



## **Executive Summary**

# **Recommendations to Improve the Structure of the Federal Historic Preservation Program**

**January 16, 2009**

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) created the national historic preservation infrastructure. The NHPA established a partnership between the federal government and state, tribal, and local governments that is supported by federal funding and technical assistance for preservation activities. Building upon this foundation, the federal government has developed additional policies, legislation, and programs that promote preservation. More recently, in 2003, President Bush signed Executive Order 13287 “Preserve America” which reaffirmed the importance of federal stewardship and the need to partner with non-federal parties to promote productive use of historic properties while encouraging efforts at the local level.

A national Preserve America Summit took place on the 40th anniversary of the NHPA in New Orleans. The Summit concluded with 13 recommendations for increasing the effectiveness and benefits from the national preservation system. Among them was the charge to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Department of the Interior to “explore improvements in the program structure of the federal preservation program through creation of an independent review panel.” Ten leaders who represent varied perspectives in the field of historic preservation were selected by the co-chairs of the Preserve America Steering Committee—Deputy Secretary of the Interior P. Lynn Scarlett and Advisory Council Chairman John L. Nau, III—as an independent review panel. The expert panel met four times in person and once via conference call. They also solicited feedback from stakeholders through a national survey and received presentations from agency and other preservation experts. This executive summary document, with its seven recommendations, encompasses the discussions, challenges, and possible improvements and enhancements to today’s national historic preservation program.

***Issue: Federal Preservation Programs Lack Strong Leadership***

***Recommendation:*** The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) should be headed by a chairperson who is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The chairperson should lead the agency full-time. Additionally, to recognize the role historic preservation can play in addressing many national issues, the chairperson of the ACHP should be appointed as a member of the Domestic Policy Council.

***Justification:*** Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in 1966, the role of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the expectations for the leadership of the ACHP have shifted significantly as broader conceptions of the role of historic preservation in broad national policy questions have emerged. The core function of the ACHP as administrator of the Section 106 compliance process, combined with the emergent role of the ACHP as a key collaborative partner in the development of effective public policy solutions, create complexity for the ACHP mission.

As contemplated by the NHPA, the case-focused aspects of Section 106 continue to be the most important aspect of the ACHP’s and its chairperson’s work. Recently, the ACHP has enhanced the application of Section 110 and developed important programs to address significant national regulatory and collaborative questions. Under the agency’s leadership, the Save America’s Treasures and Preserve America programs have become important parts of the federal preservation program.

A chairperson, appointed by the President and subject to Senate confirmation, will ensure critical, daily operational guidance for the ACHP. Since the chair currently only serves in a part-time, volunteer capacity, he has not been able to have as much influence on federal interagency processes. Elevating the position will enhance the chairperson’s effectiveness. A full-time chairperson will have the time to devote to resolving complex issues within the federal interagency process and with other federal agency leaders. A full-time chairperson will also be integral to collaboration among governments at all levels, the non-

profit community, and the private sector. A full time chairperson will be better able to engage in government-to-government consultation with Indian tribes.

Senate confirmation of a chairperson will provide an important venue for timely debate on the direction of federal preservation policy. Historic preservation, and the role of the federal preservation program, is increasingly part of the national dialogue in a number of policy areas. In addition to traditional concepts of the role of federal preservation policy and programs in tourism and economic development, historic preservation has become critical in urban and rural policy concerns, climate change and sustainability, transportation, housing, disaster preparedness and response. The concept of historic preservation itself is evolving from one concerned solely with the built environment to one that is sensitive to a systemic view of the built and natural environments. Recognizing the evolution in the concept of historic preservation and the role the preservation ethos can play in developing broader federal policy and programs, the Expert Panel also recommends that the President include the ACHP chairperson as a member of the Domestic Policy Council.

*Implementation:* The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 should be amended by Congress to provide for the appointment of a full-time chairperson by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to head the agency. The President should also designate the chairperson to serve as a member of the Domestic Policy Council. Executive Order 12859, which defines the members of the Domestic Policy Council, states that in addition to the enumerated members, the President can include “such other officials of Executive departments or agencies as the President may, from time to time, designate.” As a result, no new Executive Order should be necessary.

***Issue: Department of the Interior Preservation Programs Require Better Coordination, Greater Visibility***

*Recommendation:* Within the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, a new Office of Preservation Policy and Procedure (OPPP) should be established to oversee implementation of the NHPA throughout the entire Department of the Interior’s bureaus and offices. The OPPP would provide leadership and direction in the coordination and achievement of historic preservation performance, evaluate achievement, secure appropriate levels of funding, and provide for a coordinated and unified approach and response to historic preservation issues and compliance with the NHPA.

The office will also provide guidance for the Department’s execution of the full range of existing historic preservation statutes, Executive Orders, regulations, and other requirements. The office would provide independent preservation advice to the Secretary; Deputy Secretary; the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management, and Budget; and other senior Department officials. The office would operate in a capacity similar to the Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance within the Department of the Interior.

*Justification:* The Secretary of the Interior is charged with implementing many important provisions of the NHPA, and much of that authority has been delegated to the director of the National Park Service (NPS). Within the NPS, the Cultural Resources Program, managed by an associate director, administers the National Register of Historic Places and related historic preservation/cultural resource programs or “external programs.” Despite the Department’s overall responsibility for these external programs, the cultural resource programs are too often forced to give way to other priorities, both within the NPS and in the Department as a whole. Understandably, the parks, and to a lesser extent their historic properties and resources, often take precedence over the “external” historic preservation and cultural resource programs. As a result, the Department lacks a sustained approach to historic preservation policy as to issues outside the parks.

Further, neither the NPS nor the ACHP has the authority to work across the Department to ensure conformity with the NHPA. For example, although the NPS has worked hard to update its nationwide Programmatic Agreement to implement Section 106 in the parks, the ACHP has struggled for years with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Office of Surface Mining, to adequately consider cultural and historic properties in their operations. As a land-managing department, the Department of the Interior oversees vast properties containing historic buildings and structures and archaeological sites as well as sites of cultural significance to American Indian tribes.

The OPPP would provide the Secretary the mechanism to assure Department-wide compliance with the NHPA, supply guidance on implementing the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, promote sustainable preservation practices, and provide leadership in historic preservation in general. The Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance has achieved success with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) within the Department, similarly, the Office of Preservation Policy and Procedure can do the same for historic preservation and cultural resource management.

*Implementation:* The Department Manual (DM) should be amended to establish the OPPP. The DM is the authorized means of documenting and issuing instructions, policies, and procedures that have general and continuing applicability to Departmental activities or that are important to the management of the Department. The DM describes the organization and functions of the Department's bureaus and offices, documents delegations of the Secretary's authority, and prescribes the policies and general procedures for administrative activities and specific program operations. The DM is used to communicate the instructions of the Office of the Secretary throughout the Department, to provide guidance to the bureaus and offices in their administrative and program operations, and to serve as the primary source of information on organizational structure, authority to function, and policy and general procedures.

Bureaus and offices must comply with the provisions of the DM, except to the extent that the provisions are superseded by appropriate authority (e.g., a change in statute, regulation, or Executive Order; a Secretary's Order; or a court decision, etc.). The Office of Planning and Performance Management under the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Performance and Management is responsible for managing the DM System; for assigning Series, Part and Chapter numbers; coordinating the review and issuance of instructions in the DM; and for maintaining the currency and completeness of the DM.

***Issue: Natural Resource and Cultural Resource Programs Should be Better Integrated***

*Recommendation:* The Expert Panel proposes the creation of an Associate Director for Cultural Resources within the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

*Justification:* Federal historic preservation programs suffer from an inadequate profile within the Executive Office of the President, and lack of coordination with environmental and natural resource counterparts. Although from the earliest days of environmental awareness, natural resources programs have had an Executive Office champion in the CEQ, the agency with comparable responsibilities for preservation programs (the ACHP) is not currently represented in the Executive Office.

CEQ was established pursuant to the NEPA, and has a broad mission ranging from "assist[ing] and advis[ing] the President in the preparation of the Environmental Quality Report" to "develop[ing] and recommend[ing] to the President national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality" to "review[ing] and apprais[ing] the various programs and activities of the Federal Government" with respect to NEPA procedures. NEPA, which CEQ helps to implement, promotes a national policy designed to "preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national

heritage.” The fact that NEPA has always included cultural and historic resources has often been overlooked or ignored.

A chairperson leads the CEQ. The President appoints and the Senate confirms the chairperson. For staff assistance, the CEQ chairperson “may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out [the Council’s] functions under this Act.” Currently, there are eight CEQ associate directors, four of whom are responsible for coordinating federal agency environmental compliance and program efforts within a particular practice area: NEPA, Natural Resources, Ocean & Coastal, and International Affairs & Climate. The remaining four associate directors (General Counsel, Deputy General Counsel, Special Assistant to the Chair, and Congressional Affairs) do not have programmatic responsibilities. None of these associate directors has specific purview over cultural preservation concerns, despite the fact that NEPA expressly is intended to protect “cultural [and] historic ... aspects of heritage.”

The Associate Director for Cultural Resources would work on parallel responsibilities as other CEQ associate directors, but focus on preservation issues. The Expert Panel envisions that the person in this position would assist the chairperson of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in developing the President’s preservation initiatives, coordinating historic preservation programs across federal agencies, ensuring better integration of preservation and natural resources objectives, especially during NEPA review, and in ensuring that the Section 106 process is timely and effectively implemented. In addition, the establishment of this new position within the Office of the President, together with implementation of this panel’s other recommendations, would signal that historic preservation is a priority of the new Administration.

*Implementation:* As noted above, the CEQ chairperson is authorized by statute to employ associate directors for areas of emphasis that he/she deems necessary to the discharge of CEQ’s responsibilities. Two associate directors (NEPA and Deputy General Counsel) are career personnel, with the remaining associate directors being political appointees who do not require Senate confirmation. Historically, the number and responsibilities of associate directors in CEQ has varied depending on the priorities of a given Administration. The qualifications for Associate Director for Cultural Resources would be commensurate with the duties to be undertaken, but education and experience in administration of historic preservation programs is essential.

***Issue: Federal Preservation Officers Are Not Fully Effective within Their Agencies***

*Recommendation:* The Expert Panel recommends ensuring the full implementation of Section 110 of the NHPA and Section 3(e) of Executive Order 13287 (Preserve America) concerning the appointment and visibility of Federal Preservation Officers (FPOs) and Senior Policy Officials (SPOs). SPOs and FPOs should have agency-wide real property portfolio management responsibilities.

*Justification:* Section 110 of the NHPA requires the head of each federal agency to designate a qualified official to be known as the agency’s FPO who shall be responsible for coordinating that agency’s activities under the NHPA. Furthermore, pursuant to Section 3(e) of Executive Order 13287 (Preserve America), the head of each federal agency is responsible for designating an SPO to exercise policy oversight responsibility for the historic preservation program of that agency. Executive Order 13287 requires that the SPO either serve concurrently as the agency’s FPO, or that a subordinate employee reporting directly to the SPO fulfill the duties of an FPO in accordance with Section 110 of the NHPA.

Executive Order 13287 clearly intends that the SPO should have authority and responsibility to both manage the historic preservation program of their agency and to ensure historic preservation considerations are integrated effectively into the agency’s real property portfolio management needs and

the agency's procedural and substantive compliance responsibilities. When an agency has both a SPO and a FPO, the FPO, with specific and necessary training and expertise, is a critical official in the development and implementation of those requirements.

In a number of cases, the agency designations of the SPO and the FPO, and the relationship of the FPO to the SPO, is not at a level sufficient to ensure the intent of the Executive Order is effectively discharged. The Expert Panel notes that for many agencies with significant management responsibilities for historic assets, the SPO is not the same individual charged with the management of real property as an Agency Senior Real Property Officer pursuant to the requirements of Executive Order 13327 (*Federal Real Property Asset Management*).

In order to strengthen the effectiveness of both Executive Orders and to ensure that the historic preservation program is effectively woven into the key management responsibilities of appropriate and responsible federal officials, the head of each federal agency should ensure full compliance with the intent of Executive Order 13287 and section 110 of the NHPA by designating an SPO with agency-wide management authority and by ensuring, where necessary, that the FPO reports directly to the SPO with sufficient authority to discharge their responsibilities.

*Implementation:* The chairperson of the ACHP, in coordination with the chairperson of the CEQ and the director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall ensure that the head of each federal agency designates the required officials in a manner consistent with the intent of Executive Order 13287 and informed by the related management responsibilities contained in Executive Order 13327.

***Issue: Federal Funding is Inadequate to Meet the Mandates of the National Historic Preservation Act***

*Recommendation:* The Expert Panel recommends fully funding the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) and allocating additional funds to Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs).

*Justification:* Beginning in 1968, Congress has provided funding to carry out activities prescribed in the NHPA. In 1976, the NHPA's significance was further emphasized and underscored when Congress authorized utilizing revenues annually from Outer Continental Shelf oil leases and creating the HPF to support preservation activities.

However, though the HPF's funding continues each year, the federal appropriation is a fraction of what is allowed under law. Recently, only \$50 million of the \$150 million in annual lease revenues were appropriated to the HPF and its NHPA activities. The current \$45 million funding level fails to provide adequate resources to fully address the responsibilities and mandates that the NHPA requires. The current funding level fails to address the growing inventory of buildings that fall under the NHPA umbrella as, each year, more and more buildings become 50 years of age (the NHPA's threshold for oversight and review). Additionally, promoting and expanding further NHPA-related activities increases citizen interest and engagement in their national heritage and cultural resources. This interest is evidenced by Congress' approval of National Heritage Areas, now totaling 31, which promote heritage tourism as regional economic redevelopment drivers.

A number of HPF programs need more funding, including Certified Local Governments, (CLGs) the local, community-based providers and reviewers for NHPA activities, which now number more than 1, 200. As contemplated in the NHPA and its implementing regulations, State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) in all 50 states and U.S. possessions and territories are actively involved in the Section 106 process, review of tax credit projects, preservation planning, and meeting other NHPA requirements and also need more funding to successfully carry out their mandates. For example, in 2007, more than

100,000 Section 106 cases were handled at the local, state, and/or federal levels while projects using the historic rehabilitation tax credit invested millions of private dollars to redevelop older residential and commercial neighborhoods. The Save America's Treasures program (SAT) provides funding for bricks-and-mortar rehabilitation work on thousands of eligible National Register properties, while the Preserve America program (PA) grants funds for inventory, planning, and marketing for more than 700 eligible PA-designated communities. Both SAT and PA are matching grant programs that need more funding and have far-reaching impact on communities across the country.

Of special concern are the THPOs, which function similarly to SHPOs. While the number of SHPOs is fixed, the number of recognized THPOs continues to grow, but the amount of funding dedicated to the THPOs has not. The current 76 THPOs divide essentially the same amount of funding that was shared when only a few THPOs existed. The small "pie" of funding continues to be cut into smaller and smaller slices. It is expected that the number of THPOs will increase as more tribes become proactive in recognizing their heritage for education and tourism and invoke their rights under the NHPA and Section 106.

The SHPOs and THPOs carry out a role established through the federal preservation program, and required by the NHPA, yet they are not adequately funded to fulfill that role. Greater funding would not only benefit the THPOs and SHPOs themselves but would also assist federal agencies and applicants for federal funding and permits, who benefit from and rely on timely reviews under Section 106.

*Implementation:* An initiative should be launched through the budget formulation process in both the executive and legislative branches to consolidate the consideration of funding for all of the preservation programs noted above under one umbrella. The overall needs of the federal preservation program would be considered without regard to which agencies are currently responsible for the management of its constituent parts, and funding could more easily be allocated according to the need of each program element. The Expert Panel also believes that by looking at the federal program as a whole, rather than in its constituent parts, the Administration and Congress will come to share the belief that the current level of funding is not adequate to carry out the mandates of the NHPA.

***Issue: Funding and Technical Support to THPOs is Woefully Inadequate***

*Recommendation:* The Expert Panel recommends greatly enhancing the visibility and capacity of Tribal preservation efforts through comprehensive training for tribal leaders, through the creation of a dedicated position within the OPPP to address Native American issues, and through dispensing adequate funding to THPOs and to the Native American Advisory Group (NAAG) located in the ACHP.

*Justification:* In 1992, the NHPA was amended to provide a stronger role for Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations within the framework of the Act. For example, the NHPA amendments recognized the National Register-eligibility of traditional cultural properties, and established the means for tribes to protect and preserve historic properties that were important to their particular communities.

Founded in 1998, the National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (NATHPO) included those federally recognized tribes that pursuant to 16 U.S.C, 471(a)(d)(2) "assumed all or any part of the functions of a Historic Preservation Office." THPOs serve to carry out the responsibilities of SHPOs on tribal lands including working with state and federal agencies on the management of historic and cultural properties covering 30 million acres of land nationwide. THPOs in many instances also serve as the mechanism by which tribes choose to preserve and some cases revitalize their traditions and culture including language, within their own tribal communities. In addition, THPOs provide continuity and

serve as the training resource for other tribal programs and new tribal administrations that may change annually or at the end of set terms.

Since 1996, the number of federally recognized tribes (nationally there are 556) who have successfully established THPOs has increased every year from 12 in 1996 to the current 76. Unfortunately, as the number of THPOs has increased the amount of funding has not. According to NATHPO, the total funding allocated for 2008 was \$6.4 million, which translated into a \$2,000-3,000 increase over the allocation per THPO in 2007. At \$72,965, this is a decrease from the highest average allocation given in FY 2001, which was \$154,815.

Without a substantial increase in appropriations that meets the needs of the growing number of THPOs, tribes will not have the ability to build the internal resources needed to fulfill their responsibilities under NHPA. This significantly affects the possibility of developing sustainable programs to effectively manage important historic and cultural properties on tribal lands and lands that exist outside of present day boundaries.

*Implementation:* The head of the newly created OPPP should appoint a qualified staff member dedicated solely to Native American issues. This staff member would assist the ACHP's NAAG in creating and disseminating a tribal preservation curriculum focused on tribal leaders and governments.

In terms of funding THPOs and the NAAG adequately, the solution lies in fully funding the HPF as the NHPA requires. As previously noted, the HPF currently receives only one-third (\$45-50 million) of its annual statutory allocation of \$150 million. If the HPF received its entitled authorized funding of \$150 million annually THPOs would receive adequate funding, and the NAAG would be able to effectively perform its functions.

***Issue: The Section 106 Function Is Lagging, and Must Be Strengthened***

*Recommendation:* The Expert Panel members strongly reaffirm that oversight of Section 106 of the NHPA is the most important function of the ACHP. ACHP involvement in individual Section 106 cases has a substantial and beneficial influence on the outcome of the consultation process and should be encouraged and expanded. Therefore, additional resources should be provided to support the ACHP's crucial role in Section 106 involvement, oversight, and training.

Furthermore, the Expert Panel recommends additional guidance from the ACHP to ensure federal agencies engage in Section 106 consultation earlier in the planning process for undertakings.

For agencies that manage land or buildings, a stronger and more active program to survey and identify historic resources under Section 110(a) of the NHPA would facilitate better planning decisions to avoid conflicts with historic properties under Section 106.

Coordination between Section 106 and other federal review statutes, especially the NEPA, is often lacking or inadequate, which leads to uninformed decisions, foreclosure of alternatives, and inefficient reviews. Guidance should include clear and specific standards for determining when Section 106 compliance is timely. For example:

- Section 106 consultations should be initiated, and effects on historic properties should be assessed, before the release of any Environmental Assessment or Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Issuance of a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS is the appropriate time to initiate Section 106 review.

- Section 106 reviews should be completed before the issuance of any final NEPA decision document (Final EIS, Finding of No Significant Impact, or Categorical Exclusion).
- NEPA procedures for public involvement and inter-agency coordination, however, are not a substitute for “consultation” under Section 106.

*Justification:* The role of the ACHP in overseeing and administering the Section 106 review process, and assisting other federal agencies in complying with Section 106, is central to the mission of the ACHP, and is a function that only the ACHP can perform. The ACHP is in a unique position to provide guidance, clarity, and consistency on issues that are faced by multiple SHPOs and THPOs, and issues that are often handled very differently by a variety of federal agencies.

Although the Section 106 regulations require coordination with agency planning and other reviews (36 C.F.R. § 800.3(b)), many agencies engage in Section 106 review as an afterthought, focusing on mitigation of historic resources *after* basic decisions about the project itself have already been made, rather than integrating Section 106 consultation into the early decisions about the project and the choice of alternatives. Some agencies issue only NEPA documents for certain types of agency decisions, while postponing Section 106 consultation to a later decision point, after the basic parameters of a program or project have already been determined. Since federal agency staff members are often familiar with NEPA, but not Section 106, guidance should be framed in the context of NEPA, spelling out Section 106 milestones that should be attained at various points in the NEPA process. This guidance should address a variety of different agency circumstances (e.g., agencies that manage land and buildings such as the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the Department of Veterans Affairs; permitting and funding agencies such as the Army Corps of Engineers and transportation agencies; and agencies that delegate Section 106 responsibilities such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development).

*Implementation:* Available mechanisms to implement these policy recommendations (aside from formally amending the regulations or the statute) include the following:

- Legislative Report Language. Without amending the NHPA, Congress could express its views about the fundamental importance of Section 106 for the ACHP and the need for agencies to engage in Section 106 review early in the planning process.
- Executive Order. The NHPA has a long history of Executive Orders being issued to amplify and establish detailed procedures for agencies to implement their NHPA responsibilities. Successful examples include E.O. 11593 (1971), which became the basis for the 1980 NHPA amendments; E.O. 13006 (1996) (locating federal facilities in downtown historic properties); E.O. 13007 (1996) (sacred sites); and E.O. 13287 (2003) (Preserve America). An Executive Order could also direct agencies to revise their NEPA procedures to conform to the ACHP/CEQ guidance on timing.
- Guidance Documents. These could be issued by the ACHP and CEQ. The ACHP has been working with CEQ for several years to develop guidance for integrating Section 106 and NEPA, but progress has been slow. This initiative should be revived to clarify the proper timing for initiating and completing Section 106 review. One recent example of the effective use of “guidance” is the archaeology guidance developed by the ACHP’s Archaeology Task Force.
- ACHP Operating Procedures. The ACHP’s internal operating procedures include provisions on Section 106 administration and member involvement in Section 106 Cases. These could be revised to address, for example, the importance of ACHP participation in individual Section 106 cases.

### **Brief Biographies of the Expert Panel Members**

#### **Susan Barnes**

*Vice Chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; and President and Chief Executive Officer, The Landmark Group of Companies*

Susan Barnes has been a historic preservation expert member of the ACHP since 2002 and was named vice chair of the ACHP in 2006. She is the President and CEO of The Landmark Group of Companies, headquartered in a historic firehouse in Aurora, Illinois. She is the founder of a multi-million dollar portfolio of historic properties located across the Midwest. She represented Illinois on the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Board of Advisors from 1993-2002 and is now an Advisor Emeritus. Barnes serves on the Chicago Advisory Board of The Trust for Public Land and the board of Landmarks Illinois (formerly Landmarks Preservation Council of Illinois) in Chicago. She also serves on the board of Rush-Copley Medical Center and Purdue University's \$1.5 billion Capital Campaign Committee.

#### **Philip Grone**

*Former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, Department of Defense*

Currently working as a director at Cisco Systems, Philip Grone served as the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations & Environment from November 2004 until December 2007, having previously served as the Principal Assistant Deputy Under Secretary since September 2001. He had management and oversight responsibilities for military installations worldwide, covering more than 46,000 square miles and containing 587,000 buildings and structures valued at more than \$640 billion. His responsibilities included the development of installation capabilities, programs, and budgets; base realignment and closure; privatization of military housing and utilities systems; competitive sourcing; and integrating installation and environmental needs into the weapons acquisition process. He had responsibility for a full range of environmental management issues, including the conservation of natural and cultural resources and served as the Department's representative to the ACHP. Grone has more than 16 years of experience on Capitol Hill, having served most recently as the Deputy Staff Director for the House Armed Services Committee from 2000-01.

#### **Daniel P. Jordan**

*President, The Thomas Jefferson Foundation; and Trustee, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

A native Mississippian and former lieutenant in the United States Army Infantry, Dan Jordan received his B.A. (English and history) and M.A. (history) degrees from University of Mississippi. In 1970, he received his Ph.D. (history) from the University of Virginia. Since 1985, Jordan has headed the nonprofit Thomas Jefferson Foundation, which owns and operates Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson, and he is a "Scholar in Residence" at the University of Virginia. Among his publications are three books, as well as more than 70 articles, essays, and reviews in scholarly journals, and numerous national media appearances.

Jordan has served as chair of the State Review Board of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and as a member of the Jeffersonian Restoration Advisory Board at the University of Virginia. Other board service includes the Thomas Jefferson Forum, in Boston; the Virginia Historical Society; the National Parks and Conservation Association; the National Trust for Historic Preservation; Glider Lehrman Institute of American History; and United States Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Board for the National Park System, which he chaired. He currently serves on advisory boards such as the Civil War Preservation Trust, the Tredegar National Civil War Center, and the Virginia State Capitol Restoration. He has served on planning groups for Independence Hall; the White House; the United States Capitol; the

Virginia State Capitol; Thomas A. Edison's research laboratory in West Orange; New Jersey; and Frank Lloyd Wright's Taliesin (East).

**Frank G. Matero**

*Professor of Architecture and Chair of the Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, University of Pennsylvania*

Frank G. Matero is chair of the Graduate Program in Historic Preservation at the Graduate School of Fine Arts as well as director and founder of the Architectural Conservation Laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania. Since 1988, he has been on the faculty as lecturer in Architectural Conservation at the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) in Rome and Senior Lecturer for Restore, New York City. He has consulted on a wide range of conservation projects including the archaeological sites of Mesa Verde, Casa Grande, Bandelier, and Catalhöyük in Turkey. His numerous publications include forthcoming books on the technical history of the stone industries of North America and a history of archaeological site preservation in the American southwest.

**Richard Moe**

*President, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

Richard Moe graduated from Williams College and received a law degree from the University of Minnesota Law School. He held administrative positions in government at the city, state, and federal levels and practiced law in Washington, D.C., before assuming the presidency of the National Trust in 1993. Under Moe's direction, the National Trust has greatly strengthened its financial base, reaffirmed its commitment to expanding and diversifying the organized preservation movement, become an outspoken and effective advocate of controlling sprawl and encouraging smart growth, and launched innovative initiatives to demonstrate preservation's effectiveness as a tool for community revitalization and for sustainable development.

A member of the board of the Ford Foundation, Moe has been awarded honorary doctorates from the University of Maryland and the University of Minnesota. In 2007, he was awarded the National Building Museum's Vincent Scully Prize, which recognized his leadership in moving historic preservation into the Mainstream of American life and expanding the public's understanding of the importance of protecting and celebrating our heritage. He also received the American Historical Association's Theodore Roosevelt-Woodrow Wilson Award for Public Service. Moe was named an honorary member of The American Institute of Architects in 2003. He is co-author of *Changing Places: Rebuilding Community in the Age of Sprawl*, Published in 1997; and author of *The Last Full Measure: The Life and Death of the First Minnesota Volunteers*, a Civil War history published in 1993.

**David Morgan**

*Former Kentucky State Historic Preservation Officer; and Project Panel Member, National Academy of Public Administration*

Now retired, David Morgan served as Kentucky State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) from 1984-2006. During his tenure, he survived funding crises, shifting political priorities, and seven governors on both sides of the political aisle by fostering an entrepreneurial approach to address challenges and change. As SHPO and executive director of the Kentucky Heritage Council, the agency achieved many successes at the federal, state, and local level based on three principles: (1) all preservation must happen locally, (2) partnerships are essential for success, and (3) historic preservation address many important issues facing the state. These ideals translated into the Heritage Council being active in a variety of important statewide initiatives pertaining to affordable housing, jobs creation, economic development, community revitalization, environmental conservation, and building quality of life. Morgan was directly responsible

for creating the oldest statewide Main Street program in the nation, and today the Kentucky Main Street Program has 120 participating communities. His direction and encouragement to Main Street communities to apply in unison prompted a similar action when applying for Preserve America Community status. Kentucky has remained the top state in the Preserve America initiative since its inception.

**Ellen O. Moyer**

*Mayor, City of Annapolis*

Ellen O. Moyer's election as the first woman Mayor in the 300-year history of the City of Annapolis culminates a career in public service spanning more than 40 years. She came to Annapolis in the 1950's as a district coordinator for the Girl Scouts of America. Later, as first lady of the City, she spearheaded a number of initiatives in conjunction with Keep America Beautiful involving beautification, recreation, and the arts.

As a community activist, she was the founder of Maryland Hall for the Creative Arts, served as president of the Annapolis Summer Garden Theatre, and developed the Parks and Paths for People program. She served on the City Council, was instrumental in initiating the Street End Parks, promoting the Barge House Museum and the Eastport Historic Walking Trail, developing an innovative zoning overlay to protect the maritime industry, and bringing the world famous Whitbread yacht race to Annapolis.

Along with performing her duties as Mayor of Annapolis, Ellen Moyer serves on the Advisory Board for the East Coast Greenway Alliance and the advisory board for the Annapolis Heritage Area.

**Theresa Pasqual**

*Director, Acoma Historic Preservation Office*

Theresa Pasqual is the first female director of the Acoma Historic Preservation Office, which protects the cultural resources of Acoma Pueblo. Rising 367 feet above a New Mexican valley floor, an impressive sandstone mesa, known as Acoma Pueblo or Acoma Sky City, is the oldest continually inhabited community in the United States. This Native American community is believed to have been occupied since 1150 A.D.

Her long-time connection to the land fueled Theresa's passion for preserving native languages and Acoma traditions, a passion that has now evolved into her personal mission. Theresa worked at the Acoma Language Retention Program (ALRP) before coming on board with AHPO. ALRP worked in tandem with AHPO to address to increasing loss of language and culture at Acoma. As the Acoma Historic Preservation Office director (appointed in December 2006) and site director for Acoma Sky City, Theresa is responsible for the protection of the cultural resources of Acoma Pueblo. Theresa is involved with the restoration efforts of the San Esteban del Rey Mission, the 1629, mission that sits atop the old village. She also supports the efforts to preserve the Keres language, one of Acoma Pueblo's greatest cultural preservation challenges.

**Doug Wheeler**

*Partner, Hogan & Hartson*

Doug Wheeler currently practices law with the focus on federal regulatory issues, with further emphasis on matters pertaining to land use and growth management; endangered species habitat, wetlands, and watershed management; water supply and distribution, including infrastructure development; management of agricultural and timberland resources; and historic preservation. From 1991-99, Wheeler served as California's Secretary for Resources and was responsible for all of the state's natural and

cultural resource programs administered through 18 departments, conservancies, boards, and commissions with combined budgets of nearly \$2 billion and a total staff of 13,000. During his tenure, Wheeler developed nationally recognized strategies to integrate economic and environmental goals and to effectively manage the state's natural resources in the face of rapid growth and development. He joined the U.S. Department of the Interior in 1969 where he served for seven years as Assistant Legislative Counsel and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. He also served as a senior executive of nonprofit environmental and conservation organizations, including the National Trust for Historic Preservation (Executive Director, 1977-80); The American Farmland Trust (President, 1980-85); the Sierra Club (Executive Director, 1985-87); and the World Wildlife Fund (Vice President, 1987-91).

**Jay D. Vogt**

*South Dakota State Historic Preservation Officer, and President, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers*

Jay D. Vogt is director of the South Dakota State Historical Society and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Vogt came to work for the State Historical Society in 1987, and he was appointed in 1996 as the State Historic Preservation Officer and led the effort to build an efficient and effective historic preservation program. He was responsible for implementing the Deadwood Fund historic preservation grant program and become deputy director of the Society in 1999 when he took over the day-to-day operation of the organization. As director of the State Historical Society since 2003, Vogt oversees the management of the five programs -- archaeology, archives, museum, historic preservation, research, and publishing -- as well as the administrative and development units. Vogt also currently serves as President of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers and serves on the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. He served as the first executive director of the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, Inc. from 1994-96 and served as Deputy Secretary of State from 1978-86.

**Acronyms**

<b>ACHP</b>	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
<b>CEQ</b>	Council on Environmental Quality
<b>DM</b>	Department Manual
<b>EIS</b>	Environmental Impact Statement
<b>FPO</b>	Federal Preservation Officer
<b>HPF</b>	Historic Preservation Fund
<b>NAAG</b>	Native American Advisory Group
<b>NATHPO</b>	National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers
<b>NEPA</b>	National Environmental Policy Act
<b>NHPA</b>	National Historic Preservation Act
<b>NPS</b>	National Park Service
<b>OPPP</b>	Office of Preservation Policy and Procedure
<b>SAT</b>	Save America's Treasures
<b>SHPO</b>	State Historic Preservation Officer
<b>SPO</b>	Senior Policy Official
<b>THPO</b>	Tribal Historic Preservation Officer