

US Department of the Interior
National Park Service
National Center for
Preservation Technology and Training
Publication No. 1996-13

Survey for State Historic Preservation Offices Regarding Introductory Preservation Education of Local Public Officials

**Conducted by
Barbara G. Anderson**

**For the
National Center for Preservation Technology and Training
Natchitoches, Louisiana
December, 1996**

Funding for this report was provided by the National Park Service's National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, Natchitoches, Louisiana. NCPTT promotes and enhances the preservation of prehistoric and historic resources in the United States for present and future generations through the advancement and dissemination of preservation technology and training.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Results of Questionnaire	6
Analysis	13
Recommendations	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1996, a survey of State Historic Preservation Offices was conducted by Barbara G. Anderson for the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training. The purpose of the survey was to determine how the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training might facilitate the education of local public officials.

The National Center for Preservation Technology and Training had previously identified a potential need for education of local public officials, but did not know how the State Historic Preservation Offices educated local public officials about historic preservation. There was an excellent response to the survey. Every State Historic Preservation Office was contacted by telephone and 70% of the U. S. states and territories responded to the written questionnaire.

The State Historic Preservation Offices appear to be interested in education for local public officials. They view their role in education of local public officials as a participant with local preservation commissions and statewide non-profit preservation organizations. The most important topics to include in introductory education for local public officials are the economic and community benefits of historic preservation. In-person contact is important in providing education to local public officials. Funding was the most desirable form of assistance for most SHPOs, but training for SHPO and local government staff in how to educate local public officials was also very desirable. A training curriculum for preservation education of local public officials and scholarships for local public officials to attend introductory preservation education activities also received high ranking.

My recommendation to the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training is to conduct or sponsor a series of regional preservation workshops that would

- Reach a diverse group of community leaders.
- Raise awareness of the impact historic preservation can have on a community's character (sense of place) and local economy.
- Create understanding and appreciation of the ways in which local historic preservation programs influence the future of communities.
- Equip participants with the knowledge and techniques to communicate the value of historic preservation in their communities.
- Establish a network of contacts for participants to use in their on-going efforts to influence local historic preservation efforts.

INTRODUCTION

A survey of State Historic Preservation Offices regarding introductory preservation education for local public officials was conducted by Barbara G. Anderson in 1996 for the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the survey was four-fold: 1) to determine the outcome of any recent studies on the subject of education of local public officials conducted by the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers or the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions, 2) to identify the programs and products currently used by State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) for formal introductory preservation awareness education of local public officials, i.e., mayors, commissioners, council members, planners, etc., 3) to solicit input from the State Historic Preservation Offices regarding the content and nature of a formal introductory level preservation awareness program for public officials, and 4) to identify the role the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training (NCPTT) can play in facilitating the development of a formal introductory level preservation awareness program for public officials.

METHODOLOGY

The first phase of the project was conducted in April and May of 1996. The first task completed in this phase was a telephone survey to determine if the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers or the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC) had conducted similar research within the last 10 years. Neither of them had conducted a study on the topic of education for local public officials.

The second task in the first phase of the project was to speak with representatives in each of the State Historic Preservation Offices about how they implement education programs for local governments and specifically if they attempted to education local public officials. The telephone inquiries were conducted by dialing the telephone number indicated for each of the SHPOs on the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers list of SHPOs and Deputy SHPOs, dated April 2, 1996. The answering party was informed of the nature of the call and asked to direct it to the appropriate staff member. Usually the call was directed to a local government or education coordinator. Occasionally, another staff member would take the call. Several states asked that more than one staff member respond. The responses to the telephone survey provided insight into the variety and similarity of efforts in the states and territories. Following are the summary results of the telephone interviews.

1. No State Historic Preservation Office implements a formal education program expressly for local public officials.

2. Every State Historic Preservation Office responds to requests for information from local public officials--usually this is an issue-oriented discussion or presentation. It can take place in a one-on-one meeting or in a public meeting. Typically in a public meeting, a few minutes of a regular meeting or work session are provided for a presentation with a period of questions and answers that follows.
3. Many states participate in conferences sponsored by statewide organizations of cities, counties, etc. Through these meetings they reach many local public officials with an introduction to the State's preservation programs or an issue-oriented presentation.
4. Nearly every state invites local public officials to conferences and workshops on preservation topics that they sponsor or co-sponsor--they all agreed that the local public officials who attend these meetings are usually the interested and knowledgeable ones who don't need an introduction to historic preservation.
5. The conferences and workshops typically cover any of the following topics: federal, state and local preservation programs; historical designation; legal issues in preservation; design review/regulation of historic properties; technical solutions to property preservation; planning and zoning in a historic preservation context; funding sources/financial incentives; and hot topics like ADA, heritage tourism, dealing with development pressure, etc.
6. Public officials tend to serve short terms and with hundreds and even thousands of newly elected or appointed public officials in each state each year, the job of educating the public officials would be overwhelming for SHPOs.
7. Several states said that public officials have little time to spend on any "special interest" and they need to perceive an incentive that will better their community and/or provide them more political clout.
8. Most states have a newsletter that reaches local public officials. Other communication media, especially newspapers and television were mentioned as ways SHPOs did introductory level education for the general public--this was not targeted at public officials but they no doubt would benefit.
9. A few states said they had Internet/WWW homepages.
10. A few states mentioned that their annual CLG report went to public officials in the CLG and that they used it as an education tool.
11. Audio/visual media were not used by all states in education programming of this sort. Of those who used A/V formats, nearly every state used their own slide programs. A few states have created educational videos. They all use their own brochures supplemented with printed literature from a wide variety of sources including the National Park Service, National Alliance of Preservation Commissions, National Trust

for Historic Preservation/National Main Street Center, American Planning Association, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Center for Preservation Law. Most states complained that there were never enough copies of NPS literature provided to their state and that the NTHP literature was expensive for them to purchase so they provided examples of NTHP publications for review and also provided ordering information.

A few states admitted that they did not know what was available in the way of slide programs and videos. Others were of the opinion that A/V presentations produced by others were unlikely to be useful in their state because they did not depict resources like those familiar to the people in their state. Most of them tailored their own talks and visual presentations to each community/audience rather than use the same presentation in all communities in their state. Some states said video format rarely work well for meetings and other states said they liked to be able to loan out videos to individuals and communities. A few states said they had established a video and slide/tape program lending library.

12. Following is a list of resources, mentioned by name, that are not produced by SHPOs but are used by SHPOs in preservation education of local government staff, appointed boards, and elected officials
 1. NPS Local Preservation Series
 2. NTHP Information Series
 3. NPS Preservation Briefs
 4. Center for Preservation Law "Updates"
 5. Historic Context video on Petaluma, California
 6. NTHP's Citizens' Guide to Protecting Historic Places: Local Preservation Ordinances by Constance Beaumont.
 7. NPS video tape on the CLG program
 8. NPS video tape on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards
 9. NPS (new) CLG brochure
 10. NPS Investment Tax Credit brochure
 11. NPS slide program on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards (adapted slides)
 12. NPS National Register brochure
 13. NPS National Register Bulletins
 14. Old-House Journal articles
 15. APA planning series brochures
 16. Illustrated Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation
 17. Video series on cultural tourism created by the U. S. Travel and Tourism Administration at the University of Colorado, Denver--particularly the one on San Louis, Colorado.
 18. NPS Preserving Your Community's Heritage
 19. NPS Teaching with Historic Places
 20. Design Review in Historic Districts, Bowsher, 1978
 21. "Built by Design" video about Frederick, Maryland design review process

22. NTHP "Saving Place" video
23. "Preservation Possibilities" video
24. NPS slide program on the NR criteria and listing
25. National Mainstreet literature

The telephone survey resulted in a clear impression that attempts to attract local public officials to historic preservation education programs would not be successful unless they were tied to other activities that would attract local public officials. California is one of the states that uses an existing meeting to educate local public officials. They use the Governor's annual training for local public officials as a forum for presenting historic preservation information. Last year they invited the newly elected public officials to participate in a bus tour of interesting historic places and a dinner at which Donovan Rypkema spoke about the economics of preservation. The California SHPO charged the public officials \$25 each for dinner and the total cost to the SHPO was only \$1,500. They had greater demand for the tour and dinner than they could accommodate and had to turn some people away. Cherilyn Widell, California SHPO, was very pleased with the results of their effort and is planning to continue to educate local public officials in this way.

The second phase of the project was to distribute a written questionnaire to State Historic Preservation Offices all 59 U. S. States and territories. The questionnaires were addressed to the person who had participated in the telephone interview and were mailed in August, 1996. Recipients were encouraged to photocopy and distribute the questionnaire to others in their office who were interested in providing a response. Seventy percent of the states and territories responded with completed questionnaires. There were several states that submitted more than one completed questionnaire. The total number of responses from SHPO staff was 61. The responses to the questionnaire are shown under "RESULTS" which begins on the next page. One state sent responses from 20 local governments, but these responses were not tallied because they were not from SHPO staff members.

The final phase of the project was the preparation of this report with analysis and recommendations based on the findings of the study.

RESULTS

based on 61 total responses representing 70% of the survey recipients
(59 total U. S. states and territories)

Survey for State Historic Preservation Offices Regarding Introductory Preservation Education of Local Public Officials

What role should the SHPO play in providing introductory preservation education for local public officials? Mark as many boxes as you like.

- Primary source of introductory preservation education for local public officials.
YES = 43 (70.5%) NO = 18 (29.5%)
- Encourage statewide or local non-profit efforts in introductory preservation education for local public officials.
YES = 38 (62.3%) NO = 23 (37.7%)
- Encourage local preservation commission efforts in introductory preservation education for local public officials.
YES = 50 (82.0%) NO = 11 (18.0%)
- Encourage local government staff, i.e. preservation planners, efforts in introductory preservation education for local public officials.
YES = 43 (70.5%) NO = 18 (29.5%)

Other

Provide materials and tools to local/statewide organizations.

Encourage local officials to appreciate economic benefits of preservation.

Cooperate with statewide and local organizations; local, state, tribal and federal agencies.

It takes all of them in coordination.

SHPO should assist others.

SHPO should participate upon request of local government.

Provide funding to support offering of and participation in preservation education.

SHPO should have a standard packet to provide to local governments.

There is no one else in AR to train public officials about historic preservation.

Speak at municipal government conference.

Cultivate strong relationship with local government leaders.

Work with/coordinate federal and state agencies' education efforts/programs.

SHPO should lead with others providing support.

Which of the following are potential partners in providing introductory education activities for local public officials in your state?

- Statewide non-profit preservation organization
YES = 48 (78.7%) NO = 13 (21.3%)

- Local non-profit preservation organizations
YES = 38 (62.3%) NO = 23 (37.7%)
- Local historic preservation commissions
YES = 52 (85.3%) NO = 9 (14.8%)
- Statewide organization of cities (or other units of local government)
YES = 31 (50.8%) NO = 30 (49.2%)
- State Main Street program
YES = 37 (60.7%) NO = 24 (39.3%)
- Cultural resource programs at public or private colleges or universities
YES = 21 (34.4%) NO = 40 (65.6%)
- National Trust for Historic Preservation
YES = 40 (65.6%) NO = 21 (34.4%)
- National Park Service
YES = 37 (60.7%) NO = 24 (39.3%)
- National Alliance of Preservation Commissions
YES = 29 (47.5%) NO = 32 (52.5%)

Other

Local history and museum organizations.
 Leaders in communities where preservation has been successful.
 Teacher organizations.
 State Department of Economic Development.
 Neighboring SHPOs.
 Statewide planning agency.
 Statewide historical agency.
 Extension services at land grant colleges.
 Statewide organizations of non-profit preservation organizations, i.e., historic district commissions, etc.
 State Historic Preservation Officer.
 Governor's office of planning and research.
 Planning organizations like APA. (2)
 Local Government Commissions, a city non-profit organization.
 State (Georgia) Alliance of Preservation Commissions.
 State (Maryland) association of Historic District Commissions.
 Local Acequia Organizations.
 Neighborhood groups.
 Local Archeological Societies
 The Municipal League.
 Statewide non-profit planning organization.
 Area development district, local government.
 Regional planning organizations.
 Statewide association of counties.
 Regional Planning Commission/Council of Governors.

Identify the importance of including the following topics in introductory education activities for local public officials in your state.

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	
National Historic Preservation Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 32 (53.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 25 (41.6%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 (5.0%)	1 NA
State Preservation Law(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> 42 (73.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 13 (22.8%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 (3.5%)	4 NA
Local Preservation Ordinances	<input type="checkbox"/> 45 (75.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 13 (21.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 (3.3%)	1 NA
Certified Local Government Program	<input type="checkbox"/> 35 (58.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 22 (36.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 (5.0%)	1 NA
Main Street Program	<input type="checkbox"/> 22 (36.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 28 (46.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 (16.7%)	1 NA
Historical Designation (National Register, National Historic Landmark, State or Local Registers)	<input type="checkbox"/> 45 (73.8%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 (24.6%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 (1.6%)	0 NA
Preservation Economics	<input type="checkbox"/> 48 (80.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 (16.6%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 (3.3%)	1 NA
Financial Incentives (Investment Tax Credits, State or local grant programs, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> 49 (80.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 (13.1%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 (6.6%)	0 NA
Heritage Tourism	<input type="checkbox"/> 34 (55.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 26 (42.6%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 (1.6%)	0 NA
Heritage Education (statewide school programs, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 (32.8%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 35 (57.4%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 (9.8%)	0 NA
Land Use & Community Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 43(72.9%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 (25.4%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1(1.7%)	2 NA
Maintaining Community Character	<input type="checkbox"/> 43 (71.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 16 (26.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1(1.7%)	1 NA
Design Review	<input type="checkbox"/> 27 (45.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 29 (48.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 4(6.7%)	1 NA
Property Types (archeology, buildings, objects, landscapes, interiors, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 (25.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 33 (55.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 12 (20.0%)	1 NA
Preservation Leadership Training	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 (37.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 22 (41.5%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 11 (20.8%)	8 NA
<i>Other</i>				
Restoration/rehab. planning process	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Where to go for info. & resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Success stories	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teachers training	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic districts	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Section 106	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arch. & community history	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Building codes for hist. bldgs.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heritage areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
How to est. local financial incentives	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educ. in schools	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrity vs. condition	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Survey	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Networking with other state agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economic benefits of preservation	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Property rights issues	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

From your experience, identify the effectiveness of the following format/media types for communication with local public officials in your state.

	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	Have Not Tried	
In-person, one-on-one	<input type="checkbox"/> 49 (80.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 11 (18.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 (1.6%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	0 NA
In-person, public meeting or group	<input type="checkbox"/> 32 (52.5%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 29 (47.5%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	0 NA
Telephone conversation	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 (13.6%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 46 (78.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 (8.5%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	2 NA
Teleconferencing	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 21 (35.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 (13.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 31 (51.7%)	1 NA
Personal letter	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 (11.9%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 42 (71.2%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 (10.2%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 (6.4%)	2 NA

Brochures & pamphlets	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 (8.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 43 (71.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 (15.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 (5.0%)	1 NA
Annual reports	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 (5.1%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 14 (23.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 26 (44.1%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 16 (27.1%)	2 NA
Newsletters	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 (8.6%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 40 (69.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 (12.1%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 (1.7%)	3 NA
Slide programs	<input type="checkbox"/> 16 (27.1%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 35 (59.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 (1.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 (11.9%)	2 NA
Videotape programs	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 (13.6%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 28 (47.5%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 (1.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 22 (37.3%)	2 NA
Internet/World Wide Web	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 (5.1%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 12 (20.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 (5.1%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 41 (69.5%)	2 NA
Electronic mail	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 (3.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 (25.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 (3.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 41 (68.3%)	1 NA
Newspaper articles	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 (15.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 43 (71.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 (8.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 (5.0%)	1 NA
Journal or articles	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 (1.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 35 (60.4%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 11 (19.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 (17.2%)	3 NA
Radio	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 (1.7%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 21 (36.2%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 (10.4%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 (51.7%)	3 NA
Television	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 (15.3%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 13 (22.0%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 (6.8%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 33 (55.9%)	2 NA
Video conferencing	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 (8.8%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 (10.4%)	<input type="checkbox"/> 46 (79.3%)	4 NA
Other					
Conferences/workshops	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Regional meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Networking	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Hands-on workday	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Mentoring	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Assign an impact rating of 1 through 5 (1 = low impact and 5 = high impact) for the following forms of assistance on the basis of the impact you believe each would have on introductory preservation education for local public officials in your state.

- Funding to provide introductory preservation education activities for local public officials.
 5=35 (58.3%) 4=15 (25.0%) 3=5 (8.3%) 2=5 (8.3%) 1=0 NA=1
- Scholarships for local public officials to attend introductory preservation education activities presented by others.
 5=12 (20.0%) 4=20 (33.3%) 3=17 (28.3%) 2=10 (16.7%) 1=1 (1.7%) NA=1
- Directory of resources available to assist in, or facilitate, introductory preservation education for local public officials.
 5=5 (8.2%) 4=15 (24.6%) 3=22 (36.1%) 2=13 (21.3%) 1=6 (9.8%) NA=0
- Profiles/descriptions of successful introductory preservation education activities for local public officials in the States and U. S. Territories.
 5=2 (3.3%) 4=15 (24.6%) 3=23 (37.7%) 2=17 (27.9%) 1=4 (6.6%) NA=0
- Literature on historic preservation topics of special interest to local public officials, i.e., NPS Local Preservation Series, CLG brochure, etc.
 5=4 (6.6%) 4=15 (24.6%) 3=23 (37.7%) 2=13 (21.3%) 1=6 (9.8%) NA=0
- SHPO staff training in how to educate local public officials.
 5=19 (31.2%) 4=16 (26.2%) 3=20 (32.8%) 2=3 (4.9%) 1=3 (4.9%) NA=0
- Local government staff training in how to educate local public officials.
 5=26 (42.6%) 4=16 (26.2%) 3=13 (21.3%) 2=4 (6.6%) 1=2 (3.3%) NA=0
- Training curriculum with materials.
 5=16 (27.6%) 4=21 (36.2%) 3=11 (19.0%) 2=7 (12.1%) 1=3 (5.2%) NA=3

Other

- 5 Subsidize a local government position in each SHPO
- 5 Tie local official training into incentive/reward program
- 5 Demand from constituents

ANALYSIS

Survey for State Historic Preservation Offices Regarding Introductory Preservation Education of Local Public Officials

What role should the SHPO play in providing introductory preservation education for local public officials?

Respondents to this questions overwhelmingly (88.5%) selected more than one choice with one-third of respondents (20) marking all four choices. One respondent selected none of the choices but commented that the SHPO should cooperate with statewide and local organizations--local, state, tribal and federal agencies.

The responses to this question lead me to conclude that the SHPO's role should include providing assistance (materials/packets, funding, participation, training, etc.) to local preservation commissions (82.0%) and local government staff (70.5%). Several comments to this question identified a need for the SHPO to coordinate efforts to educate local public officials about preservation. Although I think it is a good idea for the SHPO to assist in coordination of education efforts, it would be very difficult to actually coordinate all preservation education activities for local public officials if most of the education were being provided by the local preservation commissions and the local government staff members.

Which of the following are potential partners in providing introductory education activities for local public officials in your state?

Respondents to this questions favored partnerships with local historic preservation commissions (85.3%) and statewide non-profit preservation organizations (78.7%). There were many excellent recommendations for other partners including regional and state planning agencies, state and national planning organizations, historical and archeological organizations, economic development agencies, and leaders in communities where preservation has been successful.

The remainder of the answers to this question were not highly informative, although the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training will be interested in the slightly higher response for partnership with the National Trust for Historic Preservation (65.6%) than for partnership with the National Park Service (60.7%). I believe part of the explanation for this response is that SHPOs are accustomed to partnering with the National Trust for Historic Preservation, but view the National Park Service as a granting agency with substantial authority over the SHPO preservation programs through on-going regulation and periodic audits. Local non-profit preservation organizations (62.3%) and State Main Street Programs (60.7%) were the other two entities with positive responses within the 60 to 70 percent range.

There was only one potential partner that received a high percentage of negative responses. Over sixty-five percent of responses were against partnerships with cultural resource programs at public or private colleges or universities. It would not be wise to develop a program of local public official education that required partnership between SHPOs and cultural resource programs at public or private colleges or universities.

Identify the importance of including the following topics in introductory education activities for local public officials in your state.

Two of the topics listed, Preservation Economics and Financial Incentives, were deemed “very important” by 80% or more of respondents. This response is not surprising given the typical interests of local public officials in improving the economic condition of their communities. However, viewing “very important” responses only does not allow one to discriminate between a topic viewed by most respondents as not important from one viewed by most as somewhat important. To account for all three responses, a convenient ranking system can be created by multiplying the number of “very important” responses by two, adding this number to the number of “somewhat important” responses and then dividing that sum by the total number of responses to the topic (including the “not important” responses.) This system reflects the relative importance (“very important” =2, “somewhat important” =1, and “not important” =0) of each of the possible answers to the question. Following is the resulting order of topics with the first one being viewed by respondents as the most important and the last one being viewed as the least important. The number in parens after a topic is the rating achieved for that topic based on the calculations described above. Double-spaces between listed items show where a substantial difference in rating (0.1 or more) exists between topics.

- Preservation Economics (1.77)
- Financial Incentives (1.74)
- Historical Designation (1.72)
- Local Preservation Ordinances (1.72)
- Land Use & Community Planning (1.71)
- Maintaining Community Character (1.70)
- State Preservation Law(s) (1.70)

- Heritage Tourism (1.54)
- Certified Local Government Program (1.53)
- National Historic Preservation Act (1.48)

- Design Review (1.38)

- Heritage Education (1.23)
- Main Street Program (1.20)
- Preservation Leadership Training (1.17)

- Property Types (1.05)

The responses to this question indicate a hierarchy of importance for the many important topics one could include in introductory education for local public officials. The first seven topics listed above are the topics that should be the core of any introductory education program for local public officials. These topics focus on the community benefit of preservation and the way in which preservation is incorporated into local and state law.

From your experience, identify the effectiveness of the following format/media types for communication with local public officials in your state.

These topics will be ranked using the same system as was used in the prior question; however, because there were high numbers of respondents that had not tried several of the format/media types, those responses were not included in the analysis of effectiveness. Over 50% of respondents indicated that they had not tried Teleconferencing, Internet/WWW, Electronic mail, Radio, Television, or Videoconferencing.

Following is the resulting order of format/media types with the first one being viewed as the most effective and the last one being viewed as the least effective. The number in parens after a format/media type is the rating achieved for that format/media type based on the calculations described above. Double-spaces between listed items show where a substantial difference in rating (0.1 or more) exists between format/media types.

In-person, one-on-one (1.79)

In-person, public meeting or group (1.53)

Slide programs (1.29)

Videotape programs (1.19)

Television (1.19)

Newspaper articles (1.07)

Telephone conversation (1.05)

Personal letter (1.02)

Internet/World Wide Web (1.00)

Electronic mail (1.00)

Newsletters (.96)

Brochures & pamphlets (.93)

Radio (.82)

Journal or articles (.81)

Teleconferencing (.72)

Annual reports (.47)

Videoconferencing (.46)

The responses to this question indicate a strong preference for in-person educational contacts. Slide programs, videotape programs, and television were deemed by respondents as the best alternative to in-person educational programs. The least effective forms of educational communications were videoconferencing and annual reports. The high number of respondents that had not tried many of the electronic forms of communication indicates that electronic media are not the means of choice for educating local public officials about historic preservation.

Assign an impact rating of 1 through 5 (1 = low impact and 5 = high impact) for the following forms of assistance on the basis of the impact you believe each would have on introductory preservation education for local public officials in your state.

The following list indicates the mean (average) rating for each form of assistance with the highest mean rating being listed first and the lowest mean rating listed last. The mean rating was determined by multiplying each numerical rating by the number of responses giving that rating, adding together these products, and dividing by the number of responses to the question. The mode response for each question is noted in parens.

- 1 Funding to provide introductory preservation education activities for local public officials.
Mean = 4.33 (Mode = 5)
- 2 Local government staff training in how to educate local public officials.
Mean = 3.98 (Mode = 5)
- 3 SHPO staff training in how to educate local public officials.
Mean = 3.74 (Mode = 3)
- 4 Training curriculum with materials.
Mean = 3.69 (Mode = 4)
- 5 Scholarships for local public officials to attend introductory preservation education activities presented by others.
Mean = 3.53 (Mode = 4)
- 6 Directory of resources available to assist in, or facilitate, introductory preservation education for local public officials.
Mean = 3.00 (Mode = 3)
- 7 Literature on historic preservation topics of special interest to local public officials, i.e., NPS Local Preservation Series, CLG brochure, etc.
Mean = 2.97 (Mode = 3)
- 8 Profiles/descriptions of successful introductory preservation education activities for local public officials in the States and U. S. Territories.
Mean = 2.90 (Mode = 3)

The first five forms of assistance in the list are the most desirable based on the responses to this question. Assuming that National Park Service funding levels will not be increased sufficiently to award funding to each of the states and territories for education of local public officials, it seems that the most valuable assistance the National Park Service could provide has three components. The first component is training for local government staff and SHPO staff in how to educate local public officials. The second component is creating a training curriculum with supporting materials for the education of local public officials. The third component is providing scholarships for local public officials to attend introductory preservation education activities.

Estimate the percentage of local officials in your state that can be reached via electronic mail. Do you use electronic mail?

E-mail does not appear to be a good means of communicating with SHPOs or local government officials. Only half of SHPOs use e-mail. Over one third of the questionnaire respondents did not estimate the percentage of local officials in their state that could be reached by e-mail. Of those who did provide an estimate of the local officials in their state that could be reached by e-mail only 37.5% thought one-half or more of the local official had e-mail. Based on the estimates provided by SHPOs, e-mail is not yet a good way to reach a high percentage of local officials in the U. S. and Territories. California (90%) and Alaska (80%) are the most likely states to attempt using e-mail to communicate with local officials.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Center for Preservation Technology and Training has an opportunity to support State Historic Preservation Offices in educating local public officials about historic preservation. The results of this telephone survey and written questionnaire suggest the conclusion that a series of regional preservation workshops sponsored by the National Park Service would be the ideal way to assist State Historic Preservation Offices (and local preservation commissions) in educating local public officials. The following specific recommendations regarding the conduct of the workshops are based on my evaluation of the results of this study and on my personal experience in historic preservation.

The goals of the regional workshops should be

- Reach a diverse group of community leaders.
- Raise awareness of the impact historic preservation can have on a community's character (sense of place) and local economy.
- Create understanding and appreciation of the ways in which local historic preservation programs influence the future of communities.
- Equip participants with the knowledge and techniques to communicate the value of historic preservation in their communities.
- Establish a network of contacts for participants to use in their on-going efforts to influence local historic preservation efforts.

The primary focus of the educational programs at the workshops should be

- Preservation economics
- Maintaining community character through historic preservation
- Tools for implementing a local historic preservation program, including:
 - Local preservation ordinances
 - Land use and community planning
 - Design review
 - Financial incentives
- Communicating the importance of historic preservation to others in the community

Participants in the workshops should include both those who “know something” about historic preservation and those who are “interested, but have little knowledge” in historic preservation. Not all workshop participants should be from State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and Certified Local Governments. The telephone survey conducted in April and May of 1996, indicated that most states believed they were reaching too few communities through the Certified Local Government program. Most states expressed a sincere interest in serving the many communities that were not likely candidates to become Certified Local Governments, but expressed concern that funding limitations would keep them from meeting the needs of all communities in their state.

My conversations with many SHPO staff members left me with the impression that it is important to reach out to communities that have not implemented preservation programs under the formal structure of the National Park Service/SHPO programs. By reaching beyond the arm of SHPO-directed preservation activities, the workshop participants will be more diverse and the impact of the workshops will be greater than if participants are drawn from the small portion of communities in each state/region that have implemented local preservation programs.

Workshop participants would include staff of State Historic Preservation Offices, local government staff members, local preservation commission members, local elected officials, community leaders, representatives from statewide history, archeology, museum, and historic preservation organizations, representatives from state, regional, and local planning and economic development agencies, neighborhood groups, and extension service programs at land grant universities. Ideally, potential participants would be identified through a variety of sources, and participants would be selected through a competitive process similar to the way in which participants are selected for the “Your Town: Designing Its Future” workshops sponsored by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Participants should receive scholarships to attend the workshop. If full scholarships are not possible, it may be necessary to have participants pay a portion of the cost of participation.

The workshops should include activities that allow in-person contact and interaction between participants and presenters/educators. Because adult education is facilitated by hands-on activities, a portion of the workshop should be devoted to allowing participants to “learn by doing.” This might be accomplished by creating scenarios of local issues to which teams of participants respond with a proposed solution/approach from a historic preservation perspective. Role-playing may be used to help the teams identify different perspectives within the community and help them define strategies for successful communication of the importance of historic preservation. Facilitators would help each group of participants work together successfully, apply their newly acquired knowledge, and develop appropriate strategies.

Workshop participants should receive a workbook that would be used during the workshop and as a repository of important information for later reference. The workbook should include the workshop curriculum and supporting materials. The workbook should include case studies, both success stories and tales of caution, and it should provide the scenarios for which the teams will construct solutions/approaches. Although it is tempting to create a single workbook for use in all of the regional workshops, I believe the regional differences among the U. S. states and territories will require a workbook prepared specifically for each workshop. (Many SHPOs expressed the importance of customizing their presentations to the audience rather than using “off the shelf” presentations and I believe that this is equally important in planning successful regional workshops.) There are two good models for such a workbook. The first model is chosen for its format and approach and the second model is chosen for its content. The first model is the “notebook” created for each of the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s “Your Town: Designing Its Future” workshops. The

second model is the “Handbook for Historic Preservation Commissions in North Carolina,” published jointly by Preservation North Carolina and the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office in 1994.

A program of regional workshops could be implemented by the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training (NCPTF) through either direct effort of NCPTT staff or through a NCPTT contract with others to produce the workshops under NCPTT direction/authority based on an approved model.