement with THPOs and the Public in Minnesota

Minnesota’s engagement strategies are notable for two reasons: their intentional THPO engagement and their creative formats for engaging with the larger public. According to Michael Koop, CLG Coordinator and Historic Preservation Specialist, and Amy Spong, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, the engagement strategies were guided by an engagement plan, which their team created in the earliest stages of their most recent planning cycle. Their staff wanted a robust approach to engagement that was listening-focused; their engagement motto was “meeting people where they are.”\textsuperscript{56} The SHPO’s Environmental Review team led the THPO engagement efforts, as those staff members had existing relationships with THPOs through Section 106 consultations.

\textsuperscript{56} Michael Koop, Minnesota SHPO, interview with the author, March 24, 2022.
Engagement began with a SHPO presentation at a Minnesota Indian Affairs Council board meeting, and then the team contacted each of Minnesota’s 11 federally recognized tribal nations as well as federally recognized tribes outside their state. The SHPO planned to have in-person listening sessions with each of the state’s THPOs, but only four were able to occur before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. As THPOs pivoted to focus on pandemic management, the rest of the meetings were switched to telephone calls or survey responses.

THPO listening sessions were intended to go beyond simply recognizing the importance of protecting tribal cultural resources; recognizing tribal perspectives on cultural heritage is necessary to shape goals and future actions. For example, a theme from the four listening sessions was the importance of cultural heritage for individual and collective mental, physical, and spiritual health among tribes, particularly in their ability to facilitate healing wounds of historical trauma experienced by Indigenous people. In response to these listening sessions, tribal capacity-building goals and objectives were highlighted throughout the Plan.

As for their engagement with the larger public, the Minnesota SHPO developed a few creative strategies to garner public input. Spong mentioned that one of the planning team members had worked on municipal comprehensive plans previously and introduced the “Meeting in a Box” based on those experiences. The Meeting in a Box is a shared and consistent tool for local, citizen-led public meetings; nonprofits, community organizations and CLGs can incorporate the material into existing meetings or as independent events. Interested organizations were provided with instructions and an agenda for the meeting, which included an online welcome video, an opening exercise,
two voting and discussion exercises, and a reflection exercise. All meeting notes and worksheets were collected and sent to the SHPO for review. Spong and Koop reported surprise at the response to the Meeting in a Box; they expected two or three responses but ended up with eleven local events that used the tool. In addition to saving the SHPO time and effort in organizing meetings, the Meeting in a Box also allowed for local groups to assume a degree of leadership for part of the State Planning efforts, gaining greater buy-in to the Plan.

Also, when attending outside events such as the Midwest Archaeological Conference or Open Streets West Broadway, the SHPO used coloring sheets, stickers, and a preservation mascot competition as ways to draw people to its table. Koop noted that their team wanted to have some lighthearted, fun activities to spark conversations with people who may have otherwise avoided the SHPO table.

_Vignette: Strategies for Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging in Maryland_

The Maryland SHPO is already unusual for its regional approach to setting goals in the State Plan, and its work to increase diversity in the Plan also used a regional approach. For the most recent Plan, Nell Ziehl, Chief of the Office of Planning, Education and Outreach at the Maryland Historical Trust (Maryland SHPO), facilitated three regional African American heritage roundtables, co-sponsored with the Maryland Commission on African American History and Culture (MCAAHC). The SHPO had an existing relationship with the MCAAHC, and the two groups co-administer a grant, so
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57 Preservation Porcupine was the winner of the preservation mascot competition.

58 Nell Ziehl, Maryland Historical Trust, interview with the author, March 23, 2022.
the SHPO was able to tap into the MCAAHC’s existing network of relationships. The MCAAHC helped the SHPO identify people who were active in Black heritage work in different regions of the state, and those people were then invited to co-develop invitation lists for the roundtable discussions. The roundtable format was suggested by MCAAHC as preferable to a survey, as it allowed for relationship-building and face-to-face conversations. Ziehl facilitated all three meetings, while another SHPO staff member took notes. The discussions at the roundtable meetings directly impacted the goals, objectives, and strategies in the State Plan, providing better understanding of statewide and regional opportunities and threats to resources as well as more nuanced narratives to tell at historic sites.

**Future Goals for the State Plan**

States were asked to describe any future goals they had for their State Plan. This information served two purposes: ascertaining how the practices of State Planning relate to changes and trends in the nationwide historic preservation movement, as well as further informing the previous question about creating solutions to SHPOs’ planning hindrances. As with the answers about planning successes, public outreach was the clear leader in SHPOs’ future goals for their State Plans (Figure 20). 65 percent of respondents mentioned public outreach and engagement as a goal, citing increased numbers of participation, younger audiences, rural engagement, better geographic distribution across the state, increased preservation awareness among elected officials, and better engagement of underserved or underrepresented communities. 21 percent of respondents cited DEIB-related goals; many of these DEIB goals overlapped with public engagement
goals, but also included goals of building or growing SHPO and preservation partners’ relationships with underrepresented communities and preserving resources related to diverse communities. These two most popular types of goals align with the larger nationwide preservation movement’s trends towards greater citizen participation and greater diversity in the preservation profession, preservation partners, and preservation resources. These goals can also be tied to other nationwide movements towards equity and justice, particularly after the civil rights demonstrations that occurred across the nation in the summer of 2020.

![Figure 20. A graph depicting the frequency that each area of future goals appeared in survey responses.](image)

Implementation was the third most cited theme for future planning goals (12 percent), with respondents focusing on tracking progress towards the plan’s goals, often mentioning annual reviews to track the plan’s implementation. Other responses stated
that the SHPO was not yet considering future goals at this stage of the planning cycle (9 percent), creating fewer, more achievable, or more well-defined goals (7 percent), and hiring a consultant to bridge the divide between preservation knowledge and planning knowledge (5 percent). One response mentioned including disaster planning and resiliency measures in future plans; another highlighted the need for more professional consideration of rural landscape preservation. Two respondents stated that their goal was simply to have an approved State Plan.

States in every category tended to follow the national trends for future goals, with public engagement goals being the most reported by far, typically followed by DEIB-related goals and implementation goals.

Usefulness of the State Plan

In his interview, Cory Kegerise suggested asking a “mood” question in the survey regarding SHPOs’ feelings about the State Plan’s usefulness. Respondents were asked how useful they believed the plan was not only for their office, but also for outside partners, and were also asked to explain their response. When analyzed by category, smaller states, including the Northeast region, states with land areas under 50,000 square miles, and state with populations under 1 million, tended to report the Plans as more useful than larger states.

42 percent of respondents stated that they do believe the State Plan is useful (Figure 21). Explanations ranged, but most focused on the Plan’s importance in guiding SHPO activities, gathering feedback on preservation programs in the state, garnering public, partner, and politician buy-in for preservation, and setting preservation programs
up for sustainability through routine evaluation. Some responses argued that since the SHPO may be the only organization in a state with a statewide focus for preservation, it is critical for the State Plan to create a unified, statewide preservation vision. Additionally, multiple responses mentioned that all organizations, including the SHPOs, need a plan to guide them. While the NPS has stated that the State Plan is not meant to be simply a SHPO management plan, SHPO’s responsibility for it and the SHPO’s centrality to many of the plan’s goals often results in the plan serving as a basis for internal management plans.

![Figure 21. A pie chart depicting survey respondents’ opinions regarding State Plans’ usefulness.](image)

The requirements for public and partner engagement were frequently noted as helpful for the SHPOs, despite the previously-stated challenges in public engagement. The State Plan was described by respondents as a bridge for preservation to meet with
other professionals, elected officials, and the public, share their goals, and provide information about preservation resources. Understanding public perceptions of preservation allows for responsive trainings and programming to meet a state’s unique needs, and meetings with preservation partners and other governmental agencies helps them to understand both how their current goals and programming align as well as how they could continue to work together in the future. Furthermore, a few responses noted that public and partner engagement surrounding the State Plan has helped the public better understand all the programs that the SHPO runs. This increased understanding of the SHPO’s wide-ranging work is not only gratifying for staff members, but it also strengthens public support for the SHPO’s work.

21 percent of respondents reported that they found the State Plan to be somewhat useful. Some of these responses echoed elements of those who did find the State Plans to be useful, such as obtaining public feedback on preservation programs and guiding SHPOs’ work. However, nearly all the “somewhat useful” responses stated concerns that the State Plan was not useful or used outside of the SHPO, either by preservation partner organizations or by other governmental agencies. As one respondent put it, “It’s a great tool to guide the SHPO, but not beyond that.” The State Plan was acknowledged by one “somewhat useful” response as being a helpful reminder of the SHPO’s basic goals for its partners, but is of limited use otherwise. Since preservation-focused organizations and governmental agencies in the state are not technically accountable for the State Plan or its goals, they are not inherently incentivized to implement the Plan nor track progress towards the Plan’s goals.
Furthermore, SHPOs’ partner organizations and agencies have their own missions, and often their own plans, to which they are more attuned; if the goals of the State Plan are not easily adoptable and adaptable to partners’ existing goals and plans, they are unlikely to be used. Multiple respondents also cited lack of SHPO capacity to properly promote the State Plan as a hindrance to its usefulness; if partners and the public are not aware of the Plan or do not know where to access it, they cannot use it. Respondents often noted that their team would need a dedicated position, whether a preservation planner or an education and outreach specialist, to properly promote the Plan’s content and maximize the Plan’s impact.

Finally, 37 percent of survey respondents reported that they did not believe the State Plan was useful. The reasons for these responses varied widely. On one end of the spectrum, respondents reported an almost complete lack of usefulness; one stated, “Zero usefulness. I cannot think of a single outside entity that has referenced it or a single internal staff member (other than me) who has referenced it in our work.” Another state reported that no one but NPS noticed when their State Plan was expired for multiple years. Others cited issues with the structure of the Plan and its intention as a truly statewide guidance document for preservation: “If we make it specific enough to be useful, it's more like a workplan for the SHPO office, which we don't want it to be. If we make it more applicable to all those working in preservation, it's so general and nebulous that it doesn't have specific recommendations that people can actually work towards.” The needed specificity for goals and objectives is viewed as incompatible with the need to create a Plan that can be used by all preservation actors in a state. A different respondent echoed the same sentiment, arguing that the State Plan “cannot and probably
will never be a strategic plan that everyone could adopt,” due to the broad perspective that the Plan stakes. The respondent went on to describe the difficulties of widespread implementation of the Plan, since the preservation movement is fairly decentralized and often organized at the local level.

Still other respondents acknowledged that the Plan had some use but was unhelpful overall. As one state put it: “I have not seen a major usefulness in the State Plan, other than raising awareness of these general issues. There is value in the process of generating the plan, but once it is complete, having continued dialogue around its goals [is] more difficult.” A couple of states tied the issues back to staff capacity and funding, arguing that without those two necessary components, the Plan cannot and will not be a priority in its creation or implementation.

**Coordination and Collaboration with other SHPOs**

Survey respondents were asked whether their state worked with other SHPOs during the planning process, including consultations, cross-state coordination, informal sharing of tips and tricks, etc. As many states share similar historic resource typologies, in some cases even sharing National Heritage Areas or National Parks, this question was meant to gauge whether those states coordinated their preservation approaches for regional unity. Additionally, the question was also meant to shed light on informal forms of collaboration and assistance between SHPOs in the State Planning process. Responses to the question centered more on the latter; if future researchers are interested in this topic, survey questions regarding regional coordination should be more specifically
worded and it may be beneficial to ask SHPOs separate questions about each type of conversation/collaboration with other SHPOs (NCSHPO listserv, plan review, etc.).

46.5 percent of respondents reported that their state works with other SHPOs in some form during the planning process. This collaboration varied, but tended to include asking other SHPOs, often in neighboring states, about what has and has not worked for them in the past, as well as strategies for tackling specific topics such as climate change, diversity, and disaster planning. Public outreach strategies were also commonly cited as a topic of conversation between SHPOs. A few states also mentioned reviewing other State Plans for ideas about Plan formatting and methodology; this seems to be a common practice amongst SHPOs, though not all considered it “working with” other SHPOs. Finally, some respondents referenced a NCSHPO listserv that staff can use to ask questions, as well as more informal conversations at conferences and meetings. It is possible that some of the respondents who said their state does not work with other SHPOs (53.5 percent) also engage in some of the activities as those who responded affirmatively, such as reviewing other State Plans.

Following up from the previous question, SHPOs were asked if they desired more communication and coordination with other SHPO planning staff. This question was partly inspired by the recommendations from Morrison’s 2014 report, which included strategies to increase and strengthen interactions between SHPOs. Across all categories of states, the majority of respondents expressed desire for more collaboration across SHPOs; the Midwest, the West/Pacific region, and states with land areas between 50,000 and 75,000 square miles all indicated interest in over 75 percent of responses.
Nationally, 63 percent of respondents reported that they were interested in more communication with their SHPO peers about State Planning (Figure 22). Three separate respondents stated that better communication would prevent states from “reinventing the wheel” in planning by being able to rely on the experience and knowledge of other states. Respondents noted the similarities between SHPOs in their shared missions and the similar challenges they face in State Planning. One respondent stated that they would be interested in more cross-SHPO communication, “…if other SHPOs are similar to us.” Though states obviously face particular challenges based on their location, size, population, and resources, the results of this thesis survey show that SHPOs do tend to be similar to one another in their challenges, successes, and goals for State Plans.

![Figure 22. A pie chart depicting survey respondents’ feelings towards the potential for increased communication among SHPO State Planning teams.](image-url)
Another common theme among those who desire more communication is that having an established mode of communication would decrease the effort that it currently takes staff, particularly new staff that do not have as many personal contacts, to gather information from other states. An established platform for sharing advice and ideas, commiserating about challenges, and sharing best practices would also allow new staff to learn from more experienced planners and would provide those with experience a platform to gather fresh ideas. One respondent noted that National Register of Historic Places coordinators have their own informal listserv that is helpful for specific questions and that their state is part of a similar group for review and compliance work; they suggested a similar listserv or group focused solely on State Planning could be helpful.

Even without an actual communication platform, one state noted that a shared repository of current State Plans would be helpful. There was a somewhat updated list of State Plans on the NPS website before updates in late 2021; it is unclear if this will return to their website at a later date. Another respondent called for the NPS to foster these discussions or create these platforms, as they are the organization responsible for reviewing the Plans; additionally, due to the staff capacity issues that have been noted throughout the survey, SHPO staff are unlikely to have the time to create and/or run these communication platforms on their own.

21 percent of respondents were unsure about increased communication and collaboration with other SHPOs. Most noted that existing methods of communication through NCSHPO and the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC) worked well enough for them and that they did not have the time to coordinate or engage in deeper discussions about State Planning with other SHPOs. A few also expressed
doubts that the experiences of different states were broadly applicable, thus sharing tips and tricks may not actually benefit other states. One noted that it could be useful to have one annual list of State Plans, where each state is in their planning cycle, and links to each state’s most recent plan; this is similar to the State Plan repository that was mentioned previously.

16 percent of surveyed SHPO staff stated that they did not desire more communication with other SHPOs. Explanations tended to be very similar to the “unsure” respondents; responses often mentioned that staff can use established NCSHPO and NAPC networks for help, and that SHPOs already look at others’ plans online. As one respondent stated, “Not sure direct contact would be more valuable than simply reviewing their plans.” Time and staff capacity were also cited, noting that ongoing national discussions can be time consuming. A few also shared that they worried about taking up time for more communication with little added benefit, as their previous attempts to gather ideas from other SHPOs were not as fruitful as they had hoped.

Inspired by a survey question from Allison Davis’ 2021 thesis, SHPOs were asked whether they had particular states that they looked to as models for State Planning.\(^{59}\) This question served the author in choosing SHPOs for follow-up interviews, but also provided greater context for potential informal communications between states about idea-sharing and best practices for State Plans. Interestingly, there was a nearly even split among responses to the question; 53.5 percent of states said there were others that they sought out as models for State Planning, while 46.5 percent said there were not.

---

Among states who did talk about models for planning, 30 percent stated that they looked to adjacent or regional states as models, since those states tended to have similar historic resources and social, economic, and political contexts. 9 percent of responses mentioned looking at states of similar sizes (Figure 23). Though states did not report intentional regional coordination of their plans, it seems that some SHPOs may be aligning their plans regionally by modelling their State Plans on others in the region. Pennsylvania was the most-mentioned individual state, noted in seven responses. North Carolina and Texas were each mentioned three times, while Oregon, Michigan, and South Dakota were mentioned twice. Elements of State Plans that were seen as aspirational included Plan structure, survey topics and questions, promotion of the Plan, consideration of issues such as disaster planning, and physical elements of the Plan such as illustration and graphic design.
Coordination and Collaboration within the State

In an attempt to gauge intra-state planning coordination and goal alignment, SHPOs were asked if they intentionally coordinated their State Plan with other state or regional plans. As noted in the first chapter, Statewide Historic Preservation Plans exist within a larger web of county, state, and regional plans regarding land use, preservation, transportation, etc. The NPS also notes in their “Planning Tips” webpage that federal, state, and local planning efforts should inform the State Plan and provide context for the planning process.  

60 This guidance does not require that the different plans be

---

“coordinated” with one another, but that they should be informed by one another’s goals; the specific language of “coordination” in the survey question may have skewed answers, so future researchers may want to carefully consider how they word questions about how State Plans interact with other types of plans.

The majority of respondents (67 percent) reported that they do not coordinate their State Plan with other state or regional plans or that they were unsure about whether their plans were coordinated (Figure 24). No further explanation was offered by most respondents. One respondent noted that though they do not currently do so due to lack of capacity, they would like to coordinate with natural resources plans. The majority of responses in every state category (region, land area, and population) reported not coordinating with other plans; the sole outlier was states with land area between 25,000 and 50,000 square miles, in which 63 percent of respondents reported coordinating the State Plan with other plans.
Nationally, 28 percent reported that they do coordinate their plans in some way; 5 percent reported that they were currently working on coordinating their Plan with others. Most explanations were fairly vague, such as, “Yes, to the extent that they are relevant.” However, some respondents offered more detailed explanations. One noted that their SHPO’s role as part of a larger state agency offered them more opportunities to consider other agency plans as part of their State Planning process, as well as encourage their partner agencies to consider the State Plan in their own planning processes. This sentiment was shared among multiple other respondents, all of whom noted coordination or goal sharing with their larger agency’s strategic plans and partner agencies’ plans. A few respondents noted specific plans that they focus on, including comprehensive plans,
disaster planning reports, state park and historic site plans, climate plans, and economic forecasting plans. Partner engagement through goal alignment is not only important to create shared goals on paper; it is also a method to encourage other agencies to actively utilize the State Plan in their own work. Even if partner agencies do not call out their activities as implementing the State Plan, goal alignment sets up activities in a way that inherently implements the Plan’s objectives.

Vignette: Coordination with Other Preservation Plans in Oregon

Ian Johnson described how the Oregon SHPO has worked to get their preservation partners to feel ownership over the State Plan and their role in implementing it. The SHPO has a good working relationship with the Oregon Heritage Commission, a group founded by the Oregon legislature, consisting of 9 members appointed by the governor and 9 ex-officio members, whose work focuses on strengthening heritage through resources, recognition, and funding. This relationship, along with their alignments in heritage and preservation-based work, make it easy to intentionally coordinate the goals and objectives of the State Plan and the Heritage Commission’s plan. The Heritage Commission also runs many workshops, community programs, and conferences, so the coordinated goals of both the State Plan and the Commission plan are consistently presented to preservation partners and to the public. Johnson noted that this easy coordination and alignment is not the case for many of the Oregon SHPO’s other partner organizations and agencies, as their missions and interests can be, and often are, fundamentally different from that of the SHPO.

---
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Vignette: Aligning with State Agencies in Minnesota

In Minnesota, interviews are the primary form of planning engagement with other state agencies. For the most recent plan, the Minnesota SHPO contracted with the state’s Management Analysis and Development (MAD) group, a public service consulting group under the state’s Department of Management and Budget, to facilitate agency and partner organization interviews, partially as a time management measure for the SHPO and partially as a way to reinforce the notion that the State Plan was not only a SHPO plan. One of the SHPO’s desires was for these interviews to continue building relationships between agencies, and that when other agencies started their own planning processes, they would consider the State Plan in their goals. Koop and Spong noted that much of this depends on the existing inter-agency relationships; if another state agency does not understand its relationship with the SHPO as going beyond regulatory responsibilities (such as Section 106 requirements), they are unlikely to incorporate the Plan into their own work. Though the Minnesota State Plan received NPS approval shortly before this thesis was written, SHPO staff have already noted the impacts of their agency interviews. For example, when the Minnesota Department of Transportation began their own planning process, a representative reached out to the SHPO to meet and discuss their goals and objectives. Though SHPOs are unlikely to reach alignment with other agencies in every goal or objective, inter-agency awareness and communication can have long-term impacts on preservation outcomes throughout a state.

---

**Vignette: Coordination with Comprehensive Plans in Washington, D.C.**

Washington, D.C.’s State Plan is closely coordinated with the D.C. Comprehensive Plan. This is both a decision to save time and effort at the HPO as well as ensure that planning and preservation issues are aligned throughout the district. By aligning the State Planning cycle with the comprehensive planning cycle, the D.C. HPO is able to tap into the public outreach and engagement activities of the comprehensive planning process. This often involves the HPO setting up a station at comprehensive planning meetings and to gather public comments, which, along with an online survey and stakeholder interviews, inform their State Plan. Maloney stated, “Outreach and engagement is not our staff’s strong suit, and we know it, so this fills a gap for us.” Coordination with the comprehensive plan also allows for State Plan goals to be crafted alongside comprehensive planning goals and gives the HPO additional opportunities to influence other district agencies, both through the comprehensive plan and through increased interactions with peer agencies.

**Conclusion**

**Discussion**

Of course, though this thesis recommends best practices for SHPOs to most effectively create and implement State Plans, there are factors outside SHPO staff control that also affect a State Plan’s success. For example, Splain noted that the Pennsylvania SHPO has strong internal and external support, which has enabled its team to hire consultants and be creative in their planning process. Beyond financial support,
governmental and public belief in the importance of the SHPO, the State Plan, and historic preservation strengthens SHPO staff members’ morale and can make Plan implementation easier. Successful SHPOs also tend to have access to non-financial forms of assistance within their larger department or agency, for example, governmental consultants, graphic design teams, and communications specialists. Similarly, SHPOs that have staff with useful expertise and skills, such as dedicated project planning staff, staff with years of State Planning experience, or staff with backgrounds in graphic design or communications, are especially equipped to succeed in State Planning. Access to pre-existing structures for public and partner outreach saves SHPOs time and effort. Finally, external situations, such as the COVID-19 pandemic or natural disasters, create unexpected barriers to State Plans, thwarting even well-planned SHPOs from their ideal levels of outreach, analysis and implementation. These hypotheses of factors affecting State Planning success, derived from survey and interviews, are not fully developed, and merit further study by future researchers.

In addition to the hypothesized factors affecting SHPOs’ success, five conclusions can be drawn based on analysis of the survey and interviews.

1. Challenges of State Planning are Universal

Regardless of state size, population, or region, nearly every SHPO has to deal with limitations in staff capacity, funding, public engagement, and implementation, though differing circumstances in each state can either mitigate or aggravate those limitations. Staff burnout is also a major hindrance to the State Plan, limiting creative problem-solving and contributing to doubt about the importance of the planning process.
2. *SHPOs Want More Assistance*

Because of the above (and other) limitations, SHPOs want increased assistance, in the form of funding, consultants, more staff members, communication with other SHPO planners, and more information on best practices and innovative ideas.

3. *Creative Planning is the Gateway to Success*

Despite limitations and lack of assistance, states that see the State Plan as an area for creativity are able to find success; their successes may be currently focused in one element of the planning process, but their willingness to strategize and seek new solutions enables them to push through failures and disappointments.

4. *Small Actions Create Big Impacts*

Even seemingly small or simple actions are able to make a large impact in preservation outcomes. Johnson mentioned in his interview that he always brings copies of the State Plan to public meetings, as people may grab a copy and read it during lulls in the discussion. At a meeting regarding a controversial proposed historic district, a woman who was vehemently against designation happened to skim through the State Plan. Discovering an image of a building from her town, she continued to read the Plan; though she still opposed the district’s designation, she took time at the meeting to publicly praise the State Plan and the SHPO, explaining that she had not previously understood all the work they did in the Oregon. An action as small as bringing the Plan to meetings can make preservation opponents into preservation stakeholders, who may go on to encourage adaptive reuse or preservation grants in their local communities.
5. *State Plans are a Uniquely Comprehensive Tool*

The State Plan is the only instrument to take a statewide view of preservation, in all its facets and to do so on a recurring basis, while making or reinforcing connections between different local, state, and regional actors. State Plans are a means to introduce new issues into the statewide discussion, gather broad public input on existing programs, foster buy-in from elected officials and governmental partners, increase awareness of the SHPOs’ work, provide a means of reflection on past work and guidance for future work, and share success stories from communities across the state. These functions may be sporadically present in other areas of the states’ preservation programs, but the State Plan provides them all in one package. Though it takes significant time and effort to effectively create and implement State Plans, their potential for positive influence on preservation in a State is too great to ignore.

*Recommendations*

1. *Experiment with Public Engagement*

The “right fit” for public engagement strategies may be slightly different for each state (and within each state) and may change over time. Creativity and flexibility in public engagement strategies allow for SHPOs to find what works for communities in their state. Do not be afraid to incorporate fun activities or silly competitions into your outreach strategies! Celebrate the previous State Plan’s successes in your outreach to make the Plan’s objectives more tangible for your audience. When possible, finding ways to let others outside the SHPO take the lead, whether that be a consultant or local
community members, can save both time and effort while reinforcing that the Plan is not just meant to guide the SHPO.

2. **Plan Ahead**

Creating “mini plans” for engagement and implementation can make the larger State Planning process go more smoothly, prevent delays in the Planning process, and increase accountability for the Plan’s goals and objectives. Additionally, ongoing data collection about public outreach and implementation activities can help with State Plan creation; the more data that a SHPO has, the more it can easily incorporate into the next State Plan.

3. **Spread Out the Work**

If possible, spread the work of creating (and implementing) the Plan across both time and people. The Washington, D.C. HPO was able to be more analytical and intentional with their State Plan once they gave themselves an additional year in the planning cycle, while the Pennsylvania SHPO garnered better staff buy-in and less burnout by involving every member of the office in the Plan’s creation.

4. **Use Existing Expertise and Relationships**

Take stock of the skills and expertise available to the SHPO in terms of staff, consultants, and individuals or teams in related governmental departments. For instance, a SHPO’s staff may not have the bandwidth to promote the Plan on social media, but the communications team of the larger department that the SHPO is housed in (e.g. the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Community Affairs, etc.) may be able to take up this task. Tap into existing relationships with outside organizations, particularly for outreach and promotion. In Minnesota, the Environmental Review team
led THPO engagement as those team members had existing relationships with THPOs through Section 106 reviews. In Oregon, the SHPO’s relationship with the Heritage Commission allows it to rely on the Commission to promote the Plan and its goals in their community workshops.

5. **Look for Efficiency Measures**

Even small changes can make a big difference towards saving the SHPO time and effort in the State Planning process. Consider changes to public engagement strategies, such as moving some public meetings to digital town halls, or shifting efforts towards promoting an online survey. If necessary, change the state’s planning cycle to allow for more time between Plans and/or align the planning cycle with that of a partner organization so the SHPO can share public outreach efforts. “Pre-setting” systems for Plan creation and implementation such as reusable plan formats, reminders to log accomplishments, and regular gathering of implementation data make the Plan more of a routine effort.

6. **Shout Your Accomplishments**

In the following State Plan, annual reports, conferences, and on social media, regularly celebrate projects that meet the Plan’s goals and objectives. This keeps the Plan in the public eye, raising public confidence in the value of the Plan and the power of preservation in your state. Furthermore, publicly celebrating accomplishments can serve as a morale boost for SHPO staff, reminding them that the Plan is active and meaningful for preservation in their state.
7. Make the Plan Part of the SHPO’s “Daily Work”

Regular re-engagement with the Plan is necessary for effective implementation, both within the SHPO and from partners. Incorporating the State Plan’s objectives into SHPO staff work plans integrates the Plan into the “regular” work of the SHPO and provides internal accountability. It is not enough to simply ask partners about their future goals and plans once every five years and expect them to keep the SHPO abreast of new developments. Establishing regular check-ins provides a means of tracking implementation, external accountability, and opportunities to re-assess and refine specific goals.

8. NPS Guidance/Assistance

NPS should take a lead role in providing additional guidance and assistance to SHPOs. Many of the recommended goals and actions from Morrison’s 2014 report are still relevant; NPS staff should re-engage with the report and seek to carry out its recommended actions. Detailed guidance documents and information about innovative planning practices should be prioritized on the NPS State Planning website, and the reports that have been removed should be returned to the webpages as resources. The NPS should also seek ways to facilitate inter-SHPO communication and information sharing, whether that be through a State Planning listserv, regional gatherings, or simply an online repository of State Plans and SHPO planning cycles. Whenever possible, the NPS should seek to publicly promote the importance of the State Plan and help states receive the funding and resources necessary to create and implement their Plans.
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Appendix A: Basic Statewide Historic Preservation Planning Process

The following overview of the State Planning process has been adapted from the NPS webpage “Planning Tips for Developing a Statewide Historic Preservation Plan,” and the author’s discussion with David Banks.

1. Evaluation of existing conditions:
   a. Gather data on historic resources and studies of resources (historic context statements, economic studies, etc.)
   b. Identify gaps in knowledge and/or data
   c. Analyze the previous State Plan’s achievements and challenges

2. Identify statewide values and desired future conditions:
   a. Informed by analysis of available data and previous State Plans, develop a public engagement strategy to use throughout the planning process
   b. Maximize public outreach and response using public survey(s), meetings, focus groups, interviews, etc.

3. Identify opportunities and constraints:
   c. Analyze the data and feedback from the previous two steps
   d. Review and analyze other plans/planning efforts that may inform the State Plan
   e. Analyze political, social, economic, technological, and cultural trends that may influence preservation in the state
   f. Give particular attention to:
      i. Underrepresented communities and associated historic resources
      ii. Disaster planning and preparedness
iii. Technological advances

iv. Budget (SHPO budget and state budget)

v. Critical legal and/or policy issues

4. Develop priorities and strategies:
   a. Create goals and objectives that address issues and opportunities identified in the previous steps
   b. Objectives should be both measurable and attainable within the timeframe of the planning cycle

5. Set targets and implement the plan:
   c. Establish targets for completing the State Plan’s objectives
   d. Indicate which group(s) lead and which group(s) assist with each objective
   e. Monitor progress and update the objectives as needed throughout the life of the Plan
Appendix B: General Outline of Statewide Historic Preservation Plans

The following is a generalized layout of elements commonly found in State Plans; the precise order of items varies between Plans.

I. Front Matter: Foreword, Welcome Letter(s), Executive Summary, Table of Contents

II. Introduction:
   a. What is preservation? Who is the SHPO?
   b. Purpose of the State Plan

III. Plan development and organization:
   a. Explanation of the development process, including steering committees, partners, consultants, etc.
   b. Explanation and description of public outreach process, including a synopsis of survey and/or public meeting feedback
   c. Explanation of the planning cycle and lifespan of the State Plan

IV. Context and assessment of historic resources in the state
   a. This context may be interwoven with larger summaries of state history

V. Analysis of impacts & programs:
   a. Successes, impacts, and achievements from the previous State Plan
   b. Challenges faced in implementation of the last State Plan

VI. Larger context of the state:
   a. Analysis of opportunities, issues, and threats to preservation in the state
   b. Consider and analyze social, political, economic, etc. trends that may affect preservation in the state
c. Consider topics such as underrepresented communities, climate change, disaster preparedness, legal issues, etc.

VII. Vision, goals & objectives
a. Some states include success stories related to their goals and objectives in this section

VIII. Implementation
a. Provide enough detail so partners and the public understand their roles and the SHPO’s role
b. Some states also explain the planning cycle in this section

IX. Appendices
a. Survey questions and a summary of survey responses
b. Summary of partner/stakeholder interviews
c. Laws & regulations affecting preservation in the state
d. SHPO programs
e. Lists of partner organizations, tribes, CLGs, etc.

f. Lists of historic contexts, studies, and designated historic resources
g. Preservation resources (websites, organizations, reports, etc.)

X. Bibliography
Appendix C: Survey Questions

The survey questions below were submitted by email to State Historic Preservation Officers, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officers, and other SHPO staff members. Answers from questions marked with a red asterisk (*) were removed from the response matrix (Appendix D) to maintain respondents’ anonymity.

1. What is your first and last name? *
2. What state/territory do you work for? (Choose from a drop-down list) *
3. What is your job title?
4. What is your primary (and, if applicable, secondary) role(s) at the SHPO?
5. What (if any) previous roles/titles have you had within another SHPO?
6. Are you the primary manager and/or contact for preparing your statewide plan?
   - Yes
   - No
7. Have you worked on more than one statewide plan, either for your current SHPO or for other SHPOs?
   - Yes
   - No
8. How many years have you been working on a SHPO’s statewide planning team? (Please include time both at your current SHPO and any previous SHPOs you’ve worked for)
   - 0-1
   - 2-5
   - 6-9
   - 10 or more
9. How many people from your SHPO work on the State Historic Preservation Plan?
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5 or more

10. Do you have training and/or education in planning?
   - Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education
   - Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education
   - No, I have no training in planning or planning education

11. Do any members of your SHPO’s planning team have training and/or education in planning?
   - No
   - Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education
   - Yes, and the majority of the team has planning training/education
   - Yes, the entire team has planning training/education

12. Does your office regularly hire consultants to help create and/or implement the plan? If so, what is the consultant’s usual role?

13. Briefly, what does your planning process for developing a statewide plan entail? (Such as: (1) analysis and evaluation of previous plan's success; (2) public outreach including public survey, meetings, focus groups, etc.; (3) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach)

14. Where is your state in the planning cycle right now? (e.g. just published a plan, drafting a plan, etc.)
15. What impediments/issues limit your office’s successful creation and implementation of the State Plan? Please provide a short explanation/description.

16. Which of the impediments/issues that you identified above would you consider the most important issues to overcome?

17. Has your office implemented strategies to address the impediments/issues you mentioned? If so, what were they?

18. What, if any, have been the biggest disappointments for your office in regard to statewide preservation planning? (things you tried that didn’t work as well as you’d hoped, e.g. a hired consultant that didn’t work out, public participation strategy that had fewer responses than expected, etc.)

19. What has your office’s biggest success been in regard to statewide preservation planning?

20. Are there any innovative practices that your state has employed for preservation planning?

21. What, if any, are your office’s goals for future Statewide Historic Preservation Plans? (such as increasing the number of respondents to the public survey and a better geographic distribution across the state)

22. Overall, how useful do you think the State Plan is for guiding the SHPO, outside partners, developers, etc. for preservation in your state? Why?

23. Does your state work with other SHPOs during the planning process? (consultation, coordination, sharing tips & tricks, etc.)
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

24. If yes, what SHPO(s) do you work with and what does the relationship entail?

25. Would you like to have more communication and coordination with other SHPO planners? Why?
26. Are there other states that you look to as models for preservation planning?
   
   o Yes
   o No

27. If yes, what state(s)? What about their preservation planning is aspirational for your SHPO?

28. Does your SHPO intentionally coordinate the statewide preservation plan with other state/regional plans? If so, please briefly explain.

29. Would you be willing to participate in a follow up interview to further discuss your State Historic Preservation Planning process? *

   o Yes
   o No

30. If yes, please provide your email address: *

31. Please select a (tentative) week for a follow up interview (exact date/time to be scheduled separately): *

   o February 21 – February 25
   o February 28 – March 4
   o March 7 – March 11
   o March 14 – March 18
   o March 21 – March 25
### Appendix D: Survey Responses

#### Survey Questions 1-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Role at the SHPO</th>
<th>Previous roles at the SHPO</th>
<th>Are you the State Plan manager?</th>
<th>Experience with other State Plans</th>
<th>Years on a State Planning Team</th>
<th>Size of Planning Team</th>
<th>Planning Background</th>
<th>Team’s Planning Background</th>
<th>Consultants – Use and Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intern Executive Director (normally Deputy Director)</td>
<td>when not Intern, I lead the NR and survey program and oversee our archaeologists</td>
<td>not with other SHPOs, but with this SHPO I’ve been National Register Assistant, Project Review Coordinator, and Intern Executive Director once before</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>SHPO/Manager</td>
<td>Compliance Archaeologist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>No, we did it in-house and will do so in our next round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>none; came from private sector</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no, there are no funds available for that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Deputy SHPO</td>
<td>Administrator of the SHPO office</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>Not in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Field Archivist</td>
<td>review and compliance of ethnographic work, i.e. TCF studies, cultural landscape studies, historical context studies; Section 106 and state law historic preservation consultation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>In the past the plan was written by consultants but this plan is in house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Deputy SHPO</td>
<td>Staff Historian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>CLG/Grants Coordinator, Social Media, Planning, Compliance Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>For the most recent version of the State Plan, SHPO hired a consultant. The previous Public Information Officer position (which had been responsible for the plan in house) was eliminated several years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Historical Services</td>
<td>Deputy SHPO</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register of Historic Places Program Coordinator</td>
<td>NREIIP Coordinator, survey &amp; inventory coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Architecture Specialist for the SHPO</td>
<td>Historic Architecture Specialist for the SHPO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, we do it in house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Operations at SHPO</td>
<td>Managing the Register and Highway Marker programs, and managing the three Regional Offices of the Department Regional offices</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director, SHPO</td>
<td>Director of Operations at SHPO, lead Developer on the 2021-2026 State IHP Plan</td>
<td>NR Reviewer, Tax Credit Reviewer, Grants Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>No. Our SHPO works with our planning bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Planner</td>
<td>Initial statewide 5 year plan, local historic districts, historic context development and special projects</td>
<td>Interned as Grad Student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, we hire a facilitator to conduct 5 public workshop around the state and provide us with a report on the findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Preservation Coordinator</td>
<td>Community outreach/education, grant program management</td>
<td>I started as a grants manager.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director/DESHPO</td>
<td>Grants, Administration</td>
<td>National Register Coordinator, Survey Coordinator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>We hired our first consultant to assist with Statewide Plan activities last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLG Program and Planning Coordinator</td>
<td>Upgrading the 5-year State Plan and administering CLG Program</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director for Financial Incentives, Administration, and Planning</td>
<td>Primary role in supervisor of financial incentives team (grants and tax credits) with responsibility for the IHP grant program and office budget; secondary role in state CLG coordinator</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We prepare the statewide preservation plan entirely in-house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Programs Division Director</td>
<td>director</td>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>For our current planning, we have hired a consultant to develop the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>Role at the SHPO</td>
<td>Previous role at the SHPO</td>
<td>Are you the State Plan manager?</td>
<td>Experience with other State Plans</td>
<td>Years on a State Planning Team</td>
<td>Size of Planning Team</td>
<td>Planning Background</td>
<td>Team's Planning Background</td>
<td>Consultants – Use and Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review and Preservation Planning Program Manager</td>
<td>Environmental review (Section 106) and the statewide preservation plan</td>
<td>E.R. Historian, E.R. Specialist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, we don’t usually, but did this year due to lack of staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)</td>
<td>Director - State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes. The Consultant does most of the composition, editing, graphics, and production of the handbook state plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director and Deputy SHPO</td>
<td>Deputy SHPO</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>For our most recent new Plan, we hired a consultant to help with engagement and interviews, but the Plan was written by the whole SHPO Team with a smaller Planning Team leading the effort. Before this current Plan rewrite, consultants were hired for outreach sessions but mostly the previous couple Plans were written by the Deputy SHPO with other SHPO staff contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>HP planning and program management</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>We have not in the past but have considered doing so in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLG Coordinator</td>
<td>CLG Coordinator, HPF Grants Manager, State Plan, Centennial Farm &amp; Ranch Program Coordinator</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>We have not in the past but have considered doing so in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Special Initiatives Coordinator</td>
<td>Manage external communications (Ntg, newsletters, etc.) and reporting</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>Yes, and the majority of the team has planning training/education</td>
<td>Prior to 2016 (our current plan), SHPO did all statewide planning work in-house. With 2018 plan, we had hired one consultant to assist with outreach and later a planning consultant to assist with issues/plan/objects development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Director of the office</td>
<td>lead Section 106 reviewer, CLG Coordinator, DSHPO for Resource Protection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We hired a consultant once to be facilitator of our public meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>I oversee the administration of historic preservation programs in the SHPO</td>
<td>I have not worked within another SHPO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The SHPO has hired a planning consultant to assist us in updating the current preservation plan. The consultant is developing and administering an online survey, hosting and facilitating stakeholder meetings and public meetings, and preparing a draft report of the findings from the public outreach including draft vision and goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLG Coordinator &amp; Historic Preservation Specialist</td>
<td>Manage the Certified Local Government program, organize the annual Statewide Preservation Conference, help prepare the Statewide Preservation Plan Survey &amp; National Register Coordinator at another SHPO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>The SHPO has hired a planning consultant to assist us in updating the current preservation plan. The consultant is developing and administering an online survey, hosting and facilitating stakeholder meetings and public meetings, and preparing a draft report of the findings from the public outreach including draft vision and goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Officer, Assistant Director, Historian, Secretary General</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Officer, Assistant Director, Historian, Secretary General</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Consultants have been hired in the past to write the plan. Currently, our office has capacity to write the own plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1. Overseeing and management of the Bureau in implementing law, particularly section (b) 2) Aligning efforts of SHPO with other policies and priorities for selection, preservation, and promotion of indigenous culture; 3) Develop partnerships in the protection, preservation, and promotion of indigenous culture.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, the last plan that was developed hired a consultant to update the plan. Please note that prior to my time as the director, I am not fully aware of what the consultant’s role is but I imagine that the consultant’s role included updating the plan by: 1) facilitating consultation with stakeholders, staff, and wider community, 2) reviewing the appropriate laws and plans to align to the plan, 3) report back to management on findings, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>Archaeologist, Review &amp; Compliance Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, strategic planning and plan drafting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Manage programs authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act, and associated state programs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>Role at the SHPO</td>
<td>Previous role at the SHPO</td>
<td>Are you the State Plan manager?</td>
<td>Experience with other State Plans</td>
<td>Years on a State Planning Team</td>
<td>Size of Planning Team</td>
<td>Planning Background</td>
<td>Team's Planning Background</td>
<td>Consultants – Use and Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy SHPO</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>State Historical Architect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>If funding allows, we have done so in the past. The consultant was responsible for conducting outreach, hosting stakeholder meetings, drafting strategies, gathering feedback, and ultimately producing the plan and executive summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy SHPO</td>
<td>administrative</td>
<td>Same SHPO, but was also Survey Coordinator, then 106 Reviewer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We hired a consultant to help us with the public survey component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Office of Planning, Education and Outreach</td>
<td>Division chief, lead on state/local planning</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Archaeologist</td>
<td>Review and Compliance, database management</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>Yes, and the majority of the team has planning training/education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer / Historic Preservation Division Manager</td>
<td>Architectural Survey Coordinator, Historical Marker Coordinator, Cemetery Program Coordinator, Section 106 Architectural Reviewer, Register of Landmarks and Heritage Coordinator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Analyst/Grants Manager</td>
<td>Fiscal Analyst/Grants Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>No, I have no training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, and the majority of the team has planning training/education</td>
<td>I am not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO Director/Deputy SHPO</td>
<td>SHPO director - I run the office</td>
<td>Outreach Historian (2014-2016), Architectural Historian (2000-2016)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Plan 2023–2028</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>Yes, and the majority of the team has planning training/education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director and State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Agency Director</td>
<td>Historical Society director and SHPO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning or planning education</td>
<td>Yes, and the majority of the team has planning training/education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Division Manager</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>yes - Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Manager and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Division Manager of the State Historic Preservation Office, Overseas National Register, Regulatory, Certified Local Government and Historic Tax Credit programs for the state</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have both training in planning and a planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>We are working on hiring our first planning consultant to help facilitate and develop our statewide plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Coordinator</td>
<td>Was made project manager for statewide plan consultant team.</td>
<td>Only worked for this SHPO, however, I previously served as a regulatory architectural reviewer and as an outreach coordinator for Historical Commission in this state. In 2010, I helped our agency planner facilitate public meetings for the Statewide Historic Preservation Plan process.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>Yes, I have training in planning, but no planning education</td>
<td>Yes, but the majority of the team does not have planning training/education</td>
<td>2010-2020, planning and updates performed in house by agency planner or staffer with planning back ground. 2021 we hired a third party consulting team, we no longer have an agency planner and the contract includes disaster publication components funded by NPS disaster grant money, work that required a higher level of disaster-related expertise. I was not involved in statewide planning efforts prior to 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Survey Questions 11-17

**Planning Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Place in the Planning Cycle</th>
<th>Impediments to Planning</th>
<th>Most Important Impediments</th>
<th>Strategies to Address Impediments</th>
<th>Disappointments in Planning</th>
<th>Successes in Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) staffing as you stated in the question, then (4) draft plan (3) public review (6) finalize plan</td>
<td>staffing. We have planned to pivot in a number of programs, but staff are very busy with their current responsibilities and carving out time to change or add new is very difficult</td>
<td>staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td>limited resources (staff, funding) to coordinate and provide resources to implement goals and strategies. Responding to quickly changing environments can mean unforeseen challenges and opportunities that were not anticipated during the planning process.</td>
<td>limited resources (staff, funding) to coordinate and focus on implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) analysis and evaluation of previous plans' success; (2) public outreach including public survey, meetings, focus groups, etc.; (3) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach</td>
<td>drafting a plan on extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) analysis and evaluation of previous plans' success; (2) public outreach including public survey, meetings, focus groups, etc.; (3) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of previous plan**

- Restarts with a review of the previous plan and identified those challenges that were identified and then analyzed our data to respond to those challenges/successes.
- Conducted several public outreach campaigns to solicit input including two groups to discuss the previous and also the future plans (this group was a cross-section of the Cultural Preservation/Lawmaker/Non-Profit worlds).
- Created a questionnaire that was submitted digitally to over 2000 individuals via email.

**Analysis of previous plan**

- Current plan is nearing end, so we are starting the efforts for the next version.
- Identified impediments. But we did have trouble having meaningful engagement with the general public on the questionnaire and planning process, and of course the other was the hands-off of internal staff to generate the plan but also wrangle all the meetings.

**Publicengagement**

- Since the previous plan we have dedicated a significant amount of time to raising awareness of our office and its role, this will hopefully help facilitate better engagement.

**Public participation**

- See above, just less public participation than we wanted.

**Planning Cycle**

- The working groups were successful to get broad ranging voices into one room and share thoughts.

**Public official interaction and practical goals that we were able to accomplish**

| Reconsideration of the goals and strategies previously proposed; (2) public outreach including public survey, meetings, focus groups, executive interviews with CRM professionals and other stakeholders etc.; (3) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach | drafts a plan, engaging in public meetings/focus groups/executive interviews with key stakeholders | financial constraints that mean we have limited personnel who can devote substantial time to the plan. I currently am the lead for the plan but I must also attend to other review and compliance duties and also help direct the burial sites specialist. Other staff are supportive but have even more limited time to help develop the plan. | The biggest constraint is limited staff |
| Staff capacity: public interest and engagement possibilities; virtual meetings |  |  |  | public engagement and participation in the goals; there is limited ownership that these goals are for everyone yet it takes a big part of the planning process to engage others. It is difficult to make a plan for others when they have no reason to participate and SHPO is accountable |
| All of the above |  |  |  |  |  |

**Public officials**

- The plan is presented to legislators and the public, allowing them to understand what we do and why—and why it matters and what is mandated by federal and state laws. The plan also enables us to show our challenges but work to address them so that preservation is not always the opponent of development and housing. It has been most helpful in the education of new administrations and leadership.

**Public officials**

- The number of individuals who are showing up to participate in the public meetings

**Public officials**

- We haven't yet done so, but plan to do so for the next version this year. Will focus on online opportunities to provide input. Will also use social media to reach out to people beyond the preservation community.

**Lack thereof.**

- Public involvement, or lack thereof. We haven't yet done so, but plan to do so for the next version this year. Will focus on online opportunities to provide input. Will also use social media to reach out to people beyond the preservation community.

| We started by evaluating progress on the previous plan.|  |  |  |  |  |
| We gathered public input through an online survey. |  |  |  |  |  |
| We solicited feedback from stakeholders and conducted a variety of forums to share information and seek input. |  |  |  |  |  |
| We compiled data on demographics and other state planning documents, as well as statistics on the preservation programs. After analysis of all three, the goals and strategies were developed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Our plan is current through 2026. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limited resources (staff, funding) to coordinate and provide resources to implement goals and strategies. Responding to quickly changing environments can mean unforeseen challenges and opportunities that were not anticipated during the planning process. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of staff capacity and focus on implementation. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Goals**

- The tremendous amount of effort that goes into developing a plan, and the difficulty seeing tangible benefits from it in the community. I observed during our previous planning process that other organizations would contribute suggestions for goals/strategies, which become part of the plan, but with a lack of follow up, little or no progress was made to implement. Also, the issues don't seem to change much.

**Effect**

- Lack of funding, lack of broad public support, lack of skilled tradespeople to make repairs.
Public survey was part of previous planning efforts, but was dropped for the last update (2019) because of expense. There were focused surveys on State Agencies and Tribal Preservation Offices. A couple of public meetings were held. Process did not involve in retrospective evaluation of previous achievements.

We are at the middle of the cycle and ready to begin the process for completion in 2024. If successful in defining as getting NPS approval, then we were successful. The chief impediment for a quality product was lack of budget for any consulting assistance and lack of staff resources (one person task). The chief impediment is the psychological barrier that the plan is basically a pointless task that has little impact on daily work and is not particularly worth doing well.

All those of your points but we also pay attention to the national dialogue on preservation's direction. Few of those surveyed identified diversity or climate related issues as important, which are undoubtedly important things for preservation to embrace as we seek to remain relevant and prosperous. Our plan will reflect the public will, but as a leader in preservation, SHPO believes it's important to introduce new issues to the statewide discussion. Pursuing diversity is a fairness issue, makes preservationists’ work interesting, and helps in grant applications. Preservator's link to less intensive building projects is a new lever preservationists can use in convincing those who don't otherwise care about preservation for the sake of history and aesthetics.

Yes to all the above. We have 5 public meetings, 1 sites outside of the state historic site system. We additionally paid for possible. Implementation plan to the NPS. Published in summer 2021

Planning Process | Current Place in the Planning Cycle | Impediments to Planning | Most Important Impediment | Strategies to Address Impediments | Disappointments in Planning | Successes in Planning
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
| | | | | | | |

All three of your points but we also pay attention to the national dialogue on preservation's direction. We are in the middle of the cycle and ready to begin the process for completion in 2024. If successful in defining as getting NPS approval, then we were successful. The chief impediment for a quality product was lack of budget for any consulting assistance and lack of staff resources (one person task). The chief impediment is the psychological barrier that the plan is basically a pointless task that has little impact on daily work and is not particularly worth doing well.

All of the above

Yes to all the above. We have 5 public meetings, 1 sites outside of the state historic site system. We additionally paid for possible. Implementation plan to the NPS. Published in summer 2021

Planning Process | Current Place in the Planning Cycle | Impediments to Planning | Most Important Impediment | Strategies to Address Impediments | Disappointments in Planning | Successes in Planning
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
| | | | | | | |

Gathered through public outreach (4) circulation of draft meetings.; (3) analysis and evaluation of information (1) analysis and evaluation of previous plan's success; (2) public outreach including public survey, and remote meetings. (3) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach (4) circulation of draft plan to stakeholders (5) review and approval of plan by the members of the state Historic Preservation Commission/Review Board.

We begin with the surveys, one for general public and second for preservation professionals, along with public meetings. A majority of questions on public survey informed the last plan, so we can track trends in public sentiment in past 5 years. Based on resource types most valued, we ran GIS overlay of resource type frequency against rates of real estate buildout and economic redevelopment to find most endangered loci to focus future work.

Having to do this every 5 years is a strain. Having to do this every 5 years is a strain. Budget - we spent just shy of $30,000 for a consultant, printing and postage and did the publication in-house. Implementation beyond the SHPO office is out of our control.

Online questionnaire, focus groups, analysis of previous success & input from public, research into current trends. Published in summer 2021

We have a small staff and many of us manage more than one program, so planning tends to take a backseat to our other regulatory or more time sensitive duties. In addition to being short-staffed, we don't have much money in our budget for creating nice handouts or programs to help promote the plan nor do much implementation.

(1) analysis and evaluation of previous plan's success; (2) public outreach including public survey, and remote meetings. (3) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach (4) circulation of draft plan to stakeholders (5) review and approval of plan by the members of the state Historic Preservation Commission/Review Board. We begin with the surveys, one for general public and second for preservation professionals, along with public meetings. A majority of questions on public survey informed the last plan, so we can track trends in public sentiment in past 5 years. Based on resource types most valued, we ran GIS overlay of resource type frequency against rates of real estate buildout and economic redevelopment to find most endangered loci to focus future work.

Our survey is complete and we're writing a draft plan. We are in a large state, and it's hard to reach all corners for person-to-person outreach. COVID removed most events and opportunities outreach effort would have capitalized on.

Our survey is complete and we're writing a draft plan. We are in a large state, and it's hard to reach all corners for person-to-person outreach. COVID removed most events and opportunities outreach effort would have capitalized on.

Difficultly reach local planners due to email restrictions, unable to print and mailed hard copies, hard to publicize the plan online.

Our survey is complete and we're writing a draft plan. We are in a large state, and it's hard to reach all corners for person-to-person outreach. COVID removed most events and opportunities outreach effort would have capitalized on.

All three of your points but we also pay attention to the national dialogue on preservation's direction. Were focused surveys on State Agencies and Tribal Preservation Offices. A couple of public meetings were held. Process did not involve in retrospective evaluation of previous achievements.

Online questionnaire, focus groups, analysis of previous success & input from public, research into current trends. Published in summer 2021

We have a small staff and many of us manage more than one program, so planning tends to take a backseat to our other regulatory or more time sensitive duties. In addition to being short-staffed, we don't have much money in our budget for creating nice handouts or programs to help promote the plan nor do much implementation.

We have 5 public meetings, 1 sites outside of the state historic site system. We additionally paid for possible. Implementation plan to the NPS. Published in summer 2021

Our survey is complete and we're writing a draft plan. We are in a large state, and it's hard to reach all corners for person-to-person outreach. COVID removed most events and opportunities outreach effort would have capitalized on.

Our survey is complete and we're writing a draft plan. We are in a large state, and it's hard to reach all corners for person-to-person outreach. COVID removed most events and opportunities outreach effort would have capitalized on.

Difficultly reach local planners due to email restrictions, unable to print and mailed hard copies, hard to publicize the plan online.

(1) analysis and evaluation of previous plan's success; (2) public outreach including public survey, and remote meetings. (3) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach (4) circulation of draft plan to stakeholders (5) review and approval of plan by the members of the state Historic Preservation Commission/Review Board.

We have a small staff and many of us manage more than one program, so planning tends to take a backseat to our other regulatory or more time sensitive duties. In addition to being short-staffed, we don't have much money in our budget for creating nice handouts or programs to help promote the plan nor do much implementation.

Online questionnaire, focus groups, analysis of previous success & input from public, research into current trends. Published in summer 2021

We have a small staff and many of us manage more than one program, so planning tends to take a backseat to our other regulatory or more time sensitive duties. In addition to being short-staffed, we don't have much money in our budget for creating nice handouts or programs to help promote the plan nor do much implementation.

Online questionnaire, focus groups, analysis of previous success & input from public, research into current trends. Published in summer 2021

We have a small staff and many of us manage more than one program, so planning tends to take a backseat to our other regulatory or more time sensitive duties. In addition to being short-staffed, we don't have much money in our budget for creating nice handouts or programs to help promote the plan nor do much implementation.

Online questionnaire, focus groups, analysis of previous success & input from public, research into current trends. Published in summer 2021

We have a small staff and many of us manage more than one program, so planning tends to take a backseat to our other regulatory or more time sensitive duties. In addition to being short-staffed, we don't have much money in our budget for creating nice handouts or programs to help promote the plan nor do much implementation.

Getting it done during Covid-19
Planning Process

Current Place in the Planning Cycle

Impediments to Planning

Most Important Impediments

Strategies to Address Impediments

Disappointments in Planning

Successes in Planning

1) analysis of current planning and disaster response efforts; 2) public outreach through online and digital formats; 3) analysis of gathered information; 4) development of statewide plan and disaster response documents; 5) quantification and analysis of survey responses; 6) draft new goal, objective, and strategy statements; 7) deliver presentation on survey results and new draft of plan to a statewide advisory committee; 8) finalize the new plan.

Just published a new plan in 2020, with minor edits in 2021.

Development of a plan normally takes 2 years. This represents a significant additional workload on top of normal duties during the development period. Once the plan is completed and submitted for approval, the return on focus to normal day-to-day duties tends to steal energy from efforts to promote and implement the plan.

We have designed a good plan development process. However, the lengthy plan development period is mentally exhausting, yet the work needs to continue almost immediately in terms of promoting and implementing the plan. Continuing the momentum through the promotion and implementation phase tends to be the biggest challenge for our state.

No, but we are working to develop appropriate strategies right now.

Sometimes it seems like the National Park Service has looked for certain things in our plans that they didn't tell us about at the beginning of the plan development process. More thorough and detailed guidance would be helpful early in the process.

According to NPS staff, our online public input survey set the national record for the number of stakeholder participants. We set the record again with the public input survey for our next plan.

We start with a review of our current plan and analysis of threats and opportunities, etc. (1) development and promotion of an online survey; (4) significant ongoing efforts throughout the survey period to monitor the number and geographic distribution of survey responses and conduct targeted promotion in under-represented counties; (5) quantification and analysis of survey results; (6) draft new goal, objective, and strategy statements; (7) deliver presentation on survey results and new draft of plan to a statewide advisory committee; (8) finalize the new plan.

Updating of previous, Public survey, analysis, drafting, and legislative restrictions may hamper some efforts.

Lack of resources

It's early in the planning process for us, so I can't answer this question as this time.

Our planning process is going well, though our agency's Commissioners have recently expressed a hope in increasing the amount of public participation.

The agency develops its own plan based partly on the statewide historic preservation plan, and that helps to guide agency activities overall in terms of state planning.

Successes in Planning

The whole SHPO Team really put in the time and effort despite being overwhelmed much of the time. This was a three-year effort and we received three extensions for several reasons. Finally have a good product and Plan was a big success. I was proud of the work that was accomplished. Our engagement plan with THPO's was comprehensive and important work.

We start with a review of our current plan and analysis of threats and opportunities, etc. (1) development and promotion of an online survey; (4) significant ongoing efforts throughout the survey period to monitor the number and geographic distribution of survey responses and conduct targeted promotion in under-represented counties; (5) quantification and analysis of survey results; (6) draft new goal, objective, and strategy statements; (7) deliver presentation on survey results and new draft of plan to a statewide advisory committee; (8) finalize the new plan.

Public outreach

We foresee successful implementation of the plan, though cost and resource limitations and legislative restrictions may hamper some efforts.

Lack of resources

It's early in the planning process for us, so I can't answer this question as this time.

Our planning process is going well, though our agency's Commissioners have recently expressed a hope in increasing the amount of public participation.

The agency develops its own plan based partly on the statewide historic preservation plan, and that helps to guide agency activities overall in terms of state planning.

Successes in Planning

The whole SHPO Team really put in the time and effort despite being overwhelmed much of the time. This was a three-year effort and we received three extensions for several reasons. Finally have a good product and Plan was a big success. I was proud of the work that was accomplished. Our engagement plan with THPO's was comprehensive and important work.

We start with a review of our current plan and analysis of threats and opportunities, etc. (1) development and promotion of an online survey; (4) significant ongoing efforts throughout the survey period to monitor the number and geographic distribution of survey responses and conduct targeted promotion in under-represented counties; (5) quantification and analysis of survey results; (6) draft new goal, objective, and strategy statements; (7) deliver presentation on survey results and new draft of plan to a statewide advisory committee; (8) finalize the new plan.

Public outreach

We foresee successful implementation of the plan, though cost and resource limitations and legislative restrictions may hamper some efforts.

Lack of resources

It's early in the planning process for us, so I can't answer this question as this time.

Our planning process is going well, though our agency's Commissioners have recently expressed a hope in increasing the amount of public participation.

The agency develops its own plan based partly on the statewide historic preservation plan, and that helps to guide agency activities overall in terms of state planning.

Successes in Planning

The whole SHPO Team really put in the time and effort despite being overwhelmed much of the time. This was a three-year effort and we received three extensions for several reasons. Finally have a good product and Plan was a big success. I was proud of the work that was accomplished. Our engagement plan with THPO's was comprehensive and important work.

1) analysis of current planning and disaster response efforts; 2) public outreach through online and digital formats; 3) analysis of gathered information; 4) development of statewide plan and disaster response documents; 5) quantification and analysis of survey responses; 6) draft new goal, objective, and strategy statements; 7) deliver presentation on survey results and new draft of plan to a statewide advisory committee; 8) finalize the new plan.

Just received the final plan draft, but already accepted by the NPS.

Lack of time to truly update. Often just an update of the last one

Lack of time

No

Public survey could always be better. We usually only get approx. 400 responses. Using a consultant has paid off

Can't think of one

We start with a review of our current plan and analysis of threats and opportunities, etc. (1) development and promotion of an online survey; (4) significant ongoing efforts throughout the survey period to monitor the number and geographic distribution of survey responses and conduct targeted promotion in under-represented counties; (5) quantification and analysis of survey results; (6) draft new goal, objective, and strategy statements; (7) deliver presentation on survey results and new draft of plan to a statewide advisory committee; (8) finalize the new plan.

Just received approval by the NPS. New statewide Plan is in effect 2022-2025. Final layout and communications plan wrapping up in February.

Spending time to periodically review the plan and how your SHPO is producing results congruent with your strategic direction.

Scheduling periodic reviews.

Trying to increase revenue for historic preservation activities.

Public education and outreach.

Planning Cycle

Current Place in the Planning Cycle

Impediments to Planning

Most Important Impediments

Strategies to Address Impediments

Disappointments in Planning

Successes in Planning

1) analysis of current planning and disaster response efforts; 2) public outreach through online and digital formats; 3) analysis of gathered information; 4) development of statewide plan and disaster response documents; 5) quantification and analysis of survey responses; 6) draft new goal, objective, and strategy statements; 7) deliver presentation on survey results and new draft of plan to a statewide advisory committee; 8) finalize the new plan.

Updating of previous, Public survey, analysis, drafting, and multiple reviews

Just received the final plan draft, but already accepted by the NPS.

Lack of time to truly update. Often just an update of the last one

Lack of time

No

Public survey could always be better. We usually only get approx. 400 responses. Using a consultant has paid off

Can't think of one

We start with a review of our current plan and analysis of threats and opportunities, etc. (1) development and promotion of an online survey; (4) significant ongoing efforts throughout the survey period to monitor the number and geographic distribution of survey responses and conduct targeted promotion in under-represented counties; (5) quantification and analysis of survey results; (6) draft new goal, objective, and strategy statements; (7) deliver presentation on survey results and new draft of plan to a statewide advisory committee; (8) finalize the new plan.

Just received approval by the NPS. New statewide Plan is in effect 2022-2025. Final layout and communications plan wrapping up in February.

Spending time to periodically review the plan and how your SHPO is producing results congruent with your strategic direction.

Scheduling periodic reviews.

Trying to increase revenue for historic preservation activities.

Public education and outreach.

All of the items stated and meeting or exceeding the NPS planning requirements.

Just received approval by the NPS. New statewide Plan is in effect 2022-2025. Final layout and communications plan wrapping up in February.

Balancing the extra internal work while keeping our general responsibilities with specific HP program areas. Had big engagement plans but didn't get to fully complete them—will focus on engaging new and existing partners in next five years of Plan. COVID-19 and civil unrest impacted our engagement, especially with the Tribes and COVID-19. Financial resources needed to be used wisely.

Staffing capacity and doing much of the work in a remote setting.

We haven't yet done a full debrief of what worked and what didn't. Have started with our SHPO Team but need to document for next time and as we begin implementing and prioritizing the Plan goals.

Answers may differ depending on who is answering this question within SHPO. We had big expectations for our State agency consulting partners with our engagement plan. In the end SHPO staff ended up doing handling much of the analysis of the data and identifying the themes to guide the Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Process</th>
<th>Current Place in the Planning Cycle</th>
<th>Impediments in Planning</th>
<th>Most Important Impediments</th>
<th>Strategies to Address Impediments</th>
<th>Disappointments in Planning</th>
<th>Successes in Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your model almost exactly 1, 2, and 3 in that order, though stakeholder outreach is very important and continues throughout the process. Government partners, statewide and community non-profit, and other group representatives are key to identifying issues that should be addressed in the plan and opportunities for collaboration or coordination. We try to acknowledge and identify how their work helps us advance preservation, so that the plan doesn’t become just a program plan for the SHPO office.</td>
<td>Just finished a plan, awaiting NPS approval</td>
<td>Finding the time to do it, given competing priorities; doing a lot of public engagement, which is not the main focus of our program; motivating staff to do public engagement (for most, it’s not their expertise or interest); pushing it through when there’s no hard deadline</td>
<td>Creating a structure that makes it a manageable task</td>
<td>We used a sequence of short plans to develop an updatable format that didn’t require starting from scratch; each plan improved on the previous one, and there were huge benefits in efficiency (updating any document is easier than starting over). Also the most recent one put into practice a simple schedule we developed for a 5-year plan (first year is develop the plan, 3 intervening years, and the last year for evaluation in prep for the next one). We also refined our schedule to align with the state’s comp planning cycle (it helps enormously to plug into its pre-planned public outreach, and encourages planning coordination). States that have a comp planning function could consider the same.</td>
<td>It was the hired consultant who had good credits, but not a real feel for the state or its program; we ended up rewriting most of it.</td>
<td>Our big glossy format with lots of pictures and an engaging presentation was a big hit, even though it was way too long. But we’ve managed to slim it down in subsequent refinements. So that caught public attention. The other big success is creating a replicable format, which allowed us to refine and learn how to improve it; and also set a firm schedule with enough planning/writing/engagement/analyzing/rewriting/vetting/approval time in it—it takes at least a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our most recent planning process relied heavily on public and partner outreach and then analysis and evaluation of the information gathered combined with subject matter research to fully understand issues and their context.</td>
<td>Just published a plan in 2020 that will be good through 2024</td>
<td>Lack of public participation. We have historically had poor input from the public regardless of our attempts. In-person meetings, online surveys, translating surveys into different languages, and in-person bilingual meetings have all been ineffective.</td>
<td>That is our only major issue.</td>
<td>We’ve attempted many different ways of increasing participation with no luck.</td>
<td>The lack of public participation has been very disheartening every time.</td>
<td>For this current cycle it has been the number of accomplishments so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our current plan is something next year so we’ve started planning for the update/next iteration.</td>
<td>Funding and staff capacity are both challenges, although they have improved by tackling the planning process differently. Ideally, SHPOs would have ample funds to hire outside planning professionals to assist with the outreach process and plan development and help reinforce that the statewide plan isn’t the SHPO’s work plan but a plan for everyone working to preserve historic places. This would also help address the issue of staff capacity to accommodate the many tasks involved in developing and publishing a plan while also managing their programs and constituent needs.</td>
<td>Funding.</td>
<td>Yes. We’ve been successful at securing additional funding from state funds to hire outside professional assistance, which helps enlist partners, promotes impartiality, and manages staff capacity. We also redesigned how the process is managed internally. One position is given the responsibility of managing the day-to-day process and overseeing the effort as a whole. Staff are then enlisted to help with different components of the plan - outreach, partners, analysis, publication - based on their expertise and interests.</td>
<td>Being able to keep our planning partners (other state agencies, non-profits, etc.) engaged throughout the whole process. After the plan is published, our challenge has been and still is also implementation.</td>
<td>We created a strong foundation document that we can use and build on and that is easily consumable for (most) everyone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and evaluate success of previous plan, update of cultural resources identified within the last five years, public meetings and questionnaire to evaluate current priorities</td>
<td>Real plan cycle</td>
<td>limited public participation in public meetings</td>
<td>Getting our constituents involved</td>
<td>different approaches to public meetings</td>
<td>lack of ownership by the HP community; often considered the SHPO plan</td>
<td>increased interaction with individuals across the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and evaluation of previous plan’s success; public outreach including public online surveys; and stakeholder and public meetings; analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach</td>
<td>Drafting the plan</td>
<td>Limited staff resources/availability</td>
<td>Limited staff availability limits the time staff can spend on the plan, especially in light of required emergency response to natural disasters.</td>
<td>We hired a planning consultant to assist us in updating the plan.</td>
<td>Public meetings had fewer participants than we had hoped for – especially in light of the meetings being held virtually, less engagement from prior partners in planning</td>
<td>The state established a state historic rehabilitation tax credit program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Process</td>
<td>Current Place in the Planning Cycle</td>
<td>Impediments to Planning</td>
<td>Most Important Impediments</td>
<td>Strategies to Address Impediments</td>
<td>Disappointments in Planning</td>
<td>Successes in Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Assess past and current conditions that affect and are projected to affect historic preservation efforts; 2) Review demographics/population changes and impacts on preservation; 3) Develop public survey and determine engagement strategy; 4) Analyze public engagement comments to develop themes; 5) Assess state's historic resource needs; 6) Measure success; from 2012-2021 Plan; 7) Develop Goals, Objectives, Actions in response to themes that were created.</td>
<td>Just finished our Plan; looking for some minor edits.</td>
<td>Lack of staff time.</td>
<td>Lack of staff time.</td>
<td>Not officially, but we have discussed hiring a consultant for the next Plan.</td>
<td>We had started to make very good progress in our consultations with THPOs and other Tribal organizations, but those efforts were cut short due to COVID. In addition, some tasks related to our public engagement efforts that we assumed were going to be handled by a sister State agency, were not completed and had to be dealt with by the SHPO.</td>
<td>Writing the Plan in-house, with the help of the document by two staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Plan will be informed through smaller regional plans. The plan incorporates those priorities as a general guidance.</td>
<td>Drafting a plan.</td>
<td>To properly implement our historic preservation program, we need the resources that need to be met but are limited by the activities identified by the program areas. We would like to pay staff properly but this does not match the goals of NPS.</td>
<td>We continue to work on our request to justify the pay changes to make a case for the funds used in salaries.</td>
<td>Limited continuity of historic preservation planning in relation to state leadership; policies tend to change with the leadership.</td>
<td>State coordination and collaboration with the office has worked nicely. Each office has taken the lead on their local projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, similar to my previous comment</td>
<td>We haven't started.</td>
<td>The first one I mentioned</td>
<td>Not yet. We still have yet to start the implementation of updating the plan.</td>
<td>I have not encountered any thus far.</td>
<td>We had a plan that expired in Dec. 2021 so I would say that we have a basis and that's always a good thing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) analysis and evaluation of previous plan's success; (2) public outreach including public survey, meetings, focus groups, etc.; (3) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach; (4) follow up public outreach during the life of the plan.</td>
<td>Drafting a plan.</td>
<td>Boils.</td>
<td>Hiring consultants to reduce staff load.</td>
<td>Limited in person public outreach and partner meetings due to pandemic.</td>
<td>Aggressive use video conferencing to have partner collaboration on plan development with our State Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee and other preservation partnerships. Also having a plenary session at our state conference for public input on the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the three steps you outline above. These are required in the Historic Preservation Fund Manual, as described in Chapter 6, section G. Our state plan describes our previous efforts in detail.</td>
<td>Drafting a new plan, due in October 2023. Public outreach will start later this year.</td>
<td>Competing priorities, limited staff and funding.</td>
<td>Competing priorities.</td>
<td>With limited staff and resources, you simply right-size your effort and choose what not to do. That may mean that some programs get less attention during the planning cycle.</td>
<td>Public involvement tends to be relatively low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-examining previous plan goals and assessing progress made towards them, creating outreach strategies and ensuring a diverse and representative audience is included in developing new strategies and needs (or enhancing / continuing previous strategies); ensuring adequate participation using a number of methods both in person and virtually; convening focus groups to home in on specific issues or topics; creating strategic drafts to be distributed to global contact list of participants.</td>
<td>Just published 2021-26 plan. Funding and staff capacity. Funding to be able to host meaningful participation. Funding to be able to adequately facilitate discussions and follow up accordingly when necessary with individuals or specific groups. Staff time to participate and comment on drafts. Funding and staff time to be able to produce deliverables.</td>
<td>Staff capacity. The funding wouldn't be an issue if we had much more staff time that we could allocate towards the process.</td>
<td>Virtual engagement reduces travel time and reaches broader geographic areas than we can by being in person. Leasing on preservation, archaeology, and Tribal communities to help facilitate discussions and provide perspective is also useful in divvying up the labor.</td>
<td>The public participation process is lengthy, though very informative. Reaching audiences outside of our normal circles is fairly difficult to keep people engaged. Representation matters, though, and our office does not currently reflect the full representation of the constituents we serve. This is a hugely systemic issue in preservation and archaeology in general.</td>
<td>We had reasonable success with the diversity of respondents to our survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan development can be found in the plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Process</th>
<th>Current Place in the Planning Cycle</th>
<th>Impediments to Planning</th>
<th>Most Important Impediments</th>
<th>Strategies to Address Impediments</th>
<th>Disappointments in Planning</th>
<th>Successes in Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has planning team</td>
<td>3 (September 2022)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Lack of awareness among audiences, funding, education about process and roles.</td>
<td>Providing grants based on availability of funding. Participating in the CLG program at the federal level.</td>
<td>Lack of diversity in grant application, both in project types and repetitive applicants. Interpretation, education, and outreach through the State Historic Sites program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan development described on our website</td>
<td>Just published a plan</td>
<td>Important issues identified through a public analysis and evaluation of previous plan's success; public outreach including public survey, meetings, focus groups; (2) analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach</td>
<td>We are currently in year 2 of our state plan (2021-2025)</td>
<td>We lost our long time planner to retirement right after we submitted our latest state plan. We do not currently have a planner on staff. We have discussed hiring a consultant for our next plan as the plan takes a lot of time and effort.</td>
<td>Limited time of current staff will impair our ability to complete our next plan as it is an arduous and complicated process. Not yet, but we have discussed hiring a consultant for the next plan.</td>
<td>Public participation is always a challenge. We seek out a broad and diverse group and can be hindered in our ability to include all voices if people do not respond to our requests. Having a longtime planner on staff with an incredible amount of institutional knowledge, had written many state plans, and had been through the process again and again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and evaluation of info gathered through public outreach</td>
<td>Just published a plan</td>
<td>Analysis and evaluation of information gathered through public outreach</td>
<td>We are currently in year 2 of our state plan (2021-2025)</td>
<td>We lost our long time planner to retirement right after we submitted our latest state plan. We do not currently have a planner on staff. We have discussed hiring a consultant for our next plan as the plan takes a lot of time and effort.</td>
<td>Limited time of current staff will impair our ability to complete our next plan as it is an arduous and complicated process. Not yet, but we have discussed hiring a consultant for the next plan.</td>
<td>Public participation is always a challenge. We seek out a broad and diverse group and can be hindered in our ability to include all voices if people do not respond to our requests. Having a longtime planner on staff with an incredible amount of institutional knowledge, had written many state plans, and had been through the process again and again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exactly 1, 2, 3 above</td>
<td>Just about to start drafting a new plan</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State Historic Preservation Plan 2023 is a document that includes the goals and objectives that should guide the preservation of our historical heritage. Citizen participation is fundamental in the selection of programmatic priorities. Through this document it is possible to manage, disseminate, implement and ensure the conservation and protection of the historic resources of the Island. This Plan is a tool to be used by any individual, government entity or group in our state.</td>
<td>The evaluation of the State Historic Preservation Plan 2012-2016, for which its validity was extended until 2021, is an essential exercise for the creation of the new State Plan 2023-2028. Review and evaluation are part of the planning cycle, necessary to determine how successful our Plan has been and to what extent the objectives have been achieved. Evaluation is the comparison of the results obtained with the established goals. This process can occur during the execution period or at the end of it. The activities carried out will be presented, corresponding to the goals and objectives, during the period from 2012 to 2031, accompanied by the analysis of their review and evaluation.</td>
<td>Natural Disasters</td>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>Sworn Analysis</td>
<td>The Office did not have a planning specialist</td>
<td>Complete State Historic Preservation Plan 2021-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan development can be found in the plan</td>
<td>recently completed</td>
<td>lack of education about process and role of preservation among audiences, funding, awareness of resources.</td>
<td>education about the process and awareness of resources.</td>
<td>We have begun and advocacy campaign to raise awareness of process and roles.</td>
<td>many projects seem, quite similar to others.</td>
<td>Advocacy and increased awareness of purpose and roles among governmental agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Process</td>
<td>Current Place in the Planning Cycle</td>
<td>Impediments to Planning</td>
<td>Most Important Impediments</td>
<td>Strategies to Address Impediments</td>
<td>Disappointments in Planning</td>
<td>Successes in Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and evaluation of previous plan’s success, community engagement, analysis an evaluation of information gathered through public outreach</td>
<td>drafting a plan</td>
<td>Technical expertise</td>
<td>Technical expertise</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>finding the right talent</td>
<td>public outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently we’re preparing to hire a consultant through a Small Contract Purchase agreement. We expect to have a variety of public outreach surveys, virtual and in-person meetings, interviews with partners, interviews with staff, the consultant will set up those logistics, gather comments, synthesis the results and write up the plan.</td>
<td>in procurement of a consultant. We hope to be complete within 2 years.</td>
<td>the SHPO used to be part of another historic preservation agency and in 2017 that Agency was disbanded by the then Governor. The SHPO along with Historic Sites were moved by Executive Order to the Department of Natural Resources. The transition was rough and there was a loss of leadership level staff at the SHPO. Without leadership there wasn’t the capacity to do much other than the bare minimum of regulatory reviews, tax credit projects and national register nominations.</td>
<td>the SHPO needs to do some mission and visioning development. The SHPO has had a major leadership pop for 3-5 years and the staff has been in survival mode.</td>
<td>there has been an effort by the current Governor and DNR leadership to fill positions. The SHPO now has a Regulatory Manager, a CLG Manager and myself as DSMPO.</td>
<td>Previous planning efforts were not very robust and at times seemed to be little more than “slapping a new cover” on the old plan. I’m not sure exactly how true that was. I’ve looked at the most recent plan and it is lacking and much of it is a recitation of “accomplishments” and the major goals identified don’t align with current staffing and with our statutory responsibilities (i.e., public education not regulatory/tax credit project review)</td>
<td>I don’t know—so far it’s actually working through the required procurement process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All work listed. | Public meetings (in-person and virtual) to collect comment wrap up late April. A draft plan will be issued end of May with virtual meetings in June/July to provide the public to comment on the draft plan. Our final NPS plan is due March 2023 but we hope to have 99% planning documents and disaster publications by Jan 1, 2023. | Geography is our challenge. It takes a great deal of time to get to everyone, whether to have sufficient regional reach for in-person meetings or to reach the many history- and preservation-related partners across the state. I’m sure most offices struggle with participation especially during a pandemic. We have provided a wide variety of public meeting opportunities with the help of our consultants; however, I believe we have had higher participation levels than in 2010 but our consultants have had a robust promotional campaign. While I’d like more public participation, we’ve done well especially given the pandemic. Less so with the disaster-related virtual meetings but the topic is one that won’t draw larger crowds. Only one in-person meeting (for comment on statewide preservation priorities) had to be postponed due to health concerns voiced by the municipal government of the proposed location. That postpone meeting will take place at the end of March. Another challenge for us is that the State Commission addresses SHPO responsibilities but also administers other programs—Main Street, Museum Services, Cemetery Preservation, Heritage Tourism, etc. There are so many priorities that the public brings to the table. | It’s a public plan, so securing broad public participation is the priority. | We had a lot of meetings. 8 in-person regional workshops. 5 online stakeholder meetings that were directed to particular audiences. 8 digital town halls. 4 of which targeted disaster-related topics and 4 that will address common themes drawn from the in-person workshops. Again, we have consultants but we also have had a lot of staff participate and support the meetings. | Disaster-related virtual meetings have had poor attendance despite several ways that our consultants and staff have promoted the meeting. Our initial “quick poll” to gain initial public comment didn’t have a high respondent rate. We’ve upped the promotional efforts for the formal statewide preservation survey in order to maximize the potential for higher respondent numbers. | We’ve had so many partners in the field support our in-person meetings, even getting media coverage and elected officials to provide welcomes. |
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## Survey Questions 18-26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovative Planning Practices</th>
<th>Future Goals</th>
<th>How useful is the State Plan?</th>
<th>Does your team work with other SHPOs?</th>
<th>If yes, what does the relationship entail?</th>
<th>Interest in Increased SHPO Communication</th>
<th>Models for State Planning</th>
<th>If yes, what state(s)?</th>
<th>Coordination with Other Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hard to say at this point. We have to do some implementation first.</td>
<td>I think it's very useful when changes are identified and included, so that the office remains conscious of them. I also think it helps outside parties to better understand the multiplet programs that we operate, many of which they may not be aware of.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>It might be beneficial to get ideas from other SHPOs, but we review other state plans to do this, rather than having person-to-person contact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None that I would consider innovative.</td>
<td>Bigger diverse community engagement and voices (ethnicity, religion, LGBTQ+, etc.), more rural input on the plan, and more awareness of lawmakrs.</td>
<td>I have not seen a major usefulness in the State Plan, other than raising awareness of their general issues. There is value in the process of generating the plan, but once it is complete, having continued dialogue around its goals are more difficult.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I have asked neighboring SHPOs for those tips &amp; tricks on what worked and what didn't. Of course, more heads the better, but of course they have their own world of demands on their time.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, because we are heavily constrained by state land use laws, lack of zoning, and intense housing needs</td>
<td>Engagement by the public and showing preservation is a tool and not the enemy</td>
<td>It is a great tool to guide the SHPO, but not beyond that.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We share ideas for outreach and overall goals. We definitely complain together about how this is a planning document for everyone. Yes, helps to share ideas so we are not reinventing the wheel, we all have the same missions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Monkey (that was innovative in the early 2010s)</td>
<td>Include disaster planning / resiliency matters; expand and enhance constituents we reach</td>
<td>Useful, it helps guide workplans for staff and funding priorities for grants.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pennsylvania stands out last time. Yes – it's a time and capacity issue again. NPS could have a better role in helping foster these discussions, particularly as the plan is their requirement.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using open ended interviews to solicit information from organizations regarding their preservation preferences isn't necessarily innovative, but it is an excellent way to cultivate relationships and establish rapport to get better information</td>
<td>Our immediate goal is to finish the current plan and then move forward with a plan for implementation</td>
<td>It could serve as a “best practices” template, but without additional staff and funding we may not be able to expand our program beyond our current review and compliance paradigm.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Yes, it would be helpful to see other programs which have more involvement beyond review and compliance with historic preservation to see how they developed their programs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet, but we're open to ideas.</td>
<td>Better public participation</td>
<td>Not particularly useful. If we make it specific enough to be useful, it's more like a workplan for the SHPO office, which we don't want it to be. If we make it more applicable to all those working in preservation, it's so general and nebulous that it doesn't have specific recommendations that people can actually work towards.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes, it could be helpful to know what's worked for others and what hasn't worked.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are trying to keep up with current practices!</td>
<td>Hitting a consultant to bridge the preservation/planning divide.</td>
<td>It continues to be a guiding document for our work moving forward. Yes</td>
<td>SHPO staff reviewed other SHPO plans for guidance and suggestions.</td>
<td>It would be good to better understand how other SHPOs are approaching their state plan development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't think so. The online survey worked very well.</td>
<td>Reduce the amount of time to create the plan, increase public participation in developing the goals, and increase buy in from organizations.</td>
<td>It's most helpful for the SHPO, as a good way to hear from the public on the issues of greatest concern. It can be helpful to shedding which new efforts or policies to pursue. For other organizations I think it is of more limited use, although it can be helpful as a reminder of the basic goals of the state office.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We looked at the state plans of several states that had recently completed the process to glean ideas for their public participation, plan organization, and types of strategies and goals. Maybe. It could be useful once a year to have a list of the state plans, and where everyone is in their process, as well as a link to their current plans.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes:
- Survey Monkey (that was innovative in the early 2010s) is included for context.
- Models for State Planning:
  - State offices share ideas so they are not reinventing the wheel.
  - States doing it differently.
  - Multiple ones.
  - We have been working with the local cultural stewardship activists' report and a state strategic plan.
- Coordination with Other Plans:
  - Yes, our state agency's strategic plan.
### Innovative Planning Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Goals</th>
<th>How useful is the State Plan?</th>
<th>Does your team work with other SHPOs?</th>
<th>If yes, what does the relationship entail?</th>
<th>Interest in Increased SHPO Communication</th>
<th>Models for State Planning</th>
<th>If yes, what state(s)?</th>
<th>Coordination with Other Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>My goal is convince leadership that the plan is important and that a major revision with office-wide participation is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero usefulness. I cannot think of a single outside entity that has referenced it or a single internal staff member (other than me) who has referenced it in our work.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not sure direct contact would be more valuable than simply reviewing their plans.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I am currently reviewing other state plans for models. Very few yet consider issues arising in last couple of years.</td>
<td>No. Other community preservation plans are described, but there is no coordination. Other plans did not influence the HP plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Getting our more for in-person discussions. We'll see what the world is like five years from now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It's great for guiding the SHPO. We need to go beyond simply releasing the plan on our website, and actually promote it directly to specific people and groups.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Surounding states</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We incorporated a section on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in our Plan for the first time.</td>
<td>The Plan will be very useful for the state, but it remains to be seen how adaptable and adaptable the Plan will be for our partners.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We reviewed several states’ approved Plans on their websites- NC, MD, WV, TN, GA.</td>
<td>Yes, so we could all learn from each other’s successes and failures in the planning process.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted interviews with DEI stakeholders</td>
<td>I didn’t know that we have been innovative, but we have been incredibly inclusive in our planning this cycle. We broke out DEI as its own section and conducted targeted interviews with DEI stakeholders in HP and Historic Sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well wait to see the results this round. With our current approach, the plan will be a huge emphasis our priorities, particularly with shaping board representation and grantmaking.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sounds exhausting to the process. Is this for the benefit of national HP planning? Our state is not short on ego.</td>
<td>Yes. Oregon was referenced heavily in terms of structure and approach.</td>
<td>Yes. Our State Parks has the Statewide Parks and Rec planning and there is synergy with that and other smaller plans for our parks and historic sites.</td>
<td>Yes. Other community preservation plans are described, but there is no coordination. Other plans did not influence the HP plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Would like to reach a new and younger audience and increase participation in non-urban portions of the state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low. I don’t think many people beyond the preservation planner refer to it.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I do look at other state plans for new formats and methodologies --</td>
<td>Probably a good idea.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In past have looked a PA, NC, CA. Depends on the look and feel of the plan</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing particularly innovative</td>
<td>We’d like to hire a consultant to help with outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We’ve never looked at the state plan as our SHPO work plan, so I can’t say it really guides what we do. We ask of our sub-grant applicants to tie their projects to a goal or objective in the state plan. Our statewide non-profit is helpful in publicizing the state plan, but it’s hard to say how they implement it. I don’t think people outside of the typical preservation channels even know that the state plan exists. I think it goes back to not having a designated preservation planner on staff whose job is to promote the plan and its content.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sore; no one likes to recreate the wheel and it's likely that other states have the same challenges.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that I can think of.</td>
<td>I would hope we could return to some face-to-face meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SHPO office uses the plan regularly to guide our activities, and it is very useful to the members of our legislative oversight committee.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We have not considered this.</td>
<td>Yes. We considered the State Climate Plan and the Economic Forecasting Plan when developing our goals and actions.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Innovative Planning Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Goals</th>
<th>How useful is the State Plan?</th>
<th>Does your team work with other SHPOs?</th>
<th>If yes, what does the relationship entail?</th>
<th>Interest in Increased SHPO Communication</th>
<th>Models for State Planning</th>
<th>If yes, what state(s)?</th>
<th>Coordination with Other Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am too new to effectively comment on this question, except to say that we are moving to all digital site records, which may eventually allow detailed data analysis.</td>
<td>None that I can think of.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Relationships and collaboration.</td>
<td>Preceding, which has led to strong</td>
<td>Tomatillo, a short presentation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public outreach has been innovative, making use of technology in some instances, including through listening sessions and digital town forums, and by taking an open house format with a short presentation preceding, which has led to strong engagement and development of relationships and collaboration.</td>
<td>Too early in the process to determine</td>
<td>Yes if other SHPOs are similar to us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public outreach has been innovative, making use of technology in some instances, including through listening sessions and digital town forums, and by taking an open house format with a short presentation preceding, which has led to strong engagement and development of relationships and collaboration.</td>
<td>Not at all, no one uses it and outside entities aren’t involved/don’t respond to survey</td>
<td>Not really. It’s statewide for a reason and each state is different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None that I can think of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Innovative Planning Practices | Future Goals | How useful is the State Plan? | Does your team work with other SHPOs? | If yes, what does the relationship entail? | Interest in Increased SHPO Communication | Models for State Planning | If yes, what state(s)? | Coordination with Other Plans
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Yes, our Planning Team came up with a preservation mascot voting activity to draw people to our table at various events. Made stickers and coloring pages and we even tallied the votes so we can incorporate into future Plan events and presentations. Came up with “Meeting in a Box” so that organizations could host their own discussions and then send us the results to inform the Plan goals. This was a great way to gather meaningful feedback when SHPO team members couldn’t travel or be everywhere. Our engagement motto was to “meet people where they are at.” We had a separate plan to consult with THPO and it was important to meet in person, unfortunately, COVID meant cancelling half of our meetings with THPOs. We had interviews with state agencies where our consultants asked the questions and took notes. SHPO leadership was present to listen and participate but really wanted to hear from our state agency partners.

But we did pick up the idea of an HP and participated but really wanted to see us continue to improve and rewrite.

Innovative Planning and Practices was to “meet people where they are at.” We had a separate plan to consult with THPO and it was important to meet in person, unfortunately, COVID meant cancelling half of our meetings with THPOs. We had interviews with state agencies where our consultants asked the questions and took notes. SHPO leadership was present to listen and participate but really wanted to hear from our state agency partners.

Having just completed our Plan, we haven’t sat our future goals. We are focused on the implementation of the Plan goals for now. We are acting a timeline however, of when we need to start planning for the next update and rewrite.

Previous Plans we worried may not have been used outside of SHPO as we’d hoped. We were very conscious with this Plan to include information on “how to use” this Plan and incorporate into other planning efforts. It’s ongoing.

No

I shared some of our early planning documents and cost estimates with other SHPOs who were just getting started. NCSHPPO has a listserv where an occasional planning question will come up and SHPO’s will share.

I’m not sure what that might look like but I do think the preservation planning program, at least in our state, has not been much of a focus. We hope to do more to encourage planners to consider historic preservation activities.

No

Our latest planning work is quite new.

Weren’t still working on that.

Yes, increasing the number of respondents; we get 665 but hope for more with better planning next time. And yes, geographic distribution is hard to achieve even in a small area. We also hope to slim ours down to make it more accessible (partly by putting a very long history document into an inventory publication, and reducing the number of goals/strategies—perhaps a vain hope.)

Extremely important; it forces you to think what you want to do, guides how you get comment and buy-in by both public and political leaders, and serves as a measure of progress. It imposes helpful structure!

No

We do google other plans and also pay lots of attention to NPS guidance.

It’s not that critical; we absorb enough about what others are doing from periodic contacts and internet

Yes

NPS’s roadmap from a while ago inspired a sense of engaging fun; the survey ideas came from NC and TX; and we always look at the small states. MI is good too.

No, but we coordinate very closely with our state’s Comprehensive Plan.

No

Increasing respondents and hopefully including different demographics

Yes, for advice and ideas

South Dakota - one of our staff members has experience with it.

No

I don’t know...I’m not familiar enough with how other states handle their planning processes and if they have had to overcome or adapt to challenges like ours. I think our internal management structure works well.

Improving our basic metrics for things like survey responses, attendance/participation at public meetings, etc. is always a priority. I want to see us continue to improve on identifying achievable and measurable goals/objectives.

It is useful for the SHPO but it is very difficult to engage partners and the public in actively using it despite our best engagement efforts during the plan development. Our grant recipients (state and CLG) must tell us how the project they’d like to have funded implements the statewide plan but beyond that, we don’t have much success.

No

Yes! To learn and commiserate.

Yes

Yes, to the degree that we can. We engage as partners other state agencies and statewide/regional non-profits during the planning process to understand their plans and how to realign programs and initiatives as a way to encourage good planning and use of the statewide plan.

No

not at this time

more public input and awareness

moderately useful; because mostly the SHPO uses it.

Yes

we review other state’s plans for comparison

no because it would improve our own plan by learning from other states

Yes

our adjacent states primarily and those similar in size and character

no
### Innovative Planning Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Goals</th>
<th>How useful is the State Plan?</th>
<th>Does your team work with other SHPOs?</th>
<th>If yes, what does the relationship entail?</th>
<th>Interest in Increased SHPO Communication</th>
<th>Models for State Planning</th>
<th>If yes, what states(s)?</th>
<th>Coordination with Other Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not that we know of, we have been able to leverage our umbrella agency's Chief Diversity Officer and Environmental Justice Office in an attempt to engage a broader constituency.</td>
<td>Given that we are still in the middle of the planning process, we haven’t reached the point where we analyze what our future goals might be in future planning.</td>
<td>The SHPO uses it as a guide for activities and priorities as it relates to reporting on our annual federal grant. The state’s preservation-related organizations use it to guide their work. It is difficult to gauge how much it is used by outside partners.</td>
<td>It would be interesting to hear others efforts, but I do not know that the experiences of one SHPO directly relate to another since the circumstances in each state are so different.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>During our early research phase we tried to gather information that was relevant from other plans prepared by our DOT, DNR, Planning agency, etc. While we were aware of the contents of those documents, we did not necessarily coordinate our Plan with those plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7) Meeting In A Box** was released for use by nonprofits, community organizations, Certified Local Governments, and other government agencies during existing meetings or at an independent event to facilitate conversations and further inform the plan. More outreach efforts to 1) specific geographic areas of the state and; 2) underrepresented populations; and initiate new relationships, particularly with those organizations identified as priority groups. Very useful because there is no other organization that focuses on planning for the preservation of our historic and cultural resources at a statewide level. We did look online at other state Plans, so to the extent that communicating with other SHPO staff who are familiar with planning efforts, that would probably be helpful. We currently only coordinate across the State. When possible, we coordinate regionally.

We encourage our offices to digitize their documents and work electronically whenever possible as well as updating their technology. States are using Google Drive to improve on reporting, in a timely manner. It’s useful, it’s a blueprint for what to do. It’s useful as a reference and orientation tool. By having a plan, we are poised for sustainable continuation of historic preservation programs and activities. Yes | We work with smaller historic preservation offices. Our office supports them by providing guidance and supplemental information as needed/requested. Yes, of course. It would be useful to unify and be on the same page moving forward. Differences in policies and procedures make it difficult to cooperate. Different areas have different priorities. The more transparency we have, the better we can assist. SHPOs outside of our region would be helpful for us to learn from them. Yes | Yes | No |

We need more local input, rather than a top down approach. Our budgets need to be able to include more outreach. We already go out and seek feedback, but the participation level is limited. We need input from wide range of stakeholders in the private and public sectors, not just those who are already at home. It’s useful, it’s something to work with. No | We would like to do that, but it’s not practical. I think we need to be more realistic. Yes | We currently only coordinate across the State. When possible, we coordinate regionally. |

Not yet. I am a bit critical to engage the community. I would like to get an understanding of what the public’s perception is of this effort. I think it’s important for any organization to have a Plan! Yes | Yes, again, we are in such an early stage that I cannot provide a concrete answer. Yes | Networking is very important to share innovative approaches, lessons learned, and sharing experiences. No | I don’t think we have tried that. |

Video calls, but many are making similar adaptations. We would like to make sure that there is an annual discussion regarding the plan and how it has and will be used within our state. Any plan is only as useful as the people that are using it. The plan can be a useful guide if people make sure to reference it and return to it as discussion. Otherwise, it ends up on a shelf. Yes | We reached out to several SHPOs to ask for information on how they have worked with consultants. We also reviewed multiple plans to determine what we would like to do different/similar. Yes, this would prevent people from having to recreate the wheel when they are working on their preservation plan development. Yes | We did look at other states and often will reach out to states with questions on how they handled things. Which state varies on question/topic/need. Yes | Yes, we are a part of a larger state agency and many of our preservation partners are also state agencies. We encourage individuals to consider other state plans that they are working with during consultation on our plan. |

No. In our next effort we will specifically look to increase public participation and focus the plan on fewer, well-defined, measurable goals. State plans are very useful for this purpose, and are an excellent way to engage the public in preservation activities. No | Yes, would be nice to bounce ideas off others. Yes | Surrounding states. These states have similar types of historic resources and economic, social, and political contexts. Yes | To the extent that they are relevant. |
I wouldn't call it innovative, but we do have good working relationships with Tribes and the input we receive through those communications is often centered in our strategies and goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovative Planning Practices</th>
<th>Future Goals</th>
<th>How useful is the State Plan?</th>
<th>Does your team work with other SHPOs?</th>
<th>If yes, what does the relationship entail?</th>
<th>Interest in Increased SHPO Communication</th>
<th>Models for State Planning</th>
<th>If yes, what state(s)?</th>
<th>Coordination with Other Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>More diverse engagement</td>
<td>It has been useful, especially in providing feedback about improving programs and helping us move forward with DEI work internally</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes but no one has time</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - just completed a statewide survey, TX - has a Texas sized staff, OR - really progressive</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant for public outreach. SWOT analysis of the old one helped get our heads around the old one, consider paths forward.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I collaborate with them via NCSHPO and find their input helpful on lots of issues. More is always better!</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - it would be great to coordinate with natural resources organizations, especially on climate and preservation, but we don't have enough resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Black heritage focus groups mentioned above, diverse advisory committee (to the extent possible). NPS has appreciated that we identify regions and make separate recommendations for those.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Informally through contacts and conferences.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early adoption and implementation of UAS technologies as a preservation tool.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, because we lost our longtime planner and it will be beneficial for the next staff person who is in charge of the plan coordinate with other SHPOs on best practices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our goals are stated in our plan. The plans are extremely important internally, they guide our day-to-day activities. Externally it provides a bridge to other professional, public, and elected officials by describing our goals and provide lists of resources.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, sharing of experiences and results is an important part of growth.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but we are certainly willing to look for ways to be innovative in this important process.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Carolina always produces excellent documents, not only for preservation plans but on other SHPO related topics as well.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does your team work with other SHPOs?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic preservation of under-represented communities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral part of the agency's mission</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovative Planning Practices</th>
<th>Future Goals</th>
<th>How useful is the State Plan?</th>
<th>Does your team work with other SHPOs?</th>
<th>If yes, what does the relationship entail?</th>
<th>Interest in Increased SHPO Communication</th>
<th>Models for State Planning</th>
<th>If yes, what state(s)?</th>
<th>Coordination with Other Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Sure, we'd like more people from around the state to participate and engage. But if I'm honest in thinking about what my goal is, it's to get it done and approved by the NPS so we can return our efforts back to stuff that is overwhelming as every day. Honestly, not very. We all know what needs to ideally be done. We all know the things we'd love to be able to do. But the fact is, we have little funding and a small staff that's stretched too thin. Just trying to manage the federally mandated programs - the things we must do every day to fulfill our NPS requirements. The plan plays very little in to our overwhelming day to day work of managing Section 106, NEHIP, CLG, Survey and data management, tax credits, etc. - and with the massive influx of federal infrastructure funding that we know is coming our way but no additional funding to help manage things and build capacity, there's no way any of us are giving more than five seconds of thought to a plan that won't change any of that.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I imagine that once we take up the planning process in earnest, our HP Planner will reach out to neighboring states or others that the NPS suggests have good models. But we have one planner who is also responsible for our CLG program and that position is currently vacant. Sure, that would probably be helpful once we have a planner in the position. The NEHIP coordinators have an informal luncheon that is very helpful for specific questions. Similarly, we have a smaller regional built environment compliance group. If there was something like that for staff responsible for plans, I'm sure it would only be helpful.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I said no above because I'm not currently in a place to be attuned to that. I'm sure there are some, and probably our planner (when we hire one) will reach out to the NPS STLPG to have them point us in the direction of states with good models.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, The Plan includes elements of recovery, resilience and risks to disasters. Increasing the number of respondents to the public survey and a better geographic distribution</td>
<td>Increasing the number of respondents to the public survey and a better geographic distribution</td>
<td>Our State Plan contains recommendations for resilient architecture and recovery guidelines for the preservation of historic heritage against natural disasters. No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New York, New Orleans, Boston</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drones and other high tech diagnostic tools.</td>
<td>see our plan</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>recess through contacts, conferences, and meetings.</td>
<td>more is always better.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wisconsin, Minnesota</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Plans that will be implemented successfully</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will be the first time that our state has used a consultant for this work.</td>
<td>Our goal is simply to have a 10 year preservation plan</td>
<td>I'm not sure that anyone has noticed (other than our NPS contacts) that the Statewide Preservation Plan is 5 years out dated.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, I have made some small attempt to talk to neighboring states SHPOs but the day to day requirements of my position don't make that easy.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>our procurement document is based on Texas and we're looking at NY, PA, OH, IL, and MN as examples of statewide plans. These states seem similar in urban/rural, mix of big and little cities, similar type of land ownership and tribal issues. SD plan was recommended by NPS staff as a good recent example, but we are concerned about the different federal/private ownership, mostly rural/small city differences.</td>
<td>I don't believe so.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Planning Practices</td>
<td>Future Goals</td>
<td>How useful is the State Plan?</td>
<td>Does your team work with other SHPOs?</td>
<td>If yes, what does the relationship entail?</td>
<td>Interest in Increased SHPO Communication</td>
<td>Models for State Planning</td>
<td>If yes, what state(s)?</td>
<td>Coordination with Other Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are really happy with our consultants’ approach to public meetings. It’s less presentation and more of an open house format with a variety of ways to provide comment. In fact, attendees have told us how much they like the format and our staff will be incorporating some of the activity formats into our own programmatic meetings in the future. I think it also helps having a third party who performs public planning meetings regularly rather than simply using state staff. I understand the financial concerns but a lot of times the state staff can be too close to the subject and the process benefits from that third party commentary.</td>
<td>We’re still in the middle of ours so we’re not in a place to think of future plans at the moment. As stated, we are concerned about respondents and participation numbers from throughout the state.</td>
<td>I’m sure the answer is that some benefit, some don’t care. However, we’ve seen our previous Plan used to substantiate need when an organization is prioritizing work, used as a benchmark within a grant application, and framing methodology when writing grant applications. For a time, our agency asked staff to regularly note how programmatic work was contributing to Plan goals/objectives.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Our agency statewide plan committee took time to review other state’s plans prior to completing the RFP for our planning consultants. In terms of interaction with other SHPOs, this was mostly done because of our use of NPS disaster funds to contract disaster-related publications and disaster-related goal within the formal plan. We talked with Connecticut because they had recently had to incorporate disaster content in their state’s plan. Also, when pricing contractor costs, we requested comment from other SHPOs via NCSHPO listserv and direct email to the SHPO.</td>
<td>I’m sure it wouldn’t hurt but my interaction didn’t really yield much constructive commentary.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Future Research Considerations

As one of only a few analyses of these Plans, many potential avenues of research arose throughout the thesis writing process that the author was unable to pursue. The following are just a few research topics that future researchers may consider:

- Detailed SHPO surveys regarding SHPOs’ engagement with other SHPOs, other governmental agencies, and other county, state and regional plans. Suggestions for edits to specific questions have been noted throughout the survey section of this thesis.

- Surveys and interviews of statewide preservation nonprofits and other stakeholders regarding their perspectives towards the State Plan. It may also be beneficial to ask about their use (or non-use) of the other county, state, and regional plans affecting preservation activities.

- Comparisons of State Plans to federally-required plans of similar scale (such as FEMA hazard mitigation plans or outdoor recreation plans), other county and state agency plans, and/or large-area preservation plans (such as NHA management plans) including plan development, the level of detail included in the plan, plan implementation, and effectiveness.

- A detailed history of State Plans, including changes to State Planning practices over time. Researchers may seek interviews with SHPO and NPS employees who have witnessed these changes over time. This research may also note changes in NPS guidance over time through archival documents at the Federal Record Center in Suitland, MD, assuming that post-pandemic these resources will once again be available for research.
• A detailed examination of a single state’s State Plans, noting change over time. This examination may remark on ways that the larger national history of State Plans can or cannot be read in the different Plans over time, as well as changes in a single state’s approach to State Planning.

• Examination of how different State Plans address historic resources that cross state borders. Are resources that sit in multiple states subject to the same/similar goals and strategies across the State Plans?

• Analysis of State Plans as an (underused) advocacy vehicle. How can SHPOs and other preservation partners better utilize the State Plan as a tool in preservation advocacy?
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