



CARING FOR THE PAST

MANAGING FOR THE FUTURE



**FEDERAL STEWARDSHIP AND
AMERICA'S HISTORIC LEGACY**

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
HISTORIC PRESERVATION

MARCH 2001

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION IS AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL AGENCY ESTABLISHED BY THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966, AS AMENDED (16 U.S.C. 470f). THE COUNCIL ADVISES THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION MATTERS, ADMINISTERS THE PUBLIC REVIEW AND CONSULTATION PROCESS FOR FEDERAL UNDERTAKINGS ESTABLISHED BY SECTION 106 OF NHPA, AND WORKS TO IMPROVE FEDERAL POLICIES, PROGRAMS, PLANNING, AND DECISIONS WHEN THEY AFFECT THE NATION'S HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION, 1100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW, SUITE 809, WASHINGTON, DC 20004. PHONE: (202) 606-8503. WEB SITE: WWW.ACHP.GOV.

C A R I N G F O R T H E P A S T M A N A G I N G F O R T H E F U T U R E

**FEDERAL STEWARDSHIP AND
AMERICA'S HISTORIC LEGACY**

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
HISTORIC PRESERVATION

MARCH 2001

“[T]he spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage, [and] the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people.”

–National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

During the last two years, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has been studying how the Federal Government could do a better job of preserving the historic resources that it controls, and how it could implement sound policies for their stewardship as we enter the next century. This special report presents the results of this study.

The Council met with key Federal officials from many of the Federal agencies with stewardship responsibilities for historic resources as well as other interested parties, held onsite meetings at Federal facilities and management areas, and solicited views and ideas from a variety of individuals ranging from agency heads to private citizens. The agency conducted research and assembled suggestions on how the Federal Government could meet its stewardship responsibilities for America's cultural heritage more effectively, while acting as a more effective leader, manager, and partner with State, tribal, and local governments and the private sector in this endeavor.

The Council's study reviewed many examples of Federal historic preservation stewardship, both positive and negative. It concluded that improvements could be made in

three major areas: leadership in building a historic resource stewardship ethic; commitment for taking care of the Nation's historic public assets; and accountability for making decisions that are in the public interest. A fourth area, collaboration, was found to be an important means for achieving these and related objectives.

As the new century opens, it is vital that Americans learn to appreciate and take better care of our rich heritage. The protection and enhancement of the Nation's patrimony must be viewed as a continuing national priority, and the Federal Government must demonstrate its leadership and commitment to effective public stewardship of America's past.

The Council believes that the Federal Government must assert its role as first among equals in the care of public property. In the process, Federal agencies can develop and sustain creative, cost-effective solutions to managing the resources that are part of the Nation's heritage. Creating these solutions is not only in the national public interest, but is the right thing to do for ourselves and for generations to come.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

as of March 1, 2001

Cathryn Buford Slater, Chairman
Stephen B. Hand, Vice Chairman
James K. Huhta, Ph.D.
Arva M.P. McCabe
Bruce D. Judd, FAIA
Carolyn J. Brackett
Parker Westbrook
Katherine A. Slick
Raynard C. Soon
Hon. Angus S. King, Jr., Governor of Maine
Hon. Floyd Adams, Jr., Mayor of Savannah, Georgia
Architect of the Capitol
Secretary of Agriculture
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development
Secretary of the Interior
Secretary of Transportation
Environmental Protection Agency
General Services Administration
Chairman, National Trust for Historic Preservation
President, National Conference of State
Historic Preservation Officers
Observers: Secretary of Defense; National Association
of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers

John M. Fowler, Executive Director

The Council wishes to thank those members of the public who contributed opinions, ideas, and suggestions to the electronic forum on the Council's Web site.

The Council also wishes to extend its appreciation and thanks to the many agencies, organizational units, and agency personnel who assisted with information and suggestions for this report. The Department of Energy, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, the General Services Administration, and the Department of the Army were especially helpful and supportive throughout the conduct of this study. The National Park Service, the Department of the Navy, the U.S. Coast Guard, and Maine State Historic Preservation Officer Earl Shettleworth, Jr., offered their hospitality and expertise to site visits at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Pearl Harbor Naval Base, and Portland and Augusta, Maine, respectively.

Special mention should be made of the late Gary Bauer, Associate Director of the BLM Arizona State office, whose personal interest and involvement in the Phoenix meeting of the Council and support for BLM's heritage programs are gratefully acknowledged.

We also thank the following individuals and organizations for their contributions:

Task Force on the Millennium Initiative:

James K. Huhta, Ph.D., Chair
 Bruce D. Judd, FAIA
 Arva M.P. McCabe
 Richard E. Sanderson, Environmental
 Protection Agency
 Michael Kaczor, USDA Forest Service
 Peter Brink, National Trust for Historic Preservation
 Kathryn Higgins, National Trust
 for Historic Preservation

Special thanks to Council members and observers for their assistance in hosting meetings:

Assistant Secretary Mahlon "Sandy" Apgar,
 Department of the Army
 Robert Peck, Public Buildings Commissioner,
 General Services Administration
 Ray Soon, Chairman, Hawaiian
 Homelands Commission
 Earl Shettleworth, Maine State Historic
 Preservation Officer
 Katharine Stevenson, Associate Director,
 National Park Service

For arranging or providing onsite testimony, hosting meetings, and offering specific ideas and suggestions that assisted in the development and preparation of this report, we wish to thank:

Caroline Alderson, General Services Administration
 Don Barger, National Parks Conservation Association
 Tom Brown, National Park Service
 Alan Downer, National Association of Tribal
 Historic Preservation Officers/Navajo Nation
 Raymond Fatz, Department of the Army
 Caroline Fisher, Department of the Army
 Phil Francis, National Park Service
 Jim Garrison, Arizona State Historic
 Preservation Officer
 J. Bennett Graham, Tennessee Valley Authority
 David Guldenzopf, Department of the Army
 Rebecca Hommon, Department of the Navy
 Cindy Kelly, Department of Energy
 Keith Kintigh, Society for American Archeology
 Roger K. Lewis, FAIA
 Ellen Lovell, White House Millennium Council
 Roger Meade, Department of Energy
 Ray Moore, Department of Energy
 Nathan Napoka, Hawaii State Historic
 Preservation Office
 Keoni Nunes (Native Hawaiian)
 Barbara Pahl, National Trust for Historic Preservation

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Gregory Paxton, Georgia Trust for
Historic Preservation

Judith Propper, USDA Forest Service

David Scott, Historic Hawaii Foundation

Hannah Springer, Office of Hawaiian Affairs

Pete Toya, Pueblo of Jemez

Vincent Anthony Toya, Pueblo of Jemez

Richard Tune, Tennessee State Historic
Preservation Office

William Whatley, Pueblo of Jemez

Gary Wright, Department of the Army

For providing information, suggestions, and other materials in meetings of Federal and State Historic Preservation Officers, in interviews, in written materials, or during onsite visits, we wish to thank:

David Banks, National Park Service

Sarah Bridges, Natural Resources
Conservation Service

James Bruseth, Texas State Historic
Preservation Office

Evan DeBloois, USDA Forest Service

John Douglas, Bureau of Land Management

Susan Escherich, National Park Service

Pat Ezell, Tennessee Valley Authority

Laura Feller, National Park Service

Edward Friedman, Bureau of Reclamation

Michael Kaczor, USDA Forest Service

John Keck, Wyoming State Historic
Preservation Officer

Kevin Kilcullen, US Fish and Wildlife Service

Greg Knott, National Trust for Historic Preservation

Trudy Kortez, National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Tom Lincoln, Bureau of Reclamation

Frank McManamon, National Park Service

Wilson Martin, Utah State Historic
Preservation Office

H. Bryan Mitchell, National Park Service

Marilyn Nickels, Bureau of Land Management

F. Lawrence Oaks, Texas State Historic
Preservation Officer

Danny Olinger, Tennessee Valley Authority

Jill Osborne, USDA Forest Service

Tamar Osterman, National Trust for
Historic Preservation

John Parascandola, Department of Health
and Human Services

Constance Ramirez, General Services
Administration/National Park Service

David Reese, U.S. Coast Guard

Paul Rubenstein, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Rebecca Shiffer, National Park Service

James Slager, Department of State

Donald Sutherland, Bureau of Indian Affairs

Jay Thomas, Department of the Navy

Karen Ronne Tupek, Department of Veterans Affairs

Richard Waldbauer, National Park Service

Scott Waldman, Department of Health
and Human Services

Nancy Witherell, National Capital
Planning Commission

For providing materials, sharing experiences and ideas, writing or editing sections of the report, and making other significant contributions, thanks are due to Advisory Council on Historic Preservation staff:

Ron Anzalone (staff project director and
principal report author)

David Berwick

Martha Catlin

Sharon Conway

Jane Crisler

Ralston Cox

Charlotte Fesko

John Fowler

Carol Gleichman

Valerie Hauser

Thomas McCulloch

Elizabeth Moss

MaryAnn Naber

Marjorie Nowick

Druscilla Null

Alan Stanfill

Stephanie Woronowicz

Preface.....iii

Council Membersiv

Acknowledgmentsv

Chapter 1. America’s Challenge1

 A Call to Action1

Figure 1–Terminology2

 About this Report5

Chapter 2. Federal Stewardship of America’s Heritage–A Context.....6

 How Did the Federal Government Get into the Preservation Business?.....6

 Federally Owned or Managed Historic Resources.....7

 Federal Stewardship Mandates8

Figure 2–National Historic Preservation Policy9

Figure 3–Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs Under Section 110.....10

 Historic Preservation Policies and Programs11

Figure 4–Principal Federal Agency Property Managers–Historic Resource Holdings12

Figure 5–Comparison of Federal Property Managing Agency Historic Preservation Programs.....14

 How Well Has the Federal Government Been Doing?15

 Conclusion.....19

Chapter 3. Challenges of Federal Stewardship–Themes and Variations20

 The Government’s Landlord and Public Buildings.....20

 Science, Technology, and Research Laboratories24

 The Nation’s Defense and Related Institutions28

Figure 6–Special and Desirable Resources: Lighthouses and Lodges.....33

 Public Lands and Multiple Uses.....36

 Parks, Refuges, and Sanctuaries.....42

 Public Works and Infrastructure48

 Areas of Interest to Native Americans50

 Conclusion.....54

Chapter 4. Historic Resource Care and Management–Summary of Findings55

Figure 7–Major Federal Stewardship Responsibilities: Did You Know. . . ?60

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 5. Successful Stewardship of the Past–Needs and Recommendations for Improvement.....61

- Leadership: Building a Historic Resource Stewardship Ethic.....61
 - Leadership Needs61
 - Recommendations.....63
- Commitment: Taking Care of the Nation’s Historic Public Assets.....65
 - Commitment Needs.....65
 - Recommendations.....69
- Accountability: Making Preservation Decisions in the Public Interest70
 - Accountability Needs70
 - Recommendations.....72
- Collaboration: Finding and Working with Partners.....73
 - Collaboration Needs73
 - Recommendations.....75
- Council Commitments.....76
- Afterword76

Research Sources and Bibliography77

Appendix 1. Policy and Program Recommendations Provided to Specific Agencies as Part of this Study81

Appendix 2. Policy, Budget, and Strategic Planning Initiatives Related to Historic Resources Stewardship Begun by Agencies During the Course of this Study.....85

Appendix 3. Other Recent Initiatives: America’s Treasures, Legacy, and “My History”86

Notes on this Study87

A CALL TO ACTION

The occasion of the Millennium gives citizens an unprecedented opportunity to celebrate and protect their heritage. Many, perhaps most, Americans see the benefits of a beautiful, vast, culturally rich, and diverse Nation, with tremendous resources in both public and private hands that are linked to the Nation's past and provide opportunities for its future.

The number of Americans who want to live, work, and play in distinctive places with a patina of time is growing. These citizens depend on cultural heritage and traditions to reinforce values and their own sense of worth. Many of them want to reside and participate in communities that make the most of their heritage, preserve its best reminders, and use older homes, commercial districts, and noted landmarks to establish their community identity and increase its livability as well as its economic vitality. They want to take their families to visit historic sites, feel the presence of those who came before, and learn from the past. Today, more and more citizens see history and historic resources as a part of an environment that is worth preserving, cherishing, and using to enrich their lives and those of their children and grandchildren.

Over the last 40 years, historic preservation has also become a more routine and accepted part of local and regional planning, community development, and business enterprise, and there are many success stories to tell. Today it is instructive and encouraging to see how far we have come in preserving our heritage. However, it is also daunting to see how far we still need to go to preserve our past and its reminders in many regions and communities throughout the country.

Though a great deal of historic preservation effort has been and continues to be locally and privately driven by grassroots efforts, the Federal Government remains a key player and facilitator in this arena. The Federal Government can play a significant role in protecting our cultural heritage in three basic ways. First, it can foster public appreciation of the values associated with the country's history, and back such promotion with sound programs and other assistance. Second, it can be sensitive and responsive to other public

and private preservation efforts, and avoid actions that are in conflict with those objectives. Third, and perhaps most important, the Federal Government can take better care of the historic resources it holds in trust for the American people. America's leaders need to consider governmental priorities at all levels, and determine how stewardship of the Nation's cultural heritage fits in their agenda.

The Federal Government manages a large percentage of America's historic assets (see Figure 1, page 2), from the national parks, forests, and museums that it operates, to the less obvious but no less important property holdings used to carry on the business of Government in office buildings, military installations, recreation areas, and research laboratories. These resources comprise a substantial part of the Nation's cultural patrimony. Federal stewardship and leadership can encourage others and set a standard of excellence for them to emulate, while offering opportunities for creative partnership to protect America's heritage. A serious commitment needs to be made to do so.

In the face of prosperity and accompanying change, the past and its reminders take on new meaning and importance. While there are thriving historic downtowns, well-preserved residential districts, and well-maintained local landmarks, some of our best historic assets—many of them publicly owned—are neglected and virtually unknown. Many popular public places—spectacular national parks as well as other locations—are overused and under-maintained. Older public works and infrastructure, much of it historic, is in need of repair. Much of our prehistoric past, and our ability to understand how things have come to be—is gone forever, and more is being lost each day. Entire ways of life in some regions, including ranching, farming, and Native American cultural practices, are disappearing, and often the public lands retain their only physical reminders.

If we do not take steps to preserve more of this historic legacy under Federal Government control, what do we stand to lose, and what opportunities are we missing?

Enhancing the Quality of Life

Much has been made of preservation of historic communities, neighborhoods, landscapes, and ambiance

FIGURE 1

TERMINOLOGY

Several different terms are typically used to discuss the tangible resources that are subject to historic and cultural preservation laws and policies, and we must clarify their usage.

Historic resources or **historic properties** are defined in the National Historic Preservation Act as “any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property or resource.” In current historic preservation policy and practice, such resources are usually places, or objects with ties to specific places.

The National Register recognizes properties significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture, at the national, State, and local levels of significance. National Historic Landmarks are National Register-listed resources that have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as outstanding resources of national significance.

Heritage assets or **heritage resources**, in this context, are used by some Federal agencies as umbrella terms that include historic resources. Used most often in a broader context, these are generally understood to be publicly held resources with historic, natural, or cultural significance and value. Reporting on “heritage asset holdings” is required of Federal agencies for financial accountability purposes under the Chief Financial Officers Act and related laws. Often these assets have economic value, and may or may not have functions or uses that meet current Federal agency mission needs and Government operations requirements. When used in this report, the term “heritage assets” will generally refer to assets with historic significance.

Cultural resources are generally defined by Federal agencies to mean the same thing as historic resources, although there is no consistent legal definition and individual agencies and organizations use different emphases. Under 10 U.S.C. 2684, which deals with the Department of Defense’s responsibilities to manage “cultural resources,” such resources are defined to include properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places; cultural items defined by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act; archeological resources as defined by the Archeological Resources Protection Act; and archeological artifact collections and associated records. The National Park Service lists archeological resources, cultural landscapes, structures, museum objects, and ethnographic resources in its management guidance and definition of “cultural resources.” Use of the term “cultural resources” by other agencies may be confusing because arts agencies and cultural endowments may use it to refer to art, performance, music, and other forms of cultural expression.

This report will use the term **historic resources** as the covering term to embody these various concepts.

in helping to preserve the quality of life. Our personal, everyday lives are enriched by “user friendly” environments that preserve diversity, identity, green space, and character. In revitalized communities, health and personal safety are increased, and more attention is paid to basic infrastructure, schools, and other key ingredients that may be linked to civic pride.

Communities with easily identifiable public landmarks offer a sense of place and well-being that is hard to find in modern sprawl and mile-after-mile of roadside development. Key publicly owned historic resources, including post offices, courthouses, parks, and other Federal assets, can provide an important nexus for other preservation activities, and their loss can have negative effects on the urban environment.

Federal assets of all kinds—National Parks, National Forests, military installations, and other holdings—certainly play a role in the local and regional economic picture as well as in its social structure. Heritage is good for business generally, and it has certainly proven to be good for tourism. Increasingly, heritage or cultural tourism makes up much of the economy of communities and regions. Recent studies have found that 46 percent of U.S. adult travelers included a cultural, arts, heritage, or historic activity while on a round trip of 100 miles or more. Visiting a historic site such as a historic community, park, or building was the most popular activity among travelers, amounting to an estimated 31 percent (62.6 million) of all travelers annually.¹

Preserving Diversity

Today, regional and local distinction and uniqueness are disappearing or becoming homogenized. America has often been referred to as a “Nation of Nations.” As such, it needs to find a way for its unique blend of individuals, cultures, traditions, ethnic groups, and communities to thrive, while not ignoring the heritage common to the entire country. Ritual, belief, and perpetuation of traditional cultural practices may be singular and significant. So too may be the special places and landscapes associated with them. Many of these places are on Federal and other public lands.

Ethnic groups and communities, particularly Indian tribes, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska natives, value the preservation of particular landforms, environments, or other “natural” features imbued with cultural meaning, as they are keyed to important practices and beliefs integral to the survival of their culture. These heritage values need to be respected and considered in how we value the past. The Federal Government has a trust responsibility to Native Americans, and needs to give special attention to the care of these resources under its jurisdiction and control.

Establishing Identity and Connections

All of us are connected to the past by a desire to know who we are and where we fit in the modern world. While our “roots” include our personal origins and ancestral ties, it also includes our community or group identity. We desire to learn about our family history and the role it played in the broader currents of American history, and we love to share some good family stories about our ancestors. As these stories are told and passed on to younger generations, they become part of our own story, and they can lend familiarity, humanity, and reality to our relationship with the past.

As Americans, we may also identify with the stories and places of people from the past who are not directly related to us. The history of the rich, the powerful, and the elite was often recorded; this was not true of the broader population until the Civil War popularized the use of photography of common people and the events that shaped so much of the American psyche for the succeeding century. Many of us may be able to relate to a pioneer family traveling by wagon train along the Oregon Trail and appreciate learning about their everyday lives. Museum objects, journal accounts, and artists’ depictions are enhanced by seeing the ruts that their wagon left in the prairie, and the rock where they stopped to scrawl a record of their passing.

Whether or not our family ancestors had similar experiences, we may come to a better appreciation of our common past and its power. Much of this

¹ Partners in Tourism and Travel Industry Association of America, 1998, 1999.

evidence is contained on Federal lands, lies in public collections, or is embodied in the public works projects or military past of former generations.

Increasing Personal Enrichment and Knowledge

Learning comes from experience, as well as from books and other written sources. Television, film, and electronic media have become increasingly important over the last 50 years. But we know that the written or spoken word, and even the visual image, can only take us so far. If “a picture is worth a thousand words,” then being able to say, “On this spot...” must be worth substantially more. In order to truly understand the past we need something more than written and photographed histories.

For example, many books have been written about the 1876 Battle of the Little Bighorn, popularly known as “Custer’s Last Stand,” and eyewitness testimony is even available. From the painted buffalo skin representations and recorded oral histories of the Cheyenne and Lakota, we may also attempt to view the battle through Native Americans’ eyes.

But if we really want to know something about this piece of history, we need to experience southern Montana on a hot day in late June, when the slightest movement kicks up dust and raises a sweat. We need to walk in the valley of the Little Bighorn River where the Lakota and the Northern Cheyenne families were camped before Custer ordered the attack. We need to climb along the ridges and gullies over which the 7th Cavalry and Indian warriors fought. We need to experience the actual place.

We revel in the “genuine article”—the truly memorable experience that only the actual place can provide. George Washington commanded the Continental Army from this tent. Martin Luther King began his public ministry and civil rights campaign in this neighborhood. Thomas Edison worked on his experiments in this laboratory. Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce people established their winter camp and pitched their tipis here. The Hindenburg dirigible was berthed in this hangar and exploded over this spot.

Real places, material objects, and the other “connective tissue” of history—photographs, maps, diaries, and other artifacts—give pattern, texture, and a richness to the past that goes beyond the schoolroom. Either by accident or design, the Federal Government owns or manages many of these sites, objects, and archives.

In Summary

In 1966, Congress wrote in the National Historic Preservation Act that “the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage,” and that “the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people.”

We may not feel that we have an obligation to learn from or appreciate the past. But if we are ignorant of our history and ignore or undervalue our historic resources, we miss many important opportunities—to enhance our lives, to preserve diversity, to establish our identity, and to learn. In short, we miss opportunities to derive inspiration, spiritual fulfillment, and tangible benefits from our past. We need to preserve enough of history’s physical reminders so that we can appreciate the values they embody. If we fail to do this, the struggles and achievements that resulted in the America of the third millennium will remain a closed book to us—a book that is in danger of being “remaindered,” sold at far less than its true value, allowed to fall apart, or even discarded and burned with the trash.

We must also meet our responsibility to protect our public investments. The American people have a vested interest in their publicly owned historic resources, including major public buildings, public engineering works, defense and research installations, and other capital improvements. The public value of many of these resources is enhanced by the broad patterns of our history that they represent as well as particular historic events associated with them. Many historic resources in public hands have value not only to the Nation as a whole, but also to local communities and groups.

Treasured historic resources can become focal points to anchor local economies and engage community spirit

and pride. Such investments in our past must be maintained. Given these many potential benefits, we should not allow such resources to deteriorate and be discarded if reasonable alternatives to such action exist.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report focuses on the myriad ways in which the Federal Government influences the preservation of our heritage through its stewardship of public resources. Federal agencies that own or manage historic resources have these stewardship responsibilities. By law, all Federal agencies must also consider historic values in their planning and decision making.

But today, the Federal Government is having a hard time taking care of many of the Nation's resources for which it is responsible. It is having trouble funding basic programs and sustaining its stewardship efforts responsibly and cost-effectively. It is struggling to meet the basic operating and maintenance needs of its facilities and public recreation areas. And in the face of other needs, Federal agencies often neglect, overlook, or misunderstand their responsibilities as good public stewards.

Too often preservation of historic resources is not afforded enough priority by agencies. In some cases such resources may be viewed not as assets but as management liabilities that strain agency budgets and personnel. Decisions made about the disposition of such resources may not fully take into account their potential use or their overall historic value to local communities or the Nation. The reasons for these situations are varied and complex, and solutions are not straightforward.

For the past two years, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the independent Federal agency charged with advising the President and Congress on historic preservation matters, has been studying how the Federal Government could do a better job of caring for the historic resources it administers. The Council's contribution to the Millennium observance is to offer its advice on historic preservation policies

and implementation strategies that may better serve future stewardship needs of the Federal Government.

The Council devoted a series of regular meetings to first-hand examination of historic resources and issues of concern to Federal managers. The meetings were held in Miami, Florida; Alexandria, Virginia; Santa Fe, New Mexico; Honolulu, Hawaii; Washington, DC; Knoxville, Tennessee; Phoenix, Arizona; and Portland, Maine. Information collected during these meetings was augmented by agency presentations and written comments, public testimony, discussions with agency preservation personnel, and research.

The Council also solicited grassroots input from a broad range of government officials, interested organizations, and individuals via a discussion forum on our Web site. Federal employees, State and local officials, Native Americans, citizen activists, historic preservation professionals, business owners, and members of the interested public shared ideas and opinions through this medium. Council staff experience also added important insights.

The report that follows reviews the richness and diversity of Federal heritage holdings around the country, and offers examples of the challenges faced by many Federal agencies in managing these resources. It looks in detail at four areas that are essential to better Federal stewardship—leadership, commitment, accountability, and collaboration—and suggests how Federal responses to these challenges might be improved. The report concludes with a series of general findings and recommendations for future action.

Our study does not purport to examine all aspects of Federal policy and experience as they relate to preservation of our past, nor have we been able to examine all Federal land and property holding agencies in depth with our own limited resources. However, we have endeavored to provide a useful overview as well as a series of focused examples of Federal agency program activity as a starting point for future discussion and debate. The Council hopes this report can help chart a new direction for Federal stewardship of historic and cultural resources in the 21st century.

HOW DID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GET INTO THE PRESERVATION BUSINESS?

The important role that the Federal Government could play in the preservation of historic resources was first acknowledged in the late-19th and early 20th centuries. The first national parks and monuments, for example, were designated in the 1870s and 1880s to set aside and protect special places and keep them in the public domain. Civil War battlefields and Native American antiquities also benefitted from early protection.

An early and forceful advocate of conservation of public lands and resources was President Theodore Roosevelt, who recognized the value of stewardship as a Government responsibility. Early in the 20th century, Roosevelt called for responsible asset management and long-term enhancement of the value of those assets. It was due to his encouragement that the Antiquities Act was passed in 1906. In 1916, the National Park Service (NPS) was created to administer many of the early park and battlefield areas and take care of protected western antiquities.

During the 1930s and 1940s, the Federal Government became more involved in preservation, conservation, and public history through such New Deal programs as the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Works Progress Administration, and the Federal Writers Project. Many of the Federal Government's park holdings, public works, and military installations were also developed or improved during this period. In the wake of World War II and the population and development boom that followed, the effects of growth and new construction on America's cities, towns, and countryside energized concerned citizens, who began to seek a new and more comprehensive approach to preserving America's heritage.

Thirty-five years ago, a special committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, in concert with the congressionally chartered, nonprofit National Trust for Historic Preservation, the White House, and several

prominent members of Congress, produced a report and plan of action entitled *With Heritage So Rich*. This publication led to the drafting and passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in 1966.

NHPA is a comprehensive piece of legislation that establishes a Federal historic preservation policy, sets forth broad Federal responsibilities to identify, evaluate, and protect historic resources, identifies key programs that will be followed by the Federal Government, and defines the role of Federal, tribal, State, and local government in advancing these policies. In addition to mandating direct Federal responsibility for what it owns or manages, a large percentage of historic preservation activity is supported through a public-private partnership established by NHPA. The partnership involves State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) in each State and territory, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), and certified local governments (CLGs). At the Federal level, NPS administers some Federal funding on a matching basis, maintains the National Register of Historic Places, and runs a variety of programs that offer technical assistance and set standards in the identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic resources.

An independent Federal agency, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, reviews Federal actions and administers a process to ensure consultation between Federal agencies, tribes, States, localities, and the private sector in Federal planning and decisions that may affect historic resources. The SHPOs, THPOs, and the more than 1,100 CLGs operate State, tribal, and local programs and oversee subgrants of Historic Preservation Fund monies under NPS administration. NPS and the States jointly oversee Federal tax incentives for rehabilitation of historic commercial property. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, chartered by Congress in 1949 (but no longer receiving regular Federal appropriations) leads a coalition of statewide and other preservation organizations, supports grassroots preservation efforts, and promotes historic preservation through a broad array of fund raising and outreach efforts.

FEDERALLY OWNED OR MANAGED HISTORIC RESOURCES

The activities of Federal land- and property-managing agencies have a combined impact on hundreds of millions of acres of public lands, hundreds of thousands of buildings and other holdings, and their adjacent communities. As a baseline for comparison purposes, it is estimated that the Federal Government owns, manages, or administers more than 665 million acres of land, and 430,000 buildings with a floor area of nearly 2.9 billion square feet. It rents an additional 2,030 square miles, and 77,000 buildings with 300 million square feet of space. A great many of these public assets have historic or cultural value of major significance.

It is true that the United States sets aside some special places, many of them historic, as National Park Units, public museums, or conservation lands to help preserve our heritage. But the resources for which the Federal Government has stewardship responsibilities are far more extensive than that. National Park Units comprise only slightly more than 11 percent of Federal lands, a small fraction of the total Federal holdings throughout the country. The remaining publicly owned and administered land and resources under the trusteeship of various departments and agencies account for nearly a third of the land area of the U.S. They comprise numerous building complexes, structures, facilities, and other resources, including a wide range of historic artifacts and public art; historic ships, aircraft, and historical collections; and historic document archives.

These Federal lands and other property include units of the National Park System, National Forests, National Wildlife Refuges, and National Marine Sanctuaries. But they also include the vast public lands throughout the West and Alaska under the administration of the Bureau of Land Management, and the military installations of the Defense Department. The launch, training, testing, and tracking facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) are Federal holdings. Federally owned or controlled Coast Guard stations and maritime navigation lights and other aids, air traffic

control facilities, research laboratories and experimental facilities, flood control dams and navigation locks, hydroelectric facilities, and nuclear power plants are also included. Veterans Medical Centers and national cemeteries are a large part of the inventory too. All told, the Federal Government controls nearly three billion square feet of building space, including post offices and courthouses, prisons, office buildings, U.S. mints, and Federal reserve banks.

As designated by the National Register of Historic Places, the Nation's official list of historic properties worthy of preservation, Federal historic resources include a broad range of buildings, structures, sites, landscapes, and areas significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture. Historic or archeological districts may comprise hundreds of individual properties. Collectively, these resources embody, celebrate, and represent important historic events; capture and symbolize the lives of persons significant in our past; include examples of period architecture, industrial design, and historic construction techniques; reflect the work of master craftsmen, designers, and engineers; and can tell us about the past and make an important contribution to knowledge of our own history, prehistory, and culture.

As of March 21, 2000, there were 71,636 properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, including both privately and publicly owned resources. Of these, 10,783 were historic districts, and the number of contributing resources within these and other listed properties was 1,127,364. (Archeological resources and properties of traditional cultural or religious importance were substantially under-represented in these known resources.) Some properties designated or worthy of designation as National Historic Landmarks have outstanding national significance and possess "exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the United States."² Approximately 2,300 properties had been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as National Historic Landmarks. Less than 10 percent of these formally recognized and documented resources are in Federal ownership, in spite of the vast holdings of the Federal Government.

² 36 CFR Part 65, "National Historic Landmarks Program."

It is difficult to determine exactly how many of these resources are Federally owned and managed, and even more difficult to know how many historic resources exist in Federal ownership that have never been fully identified, evaluated, documented, and registered. We know that there are many properties in Federal ownership or control that have not been listed that contain important archeological resources or antiquities, and there are also many significant but unregistered Native American sites containing human remains, associated or unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of Native American cultural patrimony. Similar caveats would apply to sites, places, and other properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations.

The Council recently requested information from Federal agencies on their historic preservation holdings or programs.³ Responses and their completeness have been spotty, and partial results of Council inquiries and research are shown in Figures 4, 5, and 7 (pages 12, 14, and 60). With some exceptions, we must conclude that Federal agencies do not have a good understanding or record of the myriad historic resources that they must manage, and thousands—some estimate the number in the millions—of historic resources may exist on Federal lands but have not yet been identified and documented.

FEDERAL STEWARDSHIP MANDATES

Both Federal legislation and several Executive orders support historic preservation as a national policy, and define a Federal role for carrying out this policy. The National Historic Preservation Act declares that “the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage,” and that “the preservation of this irreplaceable heritage is in the public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, esthetic, inspirational, economic, and energy benefits will be maintained and enriched for future generations of Americans.”⁴

³ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Memorandum to Federal Preservation Officers, May 9, 2000.

⁴ NHPA Sections 1(b)(1) and 1(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 470).

⁵ NHPA, Section 110 (a) (1) (16 U.S.C. 470 h-2).

⁶ E.O. 11593, Section 1.

⁷ NHPA, Section 106 (16 U.S.C. 470f).

Title I of NHPA lays a policy foundation for Federal agencies (see Figure 2, page 9). NHPA goes on in Section 110 to lay out a comprehensive framework for programs to carry out national preservation policy in support of Federal stewardship. Section 110 directs Federal agencies to “assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties which are owned or controlled by such agency,”⁵ and to establish and carry out preservation programs to meet these and the other purposes of the law (see Figure 3, p. 10). Executive Order 11593 (“Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment”) directed the Federal Government to provide leadership in this effort, and specifically to “administer the cultural properties under their control in a spirit of stewardship and trusteeship for future generations.”⁶ In later amendments to NHPA, much of Executive Order 11593 was codified and incorporated into the law.

In addition, by law Federal agencies are required to consider the effects of their actions, including financial assistance, licensing, and approvals, on historic resources and engage in public consultation with a variety of concerned parties as part of their decisions on those actions. Under Section 106 of NHPA,

the head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking in any State and the head of any Federal department or independent agency having authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The head of any such Federal agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established under Title II of this Act a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such undertaking.⁷

FIGURE 2

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION POLICY

Under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Section 2), Federal agencies are directed to:

- use measures, including financial and technical assistance, to **foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony** and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations;
- **provide leadership in the preservation of the prehistoric and historic resources of the United States and of the international community of nations** and in the administration of the national preservation program in partnership with State, Indian tribes, Native Hawaiians, and local governments;
- **administer federally owned, administered, or controlled prehistoric and historic resources in a spirit of stewardship** for the inspiration and benefit of present and future generations;
- **contribute to the preservation of nonfederally owned prehistoric and historic resources** and give maximum encouragement to organizations and individuals undertaking preservation by private means;
- **encourage the public and private preservation and utilization of all usable elements of the Nation's historic built environment;** and
- **assist State and local governments, Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation** to expand and accelerate their historic preservation programs and activities.

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an independent Federal agency that advises the President and Congress on historic preservation matters, oversees and administers Section 106 of NHPA, and issues government-wide regulations that govern its implementation. State Historic Preservation Officers and Indian tribes play key roles in consulting with and advising Federal agencies as they meet these responsibilities.

Agencies are also responsible for considering the impact of their actions more broadly on the environment in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Major Federal actions “significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” must be examined to determine whether less damaging alternatives exist, and detailed analyses prepared to assist in decisions about those actions. Impacts on historic resources are included along with other environmental factors.

Agencies are required to protect and control the removal, destruction, or defacement of significant resources on their lands under the Antiquities Act, the Archeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. (These laws apply not only to Federal property, but also to those lands held in trust for Indian tribes.) Agencies that manage land or operate Federal facilities have a variety of other responsibilities as well, including both general environmental protection statutes and more specific land-use planning and facilities management requirements. The Bureau of Land Management, for example, is governed by the provisions of the Federal Land Policy Management Act; the U.S. Forest Service, by the National Forest Management Act. Building and facility managers have responsibilities related to planning, construction, operations, and maintenance of the structures and installations under their charge, such as those contained in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and related authorities.

FIGURE 3

FEDERAL AGENCY HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAMS UNDER SECTION 110⁸

Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act sets out the broad historic preservation responsibilities of Federal agencies and is intended to ensure that historic preservation is fully integrated into the ongoing programs of all Federal agencies. This intent was first put forth in the preamble to the National Historic Preservation Act upon its adoption in 1966.

When the Act was amended in 1980, Section 110 was added to expand and make more explicit the statute's statement of Federal agency responsibility for identifying and protecting historic properties and avoiding unnecessary damage to them. Section 110 also charges each Federal agency with the affirmative responsibility for considering projects and programs that further the purposes of NHPA, and it declares that the costs of preservation activities are eligible project costs in all undertakings conducted or assisted by a Federal agency.

The 1992 amendments to NHPA further strengthened the provisions of Section 110. Under the law, the head of each Federal agency must do several things. First, he or she must assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties owned or controlled by the agency. Each Federal agency must establish a preservation program for historic properties' identification, evaluation, nomination to the National Register, and protection. Each Federal agency must consult with the Secretary of the Interior (acting through the director of the National Park Service) in establishing its preservation programs. Each Federal agency must, to the maximum extent feasible, use historic properties available to it in carrying out its responsibilities.

The 1992 additions to Section 110 also set out some specific benchmarks for Federal agency preservation programs, including:

- historic properties under the jurisdiction or control of the agency are to be managed and maintained in a way that considers the preservation of their historic, archeological, and architectural values;
- historic properties not under agency jurisdiction or control but potentially affected by agency actions are to be fully considered in agency planning;
- agency preservation-related activities are to be carried out in consultation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, and the private sector;
- agency procedures for compliance with Section 106 of NHPA are to be consistent with regulations issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; and
- an agency may not grant assistance or a license or permit to an applicant who damages or destroys historic property with the intent of avoiding the requirements of Section 106, unless specific circumstances warrant such assistance.

⁸ National Park Service, *Federal Register*, April 24, 1998.

There are special provisions for dealing with property acquisition and leasing, as well as for surplus property and transfers of property out of Federal ownership. Statutes like the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act made it possible for the General Services Administration and other agencies to enter into cooperative arrangements with non-Federal parties for the management and use of public buildings. More recently, Executive Order 13006 (“Locating Federal Facilities on Historic Properties in Our Nation’s Central Cities”) reaffirmed a Federal commitment to leadership in the preservation of historic resources and preference for using historic properties in central cities for Federal facilities.⁹

Finally, all agencies have some basic public responsibilities for preservation and maintenance of archival records that reflect the history and operation of each agency, and special rules and procedures may apply to stewardship of Federal artwork, historic furnishings, museum collections, and other historic holdings.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Federal agencies have adopted a variety of policies and organizational schemes for meeting their historic preservation responsibilities. Today, a number of Federal agencies and programs are focused on various aspects of cultural heritage preservation and enhancement, and attempt to comply with the Federal mandates governing them. Most active among Federal departments and agencies that own, control, or manage land and property are the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, and the General Services Administration.

The Department of Energy, the Department of Commerce, and the U.S. Postal Service, which is not considered a Federal agency but an “independent

establishment of the Executive Branch” under the Postal Reorganization Act, also have large property holdings. Key constituent bureaus of these departments and other responsible agencies are listed in Figures 4 and 5 (pages 12 and 14). Each of these agencies has stewardship responsibilities for the land and public property it owns or manages.

As required to implement Section 110, the National Park Service has issued standards and guidelines for Federal agency historic preservation programs.¹⁰ The standards summarize the statutory requirements, and spell out the principal performance measures on which to judge Federal agency programs (see Figure 3, page 10). The standards are:

1. Each Federal agency establishes and maintains a historic preservation program that is coordinated by a qualified Preservation Officer; and that is consistent with and seeks to advance the purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act. The head of each Federal agency is responsible for the preservation of historic properties owned or controlled by the agency.
2. An agency provides for the timely identification and evaluation of historic properties under agency jurisdiction or control and/or subject to effect by agency actions.
3. An agency nominates historic properties under the agencies’ jurisdiction or control to the National Register of Historic Places.
4. An agency gives historic properties full consideration when planning or considering approval of any action that might affect such properties.
5. An agency consults with knowledgeable and concerned parties outside the agency about its historic preservation-related activities.

⁹ Executive Order 13006 was codified in the most recent amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act in May 2000 (NHPA Amendments of 2000, P.L. 106-208, Section 110 (a) (1) (16 U.S.C. 470h-2(a)(1))).

¹⁰ National Park Service, *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs Pursuant to the NHPA*, 63 FR 79, 20495-20508, April 24, 1998.

FIGURE 4

PRINCIPAL FEDERAL AGENCY PROPERTY MANAGERS—HISTORIC RESOURCE HOLDINGS

Department/Agency	Acreage/Bldgs/Other	Designated Historic Resources	Other Known or Estimated Resources	
		National Historic Landmarks*	National Register of Historic Places	
AGRICULTURE Forest Service	191 million acres (155 National Forests, 20 National Grasslands)	15	900	277,000 "heritage sites"; 1.5 million archeological resources (est.)
COMMERCE National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	6.7 million acres (12 National Marine Sanctuaries, 7,933 nautical sq. mi.)	1	1	Unknown; USS <i>Monitor</i> wreck; 160 known shipwrecks in Thunder Bay NMS, Michigan
DEFENSE Air Force	9 million acres	10	1,800	4,000 "potentially eligible" resources
Army	12 million acres	20	12,000 buildings	53,000 known archeological resources
Army Corps of Engineers	11.7 million acres (459 lakes)	15	47 structures 49 buildings 98 sites	50,000+ known archeological resources; 886 archeological collections
Marine Corps	(Department of the Navy, including Marine Corps)	2	9	70**
Navy	3.6 million acres	21	77	260**
ENERGY	2.4 million acres (9 multipurpose labs, 10 single-purpose, 11 smaller mission—14,000 buildings)	2	3 major laboratory complexes associated with Manhattan Project; 6 with Cold War era	5,000+ known archeological resources; other known historic resources
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	220 million sq. ft. bldg. space	13	205 buildings	250 eligible
INTERIOR Bureau of Indian Affairs	309,000 acres (55.7 million acres reservation/Trust lands)	7†	(no data)††	(no data)††
Bureau of Land Management	272 million acres	22 (5 World Heritage)	255 (incl. 3,610 properties)	229,000 known other historic and archeological resources (est. 4-4.5 million potential total)
Bureau of Reclamation	5.77 million acres (withdrawn from other public land holdings; 348 reservoirs, 58 hydroelectric plants)	3	55 7 Historic Districts	1,415 eligible; 10,724 known archeological resources

FIGURE 4 (CONTINUED)

PRINCIPAL FEDERAL AGENCY PROPERTY MANAGERS—HISTORIC RESOURCE HOLDINGS

Department/Agency	Acreage/Bldgs/Other	Designated Historic Resources		Other Known or Estimated Resources
		National Historic Landmarks*	National Register of Historic Places	
Fish and Wildlife Service	93 million acres (521 National Wildlife Refuges)	9	78	409 eligible, 188 buildings and structures; 11,000 [†] known historic and archeological resources; 2.8 million objects in collections
National Park Service	83.6 million acres (379 National Park Units)	163	1,268	26,000 resources on List of Classified Structures; 2,067 cultural landscapes; 63,000 known archeological resources; 1.5 million archeological resources (est.); 35 million objects and specimens; 45 million archival documents
NASA	HQ, 9 field centers	21	1	(no data) ^{††}
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY	265,000 acres	1	(no data) ^{††}	(no data) ^{††}
TRANSPORTATION U.S. Coast Guard	66,000 acres (1,600 CG stations and facilities, 21,000 buildings and structures)	9	(no data) ^{††}	489 historic properties (buildings and structures) 18,000 [†] artifacts (ship equipment, lighthouse items, uniforms, etc.) ^{**}
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE	38,000 postal facilities	(no data) [†]	1,200 National Register or contributing to National Register historic districts	(no data) ^{††}
VETERANS AFFAIRS	25,000 acres (173 VA Medical Centers, 119 national cemeteries)	4	1,905 historic structures in 75 historic districts, 119 national cemeteries	32 known archeological resources, other heritage assets

Explanatory notes for Figure 4:

* Combined data on NHLs from agencies and NPS database; some figures may be incomplete, require updating, or involve multiple ownership.

** Figures do not include estimates of unknown archeological sites or other resources not formally evaluated.

† Unverified; may include properties owned or managed by specific Indian tribes.

†† These Federal agencies did not provide this information to the Council, and the National Register of Historic Places databases are not yet able to provide this information.

+ Unknown, although some postal facilities are contributing elements in National Historic Landmark districts or building complexes.

FIGURE 5

COMPARISON OF FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGING AGENCY HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAMS*

Department/ Agency	Program Umbrella	Preservation Officer	Separate Full-Time Employees/Budget Allocation**
AGRICULTURE Forest Service	Recreation	Senior Professional	300/\$13.9 million
DEFENSE Air Force Army Army Corps of Engineers Marine Corps Navy	Environment† Environment† Environment Facilities Facilities†	Deputy Assistant Secretary Deputy Assistant Secretary Senior Professional Deputy Assistant Secretary [same]	30/\$6.3 million 40/\$10.2 million 120/\$15 million 22/\$4.3 million
ENERGY	Facilities†	Senior Manager	7/\$830,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	Resources††	Senior Professional	6/\$1.8 million
INTERIOR Bureau of Land Management Bureau of Reclamation Fish and Wildlife Service National Park Service	Resources Facilities† Resources Resources†	Senior Professional Senior Professional Senior Professional Senior Manager/Professional	160/\$13.4 million 32/\$7 million 20/\$2 million 721/\$64 million
NASA	Facilities†	Senior Professional	none
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY	Resources	Senior Manager	6/\$600,000
TRANSPORTATION Coast Guard	Environment	Senior Manager	none
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE	Facilities	Senior Professional	none
VETERANS AFFAIRS	Facilities	Senior Professional	none

Explanatory notes for Figure 5:

* Federal agency historic resource holdings and programs not depicted in Figures 4 and 5 include: Department of Health and Human Services (Indian Health Service, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service); Department of Justice (Bureau of Prisons); Department of State; Department of Transportation (Federal Aviation Administration); Department of the Treasury (U.S. Mints, Federal Reserve Bank); Smithsonian Institution.

** Staffing and budget figures (FY 2000) approximate; some agency estimates based on principal known accounts, and may not include special short-term projects, fund transfers, or secondary duty assignments.

† Agencies with separate History offices for agency history.

†† Agency with special Arts and Architecture office.

6. An agency manages and maintains historic properties under its jurisdiction or control in a manner that considers the preservation of their historic, architectural, archeological, and cultural values.
7. An agency gives priority to the use of historic properties to carry out agency missions.

Each Federal agency is required to designate a Federal Preservation Officer to coordinate matters of historic preservation and statutory compliance within the agency. These individuals and other staff who have responsibilities for historic resources and related programs are located in many places within Federal agency structures, and have varying degrees of agency-wide authority and responsibility. Some are in environmental management or policy offices; others are part of facilities or real estate management divisions. A few are at the Assistant Secretary or Deputy Assistant Secretary level, and others are senior professionals in history, architecture, archeology, or a similar field.

For some agencies separate offices are devoted to historic preservation and historic resource stewardship, and field staff are located in regional, State, district, or unit offices with advisory, rather than line, responsibility to and through senior managers such as Park Superintendents, Forest Supervisors, or Installation Commanders. Some agencies have organized preservation expertise to have maximum effect in policy making, budget formulation, and crisis management. Preservation boards or internal advisory groups have proven helpful in some instances. Other agencies have entered into cooperative relationships with State Historic Preservation Officers, Indian tribes, academic institutions, or preservation organizations at the regional, State, or local level to enhance their ability to meet resource management and other needs.

Many, if not most, preservation services are obtained through contracts and consultant services, but most land or property managing agencies have some form of internal operating manual, procedures, and other policy and technical guidance intended to establish the framework for resource management, planning, and

decision making about historic resources for which the agency is responsible. In some cases, national or regional Programmatic Agreements or Memoranda of Understanding help to meet this need while also serving to document an agency's statutory compliance under NHPA, NEPA, or other laws.

Budget allocations and funding for historic resource stewardship vary considerably, both as a percentage of total agency budgets as well as how distinct or separate it is as a budget line item. In many cases agencies have little or no funds earmarked for these activities, and must rely entirely on real estate, facilities management, operations, planning, or environmental compliance accounts. In other cases some funding is set aside, or "fenced," but is largely inadequate to meet the myriad needs.

HOW WELL HAS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BEEN DOING?

Since NHPA was amended in 1992, and then during and following publication of the standards and guidelines, a number of agencies have worked to improve their policies and programs as well as their compliance with historic preservation mandates. In spite of substantial progress by some agencies, no Federal agency has yet developed an internal historic preservation program that meets all of the various requirements of Section 110, and no agency has formally taken steps to consult with the Secretary of the Interior comprehensively about its program as required by Section 110.

The agency that most closely meets the program standard envisioned by Section 110 is the National Park Service itself, for its operation and management of the individual units of the National Park System, although continuing downsizing, reorganization, and decentralization of some NPS program activities, coupled with a growing list of maintenance, visitor services, natural resource protection, and similar program priorities, have affected NPS's ability to meet its historic preservation responsibilities. To a greater or lesser degree, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service

have relatively strong programs in place, although both agencies have been under program and funding stress and are more effective and active in some parts of the country than in others.

A number of other Federal agencies have been making significant progress in establishing effective Section 110 programs in recent years. The Council has been actively working with several of these agencies to improve deficiencies the agencies themselves have recognized. These agencies include the Department of the Army, the Department of Energy, and the General Services Administration.

Some agencies, most notably those responsible for large tracts of public land, quite naturally place a high priority on archeological inventory and archeological resource protection on lands under their jurisdiction or control. They also correctly emphasize the concerns of Native Americans for identifying and protecting properties of traditional cultural and religious importance. BLM, the Forest Service, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Fish and Wildlife Service have historically fallen into this category. On the other hand, agencies whose missions entail greater responsibility for facilities or complexes that contain important historic buildings and structures include the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the General Services Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Postal Service. These agencies typically focus on developing operations and maintenance procedures for planning and carrying out repairs and rehabilitation work on the buildings and structures they manage.

Program organization and staff expertise may therefore focus on archeological resources at the expense of the built environment, or vice versa. This relative focus, while completely logical and appropriate, may lead to problems when a facility manager has to deal with archeology or places of significance to Native Americans. Conversely, a public land manager may be faced with a large and deteriorating historic structural complex to manage, and not have the experience or agency resources to address the issue.

Recent Policy Reviews and Investigations

Several studies have examined agency progress in meeting historic preservation program responsibilities. A 1988 examination by the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the status of historic preservation programs at six Federal agencies: the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the General Services Administration, the Postal Service, and the Veterans Administration (later renamed Department of Veterans Affairs). The report found that because of their different sizes and missions as well as other agency priorities, the agencies had mixed results in locating, inventorying, and nominating historic properties, and were having difficulties in using their historic buildings for program purposes. All of the agencies were also having problems in adequately protecting, preserving, and maintaining some of their historic properties.

As GAO noted: "This has resulted in deterioration or damage of historic properties, including those of national and international significance.... Agency officials generally agreed that their agencies' compliance with the historic preservation requirements of the amended act could be improved. However, they also believe they need better guidance and support from Interior and specific program funding."¹¹

As previously mentioned, amendments were made to NHPA in 1992 to strengthen its program provisions, and two sets of Section 110 guidelines and other technical guidance have been issued by the National Park Service to assist agencies in meeting their responsibilities. In 1996, both the Council and the National Park Service were asked about Federal agency progress in developing historic preservation programs by Congressman James Hansen, Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, Committee on Resources, U.S. House of Representatives. Both agencies gave mixed reviews to agency program activities and progress in compliance with the law, although the National Park Service was more positive and hopeful about recent progress than the Council.

¹¹ General Accounting Office, *Implementation of Federal Historic Preservation Programs Can Be Improved* (GAO/RCED-88-81), 1988.

While there have been many improvements in some agencies, such as the Department of Defense, over the last three years other internal agency audits and external, independent examinations of some agency resource management programs have pointed out serious problems. These have included two Departmental Inspector General reports, one from the Department of the Interior and one from the Department of Agriculture, pointing out serious deficiencies. The Bureau of Land Management cultural resource inventory program and its management of cultural collections were singled out,¹² as was the Forest Service's data collection and environmental analysis for timber sales.¹³

Independent critiques have also included several General Accounting Office reports on problems with Federal property management, including needed repairs and alterations of Federal buildings,¹⁴ and deficiencies and problems in military housing and attempts to privatize that infrastructure need.¹⁵ Outside reports have focused on deterioration of the National Park System,¹⁶ offered a detailed and case-specific indictment of the operations and activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,¹⁷ and produced an expert examination of broad deficiencies in the management of Federal facilities.¹⁸

Previous Council Studies

In the last decade, the Council prepared two specialized studies focusing on particular issues and agencies.

The first study, responding to a request from the House Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, analyzed issues related to the appropriate role of historic preservation in decision making about the operation and management of highly scientific and technical facilities.¹⁹

The report focused on NASA and grants made by the National Science Foundation, although it also examined certain related facilities and agency policies in other departments (e.g., the Air Force, the Department of Energy). Findings and recommendations in the report emphasized the need for a reasonable balance to be struck between the operational and research needs of active scientific and technological facilities, and the long-term preservation, management, and public interpretation of the physical reminders of America's historic heritage in science and technology.

The Council's second study, submitted to the Secretary of Defense, examined the Defense Department's adherence to the National Historic Preservation Act.²⁰ The report was conducted in cooperation with, and with financial assistance from the Department of Defense in conjunction with the Legacy Resource Management Program. At that time, the Council found a record of inconsistent legal compliance and program administration; poor understanding,

¹² DOI OIG, Audit Report, *Cultural Resource Management*, BLM, Report #99-I-808, September 1999.

¹³ USDOA OIG, Evaluation Report, *Forest Service Timber Sale Environmental Analysis Requirements*, Washington, DC, Report #08801-10-AT, January 1999.

¹⁴ GAO, Report to Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, Hazardous Materials, and Pipeline Transportation, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, *Federal Buildings: Billions Are Needed for Repairs and Alterations*, GAO/GGD-00-98, March 2000.

¹⁵ GAO, Report to Congressional Committees, *Military Housing: Continued Concerns in Implementing the Privatization Initiative*, GAO/NSIAD-00-71, March 2000.

¹⁶ Sharon Buccino, Charles Clusen, Ed Norton, and Johanna Wald, *Reclaiming Our Heritage: What We Need to Do to Preserve America's National Parks*, Natural Resources Defense Council and National Trust for Historic Preservation, July 1997.

¹⁷ Jeff Stein, Peter Moreno, David Conrad, and Steve Ellis, *Troubled Waters: Congress, the Corps of Engineers, and Wasteful Water Projects*, Taxpayers for Common Sense and National Wildlife Federation, March 2000.

¹⁸ Committee to Assess Techniques for Developing Maintenance and Repair Budgets for Federal Facilities, Board on Infrastructure and the Constructed Environment, and Commission on Engineering and Technical Systems, National Research Council, *Stewardship of Federal Facilities: A Proactive Strategy for Managing the Nation's Public Assets*, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1998.

¹⁹ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, *Balancing Historic Preservation Needs with the Operation of Highly Technical or Scientific Facilities*, Report to Congress, February 1991.

²⁰ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, *Defense Department Compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act: Section 202(a)(6) Evaluation Report*, March 1994.

support, and appreciation for historic resource stewardship; and low priority devoted to funding, staffing, and planning related to historic resource management. The Defense Department has been working since then to correct many of these deficiencies.

Common Concerns

General problems in how agencies discharge their stewardship responsibilities to historic resources can be attributed in part to reduced budgets, downsizing, reduced availability of experienced staff (some of whom have been reassigned elsewhere), and agency or program reorganization. In addition to absolute numbers of staff and size of budgets for historic resource stewardship, the placement, authority, responsibility, and expertise of preservation staff, as well as opportunities of these personnel to influence budgets and other decisions, are critical factors in how well or how poorly Federal stewardship of historic resources is carried out.

As financial and personnel resources have grown scarcer, increased conflicts between primary mission activities and historic preservation mandates have been a factor in the ability of some agencies to address overall historic resource stewardship needs and Section 110 program goals. Many agencies have had to focus their remaining limited staff and funding on other legislative mandates, which unlike Section 110, have statutory time frames and a potential threat of legal action.

For example, agency compliance with the requirements of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) has had a substantial impact on Federal land managing agencies since it was passed in 1990. Agencies have had to develop inventories of human remains, cultural items, and objects of cultural patrimony held in Federal collections, and consult with Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, and others about repatriation and related issues.

Agencies in some parts of the country, including some Bureau of Land Management offices, have also stated that they may spend up to 90 percent of their staff time and resources reacting to survey and impact analysis requirements and consultation needs to meet their Section 106 compliance responsibilities. This, in their opinion, severely limits their ability to develop proactive stewardship programs, including onsite interpretation and public education.²¹

Unlike the detailed reporting requirements associated with NAGPRA, there is currently no requirement, either in NHPA or elsewhere, for agencies to report on their holdings or the progress they are making with identification and evaluation of historic resources in general. Such a requirement does exist for archeological resources;²² however, archeology provides only a part of the picture. The Secretary of the Interior does prepare a report on threatened and endangered National Historic Landmarks, but a similar reporting requirement on significant threats to properties included in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places²³ has never been implemented by Interior due to lack of funding and personnel.

Heritage asset reporting, now required of agencies with their other stewardship reports of assets and liabilities under the Chief Financial Officers Act, has begun but is in its infancy, and agencies are having a hard time collecting information and providing meaningful and useful assessments of this data. Agencies need to have systems in place to quantify and describe the broad and full range of resources for which they have stewardship or planning responsibilities under Section 110.

For those Federal agencies that have jurisdiction or control over resources, knowledge of and appreciation for the vast extent and diversity of their holdings varies considerably. Some have responsibilities for particular types

²¹ State protocols under a nationwide agreement with the Council and the National Conference of SHPOs may eventually help to streamline protection work and permit more attention to proactive management activities. Similar cooperative results are anticipated from agreements with Indian tribes.

²² Under Section 5(c) of the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, P.L. 93-291, the Secretary of the Interior is charged with preparing an annual report to Congress on archeology.

²³ NHPA, Section 101 (a)(8).

of historic resources more than others (e.g., lighthouses, dams, post offices, or scientific research facilities), while most either manage, plan for, or consider the full range of historic resources that either meet the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or are cultural artifacts, historic objects, and archival materials.

As previously mentioned, when asked many agencies are hard-pressed to provide specific information on the number, type, and level of significance of all of their historic resource holdings, let alone an assessment of their condition or potential mission use. Properties that are already listed in the National Register of Historic Places are known and documented by agency preservation specialists, including Federal properties contributing to larger historic districts in local communities. However, sites and structures that have had some evaluation but have not been studied in detail are more difficult to characterize, and resources that have not been thoroughly evaluated or otherwise described but are known to exist on lands under agency jurisdiction or control are far more problematic. The extent to which this information is adequately maintained in management databases, disseminated to other agency technical specialists, or made known to decision makers varies substantially.

Recent studies also suggest that the vast majority of both federally and non-federally managed or owned lands remain unsurveyed (between 90 and 95 percent). For those Federal agencies that account for more than 85 percent of the Federal land base—Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and NPS—the majority of their

historic resource holdings are archeological sites, but all of these agencies are responsible for a wide range of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects as well. Some agencies have provided somewhat more detailed (but still problematic) estimates, and such information is reflected in Figure 4 (page 12).

On the agency program side, as partially depicted in Figure 5 (page 14), less than one percent of congressionally appropriated dollars, and less than one-tenth of one percent of Federal employees, are devoted to full-time historic and cultural site preservation work. Many employees have related environmental management, planning, or review responsibilities as an “extra” duty, often only vaguely related to their other duties, training, and expertise. Archival and museum preservation occupies perhaps another one-tenth of one percent of employees.

CONCLUSION

In spite of the important stewardship responsibility entrusted to Federal agencies for much of our Nation's heritage, other agency mission priorities often force historic preservation activities, programs, funding, and staffing to take a back seat. Some agencies see historic resources as integral to their public programs and legislative mandate, while others do not. Protection, use, and related activities often remain underfunded and understaffed. The reasons for this situation are varied; the solutions are not readily apparent. A more detailed examination of issues and problems that are being faced by many of the agencies may help to indicate areas for improvement and change.

In order to gain a better sense of some of the challenges facing Federal agencies in their management of historic resources and how that management relates to agency missions, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation met with agency representatives and other interested parties and toured local Federal facilities or lands. The meetings included the following locations (principal agency focus is shown in bold):

- November 5-6, 1998, Santa Fe and Los Alamos, New Mexico (**Department of Energy**; Civilian Conservation Corps/National Park Service; Indian tribes)—Los Alamos National Laboratory, Pueblo of Jemez, and National Park Service Intermountain Support Office
- February 10-12, 1999, Honolulu, Hawaii (**Department of Defense**, including Departments of the Army and Navy; Native Hawaiians; statewide preservation organizations)—Fort Shafter, Schofield Barracks, Makua Maneuver Range, and Naval Base Pearl Harbor
- June 24-25, 1999, Washington, DC (**General Services Administration**; White House Millennium Council)—General Post Office/Tariff Building, the Ariel Rios Federal Building, the John Wilson Building (DC Mayor and City Council offices), and the Ronald Reagan International Trade Center and Federal Building
- November 15-17, 1999, Knoxville, Oak Ridge, and Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tennessee (**Department of Energy**; **National Park Service**; Tennessee Valley Authority)—Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and Tennessee Valley Authority Headquarters, Norris
- March 9-10, 2000, Phoenix, Arizona (**Bureau of Land Management**; **U.S. Forest Service**)—Bureau of Land Management Arizona State Office, Tonto National Forest, Agua Fria National Monument
- June 22-23, 2000, Portland and Augusta, Maine (**U.S. Coast Guard**)—Casco Bay lighthouses and the Maine State Capitol

Information gathered in conjunction with these meetings, as well as other data and observations about Federal stewardship, was used to inform the following discussion. Examples of some of the challenges faced by Federal agencies are arranged around six themes that focus attention on related resource types and issues facing their managers:

- Public buildings;
- Scientific and technological facilities;
- Military and related installations;
- Multiple-use public lands;
- National parks and other preserves; and
- Public works and infrastructure.

Additional attention in this chapter is focused on two special topical areas: special landmarks, and issues of particular concern to Native Americans.

THE GOVERNMENT'S LANDLORD AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS

General Services Administration

The General Services Administration, an independent agency, is responsible for 455 historic public buildings, with more than 55 million square feet of building space. This amounts to nearly one-fourth of all of the space in the inventory of GSA's Public Buildings Service, and does not include a number of other historic resources under GSA management (such as portions of the African Burial Ground under and around the Foley Square Federal Annex in downtown Manhattan, New York City). In the Washington, DC, area, for example, GSA's National Capital Region has more than 70 historic buildings, many of them constructed over a relatively short period of time as the central core of Federal Government headquarters offices.

Many of GSA's historic resource stewardship responsibilities are carried out by its regional offices, with advice and guidance from headquarters offices that bring a national policy perspective and centralized support. Recent renovation work on the Ariel Rios Federal Building in Washington offers an interesting case example: upholding historic integrity while improving energy efficiency, and

upgrading and modernizing mechanical and electrical systems, proved challenging. Conservation of building materials, incorporation of fire and life safety improvements without damage to the building's historic character, and sensitive design based on a carefully developed Historic Structures Report all proved critical in the success of the approach. The Public Building Service's new approach to this and other historic preservation projects relies on upgrading existing building elements where possible rather than expensive total makeovers.

GSA sets out its comprehensive historic preservation program in *Held in Public Trust*,²⁴ a study that was already in preparation on how GSA could improve its own program and more effectively meet its stewardship responsibilities for the historic resources in its inventory. Copies of the study were distributed to Council members to inform their subsequent discussion. *Held in Public Trust* recommends GSA's adoption of more effective ways to integrate historic resource stewardship into the agency's business approach to providing and maintaining Federal work space. Key issues examined and highlighted include a reinvestment philosophy for historic buildings, flexible application of codes and design standards, quality assurance for design and construction, enhancing employee education and tenant awareness, early consultation on projects with communities and review groups, and using building preservation plans for planning and decision making.

The study includes a variety of recommendations—policy, business processes, technical research priorities, partnership approaches, and training and recognition—for better managing GSA's historic assets. The intent is to ensure the viability of these historic resources and their attractiveness within the agency's funding limitations, and emphasize the value of careful and appropriate daily maintenance and repair of historic properties through the development and use of Building Preservation Plans and other basic tools.

Such authorities as Section 111 of NHPA and the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976 establish

mechanisms for making Federal Government properties available through leases, exchanges, and cooperative ventures for both commercial and not-for-profit purposes, while protecting and enhancing their historic values. Properties transferred out of Federal ownership, with appropriate conditions for long-term preservation, maintenance, and use, must also be considered. For the renovation and adaptive reuse of the General Post Office/Tariff Building in Washington, DC, which had long been unoccupied and unused, GSA held a roundtable and public forum on viable reuse options for the National Historic Landmark with assistance from the National Building Museum and others. Historic preservation and ensured public access were two primary goals of the initiative. The roundtable reinforced the importance of the building both architecturally and in its urban context.

As a result, the building will be leased to a private commercial developer, renovated, and reconfigured to meet the needs of a first-class hotel, given its historical prominence, architectural features, and close proximity to the Washington, DC, Convention Center and other sites. GSA hopes to use this sort of process for other buildings in its inventory where appropriate, and when possible supplement Federal tax dollars with private funds and management to help meet stewardship and other public needs.

One area that has presented challenges to GSA over the years is the courthouse modernization and design program. GSA tries to work closely with the Federal judiciary to ensure appropriate and sensitive design that meets not only security, privacy, and needs of Federal judges and the U.S. Marshals Services but also historic preservation needs. Unfortunately, the extent of public involvement and consultation, the amount of consideration GSA has been able to afford adaptive use of existing historic buildings, and the degree of flexibility incorporated in the planning and design process have been inconsistent from a preservation point of view. Prominent recent cases include, on the one hand, San Diego, California, which may result in demolition of the historic Hotel San

²⁴ *Held in Public Trust*, General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, 1999.

Diego on a prominent downtown site, and an arguably more successful result in Gulfport, Mississippi, which will gut and reuse the former Gulfport High School for U.S. Attorney and Probation Services offices adjacent to the new courthouse structure.

Because of its Federal leadership role in real property management, GSA has also developed real property asset management principles that it has made available to other Federal agencies. Issued in 1996, these principles are summarized as:

Use what you have first. Real property assets under the custody and control of the Federal Government should be considered first when accommodating Federal agency mission requirements.

Buy only what you need. The amount of interest in Federal real property assets should be the minimum necessary to effectively support a Federal agency's mission.

Use industry-like instruments of agreement. Real property assets of the Federal Government should be utilized among agencies with the use of instruments of agreement that follow the best practices of the industry.

Reinvest. Reinvestment in a real property asset is essential to maintain its fair market value and its ability to benefit from advancements in business practices and technologies, and to support the Federal mission and enhance employee productivity.

Strive for income/expenses comparable to the market. Any income realized by a real property asset during its useful life should approximate that generated by a comparable commercial property; while any expense by such an asset during its life cycle should approximate that incurred by a comparable commercial property.

Maximize use among agencies. The maximum utility of a real property asset can be realized if it is continuously transferred among agencies having mission needs while it is under the control of the Federal Government.

Ensure timely disposal. A Federal property asset that has no further mission support use by the Federal Government should be disposed of in a timely manner that best serves the public interest.

Retain proceeds from disposal and outleasing. The proceeds gained from the disposal of a Federal real property asset, or from outleasing, should be available for use by the agency having custody, control, and use of the asset.

Provide professional training. Federal employees should be given the training needed to perform their jobs at the highest level of professionalism, and in order to utilize models and other analytical tools for optimizing their real property asset management decisions.²⁵

GSA has continued to examine these principles since they were issued, to ensure that they are interpreted and implemented in ways that are sympathetic to and consistent with stewardship of historic resources. At the same time, GSA has also developed a new approach for many of its landmark Federal office buildings and courthouses. Called "First Impressions," these projects have incorporated landscaping, signage, lighting, and other design elements to make them attractive and welcoming to the public, an active contributor to the local street scene, and a desirable environment for tenants. Historic and artistic displays have been placed in lobbies and other public areas, and associated brochures about the buildings and their history are being made available to tenants and the public.

Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended, and property regulations, GSA has continued to administer much of the surplus property process for the Federal Government. This has often resulted in historic resources being reported to GSA as "excess to agency needs" by other Federal agencies, and then left to GSA to be disposed of by being sold or transferred from Federal ownership. Special provisions make it possible for some historic resources to be offered at no cost to State and local governments for "historic monument" and recreational purposes, with National Park Service

²⁵ "Federal Real Property Asset Management Principles," *GSA Bulletin D-240, Office of Governmentwide Real Property Policy*, General Services Administration, 61 FR 201, 53925-53929, October 16, 1996.

review and involvement. Requirements for such consideration include submission of a use plan, financial plan, and architectural plan, and any property changes must be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation*. Many former military facilities, such as coastal gun emplacements and bunkers, were transformed into State and local parks by this means.²⁶

As military base closure and realignment developed into an important Federal Government priority in the late 1980s, Congress gave the authority and responsibility for this activity directly to the Department of Defense. However, GSA remains the sole Federal agency with explicit authority to place protective covenants on property involved in such transfers. As a consequence, GSA has played a continuing yet significantly reduced role in such transfers, while the Department of Defense has taken on major responsibilities for closing installations, finding potential new users, disposing of their holdings, and assisting local communities with “economic adjustments” to the accompanying loss of Federal employment from these installations.

U.S. Postal Service

A number of the buildings that fall under GSA's responsibility were originally built as combined spaces for U.S. post offices and courthouses. The Post Office Department was one of the original branches of the Federal Government, under Benjamin Franklin. Today, the U.S. Postal Service is “an independent establishment of the executive branch” under the terms of the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 (39 U.S.C. 101 et seq.). The Council did not pursue discussions with the Postal Service about its program or the many historic resources actively used or affected by Postal Service actions every day, due to Council funding and staffing limitations as well as the ambiguous legal status of the Postal Service in the executive branch. However, any future discussions of Federal stewardship of historic resources need to include serious consultation with the Postal Service about its holdings, as well as its policies, programs, and changing priorities and needs.

These local landmarks have fallen under increasing pressure because of Postal Service changes in its operations. The Postal Service maintains some 38,000 postal facilities of various kinds throughout the country. Although it is not considered a Federal executive branch agency, the United States Post Office is still viewed by most Americans as the local embodiment of the Federal Government in their communities, and stewardship of historic post offices is extremely important.

By the Postal Service's own estimates, perhaps 1,200 of its postal facilities—approximately 3 percent—are individually significant or contribute to a listed historic district.²⁷ State Historic Preservation Officers, with the cooperation of the Postal Service and others, have prepared thematic historic studies and listed significant post offices in the National Register of Historic Places in Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming.

At the same time, the Postal Service in recent years has been pursuing an aggressive consolidation and relocation strategy to make its operations more cost-effective. This has resulted in the closing of many rural post offices, many of them historic, to be vacated or reduced to minor substations, while new facilities with better transportation, carrier route access, and mail handling facilities are being built in suburban or exurban areas. Recent legislative proposals have sought to address some of these concerns, including consideration for reuse of historic resources in post office relocation projects, but have yet to become law. In addition, the Postal Service has limited personnel with expertise in the care of its remaining historic facilities, many of which have architecturally important lobbies and other interior spaces, historic murals, ornamental metal work, and other historic characteristics worth preserving. These issues could benefit from some focused policy attention and discussion with Postal Service officials and other concerned parties.

²⁶ Since the program's inception in 1949, more than 100 historic properties, including lighthouses, post offices, customs houses, and military holdings, have been transferred for new uses.

²⁷ U.S. Postal Service Preservation Officer, personal communication, September 6, 2000.

Common Concerns

There are a number of major issues that challenge the continuing use, reuse, and proper care of Federal historic buildings for agencies like GSA, the Postal Service, and others with such holdings.²⁸ Maintaining the viability of the Federal inventory of historic resources is difficult in the face of fiscal constraints, a shrinking Federal workforce, client or tenant concerns about retrofitting “old” buildings in a way that can meet their needs, and Congressional commitment in light of new construction pressures. Investments already made in the Federal Government’s historic assets need to be carefully weighed against demands for new space and “name” facilities. Balancing security, user safety, and open public access is and will continue to be challenging, particularly for GSA as it works with the Federal judiciary. The desire for Federal policies that limit or reduce suburban sprawl and its associated transportation and other costs, while supporting reuse of historic resources in urban downtowns, often seem to be at odds with operational needs or short-term financing strategies. Finally, all such agencies must work hard to develop and implement design standards for new construction that complement historic buildings and neighborhoods, and work closely to integrate such plans into the revitalization and “smart growth” efforts of local communities.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND RESEARCH LABORATORIES

Department of Energy

The Department of Energy (DoE) operates programs related to nuclear weapons research and development, energy technology, and related technical capabilities for the science, technology, and national defense. It oversees or administers nine major laboratory complexes and other ancillary research and development facilities with approximately 2.4 million acres of land. A number of these facilities are historically significant for the role they played in the development of the atomic bomb during

World War II, or their part in post-war weapons development and other research, and are a unique part of our Nation’s heritage. Several of the facilities have important archeological areas of traditional importance to Indian tribes and other Native Americans, or other historic resources that predate Federal ownership.

Los Alamos, New Mexico, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and Hanford, Washington, contain important resources connected with the Manhattan Project, the World War II effort to construct an atomic bomb. A number of these Manhattan-era facilities and the Government housing that was built to support them are no longer in Federal ownership. However, a number of significant facilities are, including the V-Site, a simple frame building complex where the A-bomb components were assembled at Los Alamos.²⁹ At Oak Ridge, two enormous complexes, the K-25 and Y-12 sites, each comprised of many individual buildings and other features, were both involved in development work on the atomic bomb. The K-25 complex is no longer active, but is scheduled for redevelopment; Y-12 is active, and both remain high security areas. The challenges of preservation under the circumstances are substantial.

Particularly at DoE’s national laboratories such as these, continuous additions and modifications to accommodate changing research needs have significantly altered many original structures and removed or modified original equipment. Given these changes, it can be challenging to judge the historic value of today’s facility and what remains worthy of preservation. Many of these complexes are also contaminated with radioactive and other hazardous materials. When a building is placed in the “surveillance and maintenance” mode for facilities management purposes, it is generally cleaned of any contents that could present a hazard over the long-term. After a building is decontaminated in this way, it is generally secured and left to decay (i.e., “abandoned in place”) for 25 years. Historic value has not typically been considered in such decisions.

²⁸ Letter, GSA Administrator to Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Chairman, August 12, 1999.

²⁹ A devastating wildfire begun in nearby Bandelier National Monument in spring 2000 destroyed portions of the V-Site, but the building where the bomb components were assembled survived. DoE successfully applied for and received a Save America’s Treasures grant to preserve the site before the fire, but was having difficulty coming up with the required match.

An additional problem relating to DoE's resource stewardship is that many of the agency's facilities are "GOCOs"—Government-owned, contractor-operated. In some cases the contractors are academic institutions, as at Los Alamos; elsewhere, such as Oak Ridge, private commercial engineering and facilities management companies are involved. Both academic and commercial facilities managers may not perceive the same management priorities, including historic resource stewardship responsibilities, that Federal personnel might.

As DoE closes down the former nuclear weapons complex sites, the future of these areas has been publicly debated. For many sites, complete environmental cleanup, reclamation, and land restoration seems to have had widespread public support. At Rocky Flats, Colorado, and Fernald, Ohio, for example, the current plan is to leave nothing standing, while at Hanford the plan is to demolish most of the Manhattan Project and Cold War period facilities except for the B Reactor. In most of these public discussions, the focus tended to be on the extent of natural resource protection and public health, and the potential for industrial, recreational, or agricultural use, while the historic value of the resources was rarely discussed.

One consequence of this is that managers believe the public does not want DoE to leave much, if anything, behind when it closes and abandons facilities. However, as clean up proceeds, some citizens are beginning to voice concern about the identity of their community and its history as embodied in the facility itself. At many sites, including Fernald, Rocky Flats, and Hanford, there is now growing public interest in creating a new museum or partnering with existing museums, preserving some of the original equipment and artifacts, and recording interviews with retired employees for use in documentary films chronicling the history of the facilities.

At Hanford, the strategy has been to group buildings by category, such as all small buildings or the entire Plutonium Finishing Plant complex. At the Savannah River plant in South Carolina, the strategy is to demolish collections of buildings. There is no incentive or

reward for discriminating among these properties to identify properties or artifacts that are historically important and might be preserved.

Field staff and contractors need to be guided and trained in what properties are appropriate to preserve because of their historic value, and issues of safety and security must be dealt with in that context. Where public health is a factor, DoE in particular needs to be able to allow access to some of the historic resources (such as the B Reactor at Hanford) without having to spend millions in restoration if the contamination is contained. This would assume, of course, that the contamination does not present an unreasonable risk to the public and there are no other security issues.

In addition, local governments around the complex are aware of the value of historic tourism and are concerned about building an alternative revenue base for the future. Interest in science, technology, and history should make the sites involved in the Manhattan Project and Cold War serious destinations for domestic and international tourists. Already, more than one quarter of visitors to the Bradbury Science Museum in Los Alamos are from Japan, Germany, Great Britain, and other countries. Currently, DoE contractors receive award fees for each building they take down. A bonus should be considered for leaving buildings with historic value standing and finding alternative uses for them, including possible public visitation or other interpretation.

Helping the former Manhattan Project and Cold War communities establish their heritage could lead to their fair share of the multi-billion dollar tourist industry predicted for the new millennium. DoE must, however, protect certain classified information and restrict public access to parts of the sites because of security and operational concerns. In some cases security concerns have limited historians' and historic preservation experts' access to historic documents, artifacts, equipment, and buildings, and these issues will have to be considered in such decisions.

DoE's management of its lands, often including substantial restricted buffer areas to maintain security

or safety, also needs to be examined carefully. The agency has an active research and management partnership with the University of South Carolina, Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, for a long-term archeological research program at the Savannah River site. The program has identified and conducted research on hundreds of archeological sites, and also has an active public outreach and education component. However, at other DoE facilities historic resource management concerns have been raised. For example, in critical comments following the Council's meeting with DoE managers at Los Alamos, representatives of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, speaking pointedly about DoE stewardship at its Hanford facility near Richland, Washington, noted,

Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Federal agencies have diligently identified historic properties; however, long-term management of many of these historic properties has not occurred. This is not unique to DoE, although the situation in some cases may be worse because historically DoE is not a land management agency. The cultural resources management deficit is a glaring reality of cultural resources management in the western United States where there are large blocks of federal responsibility, unprotected and subject to constant loss. Cultural resources managers have essentially built an industry of NHPA Section 106 clearance priorities and have neglected other management and stewardship responsibilities.

The contrast between Hanford and Savannah River is stark, and management issues like these need to be considered in continuing discussions between the Council and DoE, as well as in relation to the broader view of stewardship needs contained in this report.

During the course of this study, DoE began to take action to improve its historic resource stewardship. On October 23, 1998, Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson established an agency-wide "corporate board" on historic preservation to help meet NHPA requirements

more effectively. The board was also charged with making recommendations as to how best preserve DoE's history, both in writing and through the stewardship of buildings and other historic properties and equipment, and with reviewing related resource requirements and potential new funding needs.

At the suggestion of the Council, and with the cooperation and assistance of DoE, a panel of experts was convened by the Council to offer recommendations on the significance of and preservation options for the "signature facilities" of the Manhattan project at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and Hanford Reservation, Washington. The Council panel held two additional site visits, with opportunities for local public input, at each of the locations. Detailed findings and recommendations were transmitted to DoE Corporate Board in October 2000, and were under study by DoE as this report went to press. The Council panel offered site-specific, short-term, and long-term program and policy findings and recommendations to improve DoE's stewardship of these important historic resources.³⁰

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is responsible for managing research and development in aeronautics, astronautics, space sciences, and exploration. It is best known for its operation and oversight of the country's manned and unmanned space programs. NASA administers nine field centers, including launch, control, testing, astronaut training, and research and development facilities. It also has a major funding and operational role in the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California, a federally funded research and development center. Twenty NASA structures or specialized facilities have been designated as National Historic Landmarks, and the main Space Transportation System (space shuttle) launch complex at the Kennedy Space Center in Florida is listed in the National Register of Historic Places for its association with the Apollo manned lunar program.

³⁰ The report was being released to the public as this went to press. For details of the recommendations and DoE's response to them, see Appendix 1 and the electronic version of this report at www.achp.gov.

NASA takes major steps to document and interpret the history of the manned and unmanned space programs, and actively works with nonprofit partnership groups to facilitate and support publications, video documentaries, and visitor centers at major NASA centers. Partners or concessioners operate public walking or bus tours to certain portions of the facilities; many of these facilities are of historic value and interest. NASA's History Office used the celebration of NASA's 40th birthday in 1998 to inspire a wide spectrum of commemorative activities, publications, and special exhibits. Many NASA employees, retirees, and contractors are proud of their history and interested in historic space hardware, and video and written accounts of the manned space program abound. NASA also has in place a cooperative agreement with the Smithsonian Institution to allow the National Air and Space Museum to select hardware and artifacts for its collections that have been determined excess to NASA's active operational needs, and portions of these historical collections are on display at NASA centers and at regional museums.

For development or test facilities that were used during previous manned space programs, such as the Apollo moon program, but that have not been needed since, NASA's management approach has tended to be one of benign neglect unless such extant structures are obstacles to facility improvements or redevelopment for new technical requirements. Many historic facilities have been modified and remain in active use; the remainder are not actively managed, but effectively "abandoned in place" and occasionally included as part of a special tour, subject to safety restrictions. In some cases, as with the beginning of the space shuttle program, more aggressive plans for demolition, major modification, or retrofitting have been advanced. Some visitor center exhibits include historical information on key facilities or experimental complexes, although they largely concentrate on modern space science applications and interactive space program demonstrations.

Launch Complex 39 (containing two launch pads for the Space Shuttle, 39A and 39B, the massive Vehicle Assembly Building, and other contributing structures and areas) at Kennedy Space Center, Cape Canaveral, Florida, is a premier historic resource as well as an operational

complex. Agreements over the years have made it possible for NASA to upgrade and modify the facilities as needed. When the Apollo moon program ended and Space Shuttle operations began, a private fund-raising effort to save the Saturn V Launch Umbilical Tower from dismantling and scrapping failed. This tower launched the lunar missions, but NASA had no further use for it and did not support its preservation, citing budget priorities. NASA has generally not viewed protection and management of "obsolete" facilities as a mission or budgetary priority. Continuing use, historic instrumentation, equipment, and other unique aspects of these facilities continues to be threatened by modification or, in the case of some facilities, abandonment and eventual removal.

Several of NASA's National Historic Landmarks elsewhere in its system—associated with experimentation, development, and flight control for the manned space program—are now unused and little or no maintenance is being done on them. One is actively being considered for demolition, and several have had key pieces of definitive equipment or instrumentation removed. This process is similar to the in-place abandonment, and eventual dismantling or demolition, that has occurred at many Energy Department facilities, as well as at Air Force launch and test sites. Managers are not permitted to expend maintenance funds on abandoned facilities.

Recently, NASA has become embroiled in a controversy involving the telescopes that it supports on the summit of Mauna Kea in Hawaii. The area is of traditional cultural and religious significance to Native Hawaiians. While NASA does not own or manage these telescopes, which are run by the University of Hawaii, it does provide significant funding for the development, operation, and research use of parts of this complex, and the case is raising the consciousness of the agency with regard to Native Hawaiian and other potential Native American interests and concerns.

Common Concerns

A number of dilemmas face both DoE and NASA as they make mission decisions and management choices. For example, without some source of funding other than drawing on "overhead" budgets, finding money for

historic preservation activities can be difficult. Over the past five years, DoE has undergone a strategic alignment that emphasizes core missions such as defense programs and environmental restoration at the expense of ancillary activities. NASA has gone through a similar exercise, including a restructuring and overall reduction in personnel. In this context, many in DoE have raised the concern that historic resource stewardship could conflict with such goals as reducing DoE's real estate liabilities or expeditiously remodeling buildings to accommodate the latest supercomputers or robotic equipment.

An ancillary problem for both agencies has been safety around its facilities, especially those that have been abandoned for some time. DoE has been struggling with a series of accidents and injuries in its work force and has tightened the procedures entailed in entering and working on older properties. These well-intentioned procedures inevitably cause delay and additional costs, and may result in further impediments to long-term preservation as well as public interpretation.

Both NASA and DoE possess first-of-a-kind or unique equipment and other artifacts that have great historic value for education, exhibition, and other purposes. However, DoE does not have an agreement like NASA has with the Smithsonian Institution to acquire such equipment for its collections. Much of the historic equipment in DoE hands is contaminated and/or remains classified, and will be disposed of as the agency demolishes most of its Manhattan Project and Cold War era properties. For artifacts that could be kept, there is a dearth of appropriate storage space throughout the agency despite the availability of some unused buildings. At the Savannah River site, for example, the historic preservation office is looking for a building to store artifacts. Existing buildings currently not in use for mission purposes have not been actively considered because they have been targeted for removal as part of a program to reduce building maintenance liability and increase operational efficiency.

Overall, a case needs to be made in both agencies for the outstanding historic value of many of their resources as part of the Nation's heritage. This

consciousness-raising needs to be linked to finding creative approaches for funding and other preservation partnership support.

THE NATION'S DEFENSE AND RELATED INSTITUTIONS

The Department of Defense (DoD) has the world's largest specialized infrastructure. Roughly the size of the State of Virginia, DoD's physical plant is worth \$500 billion. It includes not only mission and mission-support facilities, but also housing for more than 300,000 families and about 400,000 unmarried service members. DoD is actively pursuing initiatives for facility strategic planning, including disposal of obsolete and excess buildings and structures; base reuse alternatives; the fostering of competition, privatization, and outsourcing, including improvements to military housing; and integrated environmental resource management.

Federal preservation staff for the military services estimate that collectively the services have identified about 120 historic districts on installations, more than 25,000 pre-1940 buildings, and perhaps as many as 80,000 World War II-era buildings. Innumerable archeological sites, sites of traditional cultural or religious importance, historic special purpose facilities (such as space launch complexes), and other historic properties have been identified or are likely to exist on DoD's 25 million acres in the United States.

The quantity, quality, and variety of historic resources under the jurisdiction of DoD is probably rivaled only by the National Park Service, and most of these remain in active operational use or on lands used for training and other purposes. The range of resource types incorporates almost every conceivable class of property, from historic documents and Native American religious sites to National Historic Landmark ships, buildings, and designed landscapes.³¹

All of the services have benefitted considerably over the last 10 years from the availability of dedicated funds for

³¹ *Defense Department Compliance*, pp. 36-37.

resource planning and management activities through the Legacy Resource Management Program. This initiative, originally created in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act in 1990, has been funded since 1991, and has permitted DoD to make significant progress in both natural and cultural resource conservation efforts. The program was intended to provide a source of support for baseline information collection, resource management planning, and demonstration projects to improve the identification, protection, and maintenance of the Department's many natural and cultural resources, including historic resources. For example, DoD installations are required to prepare Integrated Plans for natural as well as cultural resources. Legacy funding has been available for such purposes. By the end of FY 1999, DoD had completed 56 percent of its Integrated National Resource Management Plans and 45 percent of its Integrated Cultural Research Management Plans.

Installations also conduct cultural resource inventories to record historic and archeological resources on installation property. The inventories help installations manage such resources and ensure better protection. They also help installation commanders and tenant commands comply with legal requirements. Significant progress has been made in completing archeological inventories. Approximately 66 percent are now complete, compared with 77 percent of historic building inventories.

Overall, DoD and military services' headquarters have established good umbrella programs that support a broad preservation ethic, but major commands, installation commanders, and tenant commands on those installations must regularly balance resource preservation with their specific mission needs within limited budgets. This is not a simple or straightforward task, and continues to present significant challenges on both a short-term and long-term basis. Many of the changes occurring throughout the Defense establishment have presented both opportunities and challenges for each of the services, and they have responded in distinctly different ways.

Department of the Army

The Army manages some 12,000 buildings and districts that are listed in or eligible for the National Register of

Historic Places, including 12 National Historic Landmarks. In addition, the Army has more than 100,000 known sites of archeological and Native American cultural importance, all on approximately 12 million acres of land. The vast number and diversity of historic properties in the Army inventory reflect nearly all periods in our Nation's history, from 12,000-year-old archeological resources to buildings and structures from the Cold War period. An estimated additional 70,000 buildings will require evaluation over the next 30 years. As inventory work continues across Army installations, the number will undoubtedly increase.

Through the Army Environmental Center, which serves as an agency-wide research, development, and advisory arm on a variety of environmental programs and responsibilities, the Army has developed a suite of policy, guidance, and Army-wide technical documents. This has resulted in, potentially at least, one of the most comprehensive cultural resource programs among Federal agencies. A variety of strategies and cooperative approaches are being developed to encourage better military planning and promote more responsive management of fragile historic and archeological resources within the military mission context.

Separate from the Army Environmental Center, a new Office of Army Historic Properties has also been created under the auspices of the Assistant Secretary for Installations and Environment. The intent is to broaden the Army's preservation program by increasing the utilization of historic buildings and improving their economic viability. As one outgrowth of the base closure and realignment process, and the need to improve military housing, the Army is working to embrace a philosophy for its historic built environment that will:

- Adapt traditional uses to meet new needs;
- Pursue innovative funding and operating methods;
- Integrate historic property management and planning into daily operations;
- Engage public, private, and nonprofit partners to support its goals;
- Explore and test creative uses—and reuses—for its historic buildings;

- Leverage Army assets with local and State government resources; and
- Stimulate private investment in preservation, maintenance, and reuse.³²

The range of historic properties the Army manages and the particular challenges posed by active military installations is illustrated by the U.S. Army Garrison in Hawaii, which oversees nearly 165,000 acres. Fort Shafter, located in the greater Honolulu area is, at 94, the oldest Army post in Hawaii. Schofield Barracks was constructed in 1909 on what was originally Hawaiian crown lands to provide a base for the Army's mobile defense of Oahu. Makua Military Reservation is a 4,190-acre training area on Oahu used for training maneuvers and live ammunition fire training. The continued use of these properties has major implications for Army historic preservation efforts.

At Fort Shafter, for example, much of the attractive and desirable housing for General Officers and senior staff around Palm Circle, near the "Pineapple Pentagon" (Richardson Hall) that is the historic Headquarters of the U.S. Army Pacific, is suffering from termite infestation. In addition to pest management, repair, upkeep, and ongoing maintenance needs are substantial, as are the costs. At Schofield Barracks in central Oahu, two recent projects have been underway to renovate the Health Clinic (which began life as a hospital facility in the 1920s), and the Barracks Quadrangles ("Quads") that date to World War I. The latter facilities were featured in the award-winning novel and film, *From Here to Eternity*.

At Makua training area in western Oahu, the Army is faced with managing property containing a number of threatened and endangered natural species, in addition to many historic and culturally significant remains of Native Hawaiian culture (see page 50). One way the Army has responded is by working with local Native Hawaiians and other community representatives, and assembling a community advisory group known as the Friends of Ukanipo Heiau to help plan and manage its stewardship of Makua.

Despite the funding that has been available through the DoD Legacy Resource Management Program, the Army reports that it is constrained by a lack of funds designated specifically for cultural resource management. Defense appropriation bills in each fiscal year set line-item figures for military personnel, operations and maintenance, construction, procurement, etc. Typically, funding for cultural resource management needs is drawn from military construction or operations and maintenance accounts as part of project costs. Preservation budgets, therefore, are generally low and could be diverted to other projects of higher priority by the commander of a given installation. Low funding contributes to widespread deferred maintenance of historic buildings and structures, and neither Legacy nor other funding has been available to attack such backlogs.

The long-term value of historic resources is still not widely recognized throughout the Army. While policies regarding historic properties may have evolved, these changes and new perspectives are not always communicated or embraced across and down the chain of command. In addition, there are special constraints placed upon certain types of military funding. For example, there have been legislative limits on the amount of money that can be spent in a fiscal year on general officer quarters. This set amount of funding is generally insufficient to accomplish major rehabilitation or restoration, actions that are often necessary to reverse deferred maintenance problems. Proposals to exceed the funding limit require congressional approval.

Department of the Navy (with U.S. Marine Corps)

The Navy has a significantly smaller land base than the Army, but still maintains a sizeable percentage of land and shore facilities with more than 3.6 million owned and leased acres. Most of the responsibility for historic resource stewardship rests with the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, the Navy's in-house architecture, engineering, and planning arm. However, the Command can only advise facility, fleet, and other commanders.

³² "Managing the Army's Historic Properties: A Blueprint for Preservation and Reuse," Office of Army Historic Properties, brochure, 1999.

The Navy and the Marine Corps have an important historical legacy in their holdings. These range from prehistoric rock art and archeological sites, to the U.S. Naval Academy and important naval industrial shipyards and support areas of the 19th and 20th centuries. Bombing and gunnery ranges in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and in the Mojave Desert have a history of controversy, while being rich in archeological and cultural sites.

The Navy has been actively engaged in a number of important activities related to its historic resource stewardship over the last several years. Unlike its sister services, military downsizing and normal obsolescence requires the Navy to address ship disposal, and some of these vessels are historic and of interest to nonprofit organizations and others. The Navy also operates an underwater resource program that works with the National Park Service and others on documentation and other projects.

One prominent place to examine some of the issues surrounding Navy stewardship is the U.S. Naval Base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Designated a National Historic Landmark in recognition of the December 7, 1941, air attack by Japan as well as the overarching historical importance of Pearl Harbor in the Pacific through time, the Pearl Harbor National Historic Landmark District consists of more than 1,200 buildings and structures constructed during the 100-year history of the base. The base also contains numerous Native Hawaiian cultural sites, including remains of stone-walled fishponds traditionally used for aquaculture. Best known of the Naval Base's historic resources are the submerged remains of the USS *Arizona* and the USS *Utah* as well as other reminders from the attack. Although the USS *Arizona* memorial is owned by the Navy and located in the middle of a Navy base, NPS has the responsibility for managing the memorial and its visitor's center and museum. Even more visitors are now expected with the opening of the USS *Missouri* (which hosted the 1945 Japanese surrender), which is berthed near the *Arizona*. Following the *Missouri's* final decommissioning in 1992, it remained mothballed until 1998 when it was moved to Pearl Harbor to facilitate creation of the Battleship Missouri Memorial.

Decisions about historic resources in the context of naval operations at Pearl Harbor are guided by a 1979 Programmatic Agreement among the Navy, the Hawaiian SHPO, and the Council that has not been altered or amended since its execution. The Navy is considering major new development at Ford Island, located in the harbor at the base. Ford Island contains buildings and structures associated with its historic use as officer housing and a naval air station, was the location of "Battleship Row" during the attack, and has both the *Arizona* site and the *Missouri* just offshore. Runways and structures still bear scars from the strafing and bombing that took place during Japan's attack. Traditionally accessible only by ferry, a bridge between the island and the mainland opened last year that would facilitate new housing and other development, and consultation on the appropriateness of such redevelopment has begun.

In 1997, the Navy completed and adopted revised planning guidelines for Historic and Archeological Resources Protection to ensure that Navy and Marine Corps installations, bases, and activities plan for and address integrated resource management needs for historic and other resources. The guidance helps the Navy and the Marine Corps establish priorities for resources by categorizing the built environment and assigning buildings, structures, and designed landscapes to appropriate treatment categories.

The guidance was one fundamental basis for a 1999 Programmatic Agreement that deals with undertakings affecting the built environment at Navy facilities in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia. The agreement concluded among the Navy, the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation eventually led to a Nationwide Programmatic Agreement for management of historic family housing units that was signed in 2000. It establishes basic procedures and criteria for identifying, evaluating, and prioritizing preservation and ongoing management of historic family housing units in general, as well as provisions for dealing with exceptions and special situations on a case-by-case basis.

Department of the Air Force

The Air Force, youngest of the services, is also faced with some significant challenges. The Air Force maintains about nine million acres. Major commands as well as bases oversee historic resource management, with technical support from an Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence located at Brook AFB in San Antonio, Texas.

Many Air Force facilities are either former Army or Army Air Corps facilities. This is the case with the former Wyoming cavalry outpost that is now Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, as well as the former Army Air Corps centers at Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. There are also some important bases, like Vandenberg and Edwards Air Force Bases in California, that combine Cold War period aerospace history and technology with remains of ancient Native American cultures.

The Air Force is coping with many of the same issues, problems, and concerns as the other services. This includes its changing role in the Nation's defense posture in the post-Cold War era, with accompanying changes in strategic nuclear force structure and tactical air defense. Environmental cleanup and remediation is a major concern in the Air Force, and potentially could result in removal or substantial alteration of facilities dating from the post-World War II period that have not yet been fully evaluated for their historic value. The Air Force has been working with the National Park Service and other partners on a number of specific historic preservation-related projects at individual installations, using Legacy Resource Management Program funds. Examples of two such projects are a historic interpretive trail at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio that was developed in cooperation with a Boy Scout Eagle Scout candidate, and an onsite interpretive center with exhibits at a prehistoric Native American site on F.E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming.³³

Likely to affect all of the military services, but perhaps the Air Force in particular, are pending decisions on a

National Missile Defense deployment. An environmental impact statement was prepared in 2000 that outlines the possible effects of Ground Based Interceptor placement, new Command and Control facilities, and detection and communication stations. There would be spin-off effects from personnel realignment and construction of support facilities to augment implementation of this plan. In addition to archeological resources and traditional properties in some areas, many of the historic resources that would be affected at installations, particularly those in Alaska, would be of World War II or Cold War vintage.

Affiliated Agencies—Veterans Affairs and U.S. Coast Guard

Although the Council did not specifically review the activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) or the Coast Guard (except for lighthouses; see Figure 6 on page 33), each of these entities shares many of the daily management and operational challenges and concerns regarding stewardship responsibilities with the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The VA's Veterans Health Administration, through its Office of Facilities Management, has recently completed (and made available on its Web site) a detailed database and other information on its historic holdings, which include many important examples of period hospital, group home, and other architecture at its Veterans Medical Centers and other facilities. The availability of this baseline information and technical guidance may make it less intimidating for property managers to include historic resource considerations in their ongoing repair, maintenance, and management decisions. However, the VA program could benefit significantly from additional support given the wealth of historic resources in its care and the modern residential and health care needs of veterans at the facilities.

The Coast Guard, an agency of the Department of Transportation that shares many characteristics and mission responsibilities with the military services, has faced similar challenges. Like the Navy, it is primarily

³³ "Conserving Natural and Cultural Resources on Department of Defense Lands: Case Studies from the DoD Conservation Program," *Technical Notes*, Department of Defense, 1999.

FIGURE 6

SPECIAL AND DESIRABLE RESOURCES: LIGHTHOUSES AND LODGES

There are certain special resources that are not only highly prized by many Americans, but also capable of engendering both public and private support for their preservation and care. For a variety of reasons, these resources are valued, and both public and private entities are often willing to make more extraordinary efforts to protect, preserve, and promote them and ensure that they remain in public use and accessible. As such, there may be some lessons to be learned for other Federal stewardship efforts that seek to engage the public and raise funding, as well as for the setting of Federal funding and management priorities. Fund raising efforts to preserve and rehabilitate major national landmarks such as the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island in New York Harbor, the Washington Monument, and similar national icons seemingly stand a better chance than garnering broad support and money for lesser known resources.

Lighthouses and their associated outbuildings (collectively known as light stations) are some of America's most evocative historic resources, with distinctive designs, colorful histories, and striking maritime settings. While a number have been transferred out of Federal ownership in recent years, a majority remain under Federal control, with most administered by the U.S. Coast Guard.

Over the past three decades, technological advances have permitted the Coast Guard to automate and “unman” virtually all of its light stations, a change that has saved the Federal Government significant manpower and money. In 1968 the Coast Guard initiated its Lighthouse Automation and Modernization Program. Over the next 20 years, more than \$26 million was spent in automating light stations. The resulting removal of Coast Guard personnel resulted in savings of more than \$63 million. Every Coast Guard-owned light station is now automated and “unmanned,” except for Boston Harbor Light. (The first light station in the country, it remains staffed at the specific direction of Congress.)

At the same time, continuing Coast Guard budget constraints have forced the agency to focus resources on primary, safety-critical missions such as providing aids to navigation (including thousands of light and sound signals) and search and rescue. Unfortunately, automation and tight budgets have combined to create problems for historic light stations that are no longer manned or lived in, including deferred maintenance and in some cases vandalism.

Withdrawal of keepers and staff, while fiscally responsible, ended the day-to-day maintenance, repairs, and oversight that historic light stations had previously enjoyed. By the 1980s, it became apparent that this situation was taking its toll on the protection and maintenance of these properties. To address this, the Coast Guard expanded its policy of leasing light stations, which had been instituted in the 1960s. Lessees of historic light stations, which are generally nonprofit organizations, assume responsibility for maintenance and rehabilitation and are able to encourage and manage public visitation.

But leasing has proven not to be the only answer. The Coast Guard has also transferred ownership of light stations to other parties while retaining easements to operate the needed navigational aids. A number of such transfers have been authorized through special legislation, notably for numerous lighthouses in the State of Maine. Such transfers bring a needed influx of commitment and funds from other parties to the challenge of light station preservation. Legal impediments remain, however, to using this approach as a comprehensive solution. *(continued)*

FIGURE 6 (CONTINUED)

In the 105th Congress, legislation was introduced to remove those barriers. Reintroduced in the 106th Congress, the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act (P.L. 106-355) amended the National Historic Preservation Act to establish a national historic light station preservation program.³⁴ Central to the law was establishment of a process that would encourage and facilitate transfer or sale of historic light stations to non-Federal parties, with appropriate review.

Transfer of light stations out of Federal ownership, while retaining easements for the Coast Guard to operate needed aids to navigation, offers several possible benefits from a historic preservation perspective. Leasing to non-profits has generally not benefitted remote light stations, many of which are offshore and have limited public accessibility. Transfer or sale of such lights may offer the best opportunity to ensure their continued preservation. Even light stations that are already leased may benefit from transfer. Ownership of the property can provide leverage and incentive that may otherwise be lacking for major preservation fund raising and projects.

National Park lodges are also among the most visible, and often prized historic structures in Federal hands. Available for visitor accommodation, their upkeep and operation are not without controversy because their locations are in highly visible natural environments. A recent “coffee table” book, *Great Lodges of the West*, highlights 11 of these structures, 10 in the National Park System and one in a National Forest. Maintenance, repair, and modernization work has been challenging, and not the least of the problem has had to do with funding the work. A variety of creative approaches has been taken, usually in cooperation with the non-governmental manager or concessioner for the facility, and often with the assistance of “friends” groups.

But these are the most visible and readily supportable of national park historic structures. As Richard Moe, President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, summarized in the foreword to that book:

Glacier National Park, to cite a single example, is home to more than 300 structures. Many of them are in serious peril. The Sperry and Granite Park chalets, built early in this century to provide a unique visitor experience in Glacier’s remote backcountry, have been closed to the public since 1992 out of concern for environmental and visitor safety. The famous Many Glacier Hotel...is still in service at present—but it could share the same fate in the near future unless extensive structural repairs are made. The cost of restoring these three buildings alone is estimated in the millions of dollars.³⁵

In National Forests, there are few grand lodges, but there are many cabins and abandoned fire lookouts that are no longer essential to Forest Service operational needs, but are extremely popular with the public. Recreation Cabin Rentals is a popular Forest Service program through which the public can rent cabins and lookouts for overnight stays. Heritage specialists are actively involved in restoring the historic structures for use in the program and making sure information is available to the visiting public about the history of the structure and surrounding area.

³⁴ Passed by Congress and signed into law by the President on October 24, 2000.

³⁵ *Great Lodges of the West*, Christine Barnes, W.W. West, Bend, Oregon, 1997.

concerned with sea and air operations rather than its shore facilities. Large Coast Guard installations like Governors Island in New York harbor, which has closed and is being made available for local recreation and private development, are being abandoned in favor of much smaller local facilities and shore support stations.

Neither the VA nor the Coast Guard have more than a few professional cultural resource staff specifically assigned to assist with their activities or to participate in planning and decisions affecting local facilities. In addition, the Department of Defense has had a basic advantage from its special program and funding support over the last decade through the Legacy Resource Management Program. Specialized training on historic preservation for Coast Guard and DoD personnel in 1997 and 1998, developed by the Council in partnership with the Navy's Civil Engineer Corps Officers School, has at least helped to raise awareness of historic resource stewardship needs and legal requirements.

Common Concerns

All of the military services and their related agencies are working to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of historic structure management and protection, in some cases with urgency. For example, under the Wherry Military Housing Act of 1949 and the Capehart Housing Act of 1955, approximately 250,000 housing units were built over 13 years to fill a critical housing shortage among the military services. Constructed with private funds on lands leased from the Federal Government, these family residences were based on civilian models of the time. The same designs of houses, apartments, and rowhouses were often built as military construction projects.

DoD is now deciding how to deal with this aging housing stock, much of which considered substandard by modern standards, and may become (if it has not already) a factor in military personnel retention through re-enlistments. DoD is also attempting to determine whether any of the remaining complexes (34,000 Army units, 25,300 Navy units, 36,900 Air Force units, and 11,500 Marine Corps units) may be considered historic, while it pushes ahead on privatized

housing initiatives that could eventually result in substantial new construction and affect other historic resources. The majority of military family housing extant today was built before 1969, and nearly 10 percent is 50 years old or older. Housing replacement, construction of new housing, privatization of housing for military families, and maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and retention of historic housing will be major issues in the new millennium. The Navy's nationwide agreement has explicit provisions for dealing with many of these concerns, but no such agreements have yet been developed for the other services.

In California, DoD used Legacy Resource Management Program funds to sponsor and review previous historic building and structure studies. DoD is using the review as one basis for planning completion of historic property inventories, as well as for heightening military personnel awareness. The project, involving 93 installations, 39 of which have closed or are closing, is a cooperative venture among DoD, the four services, the California SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, and the governor's Office of Planning and Research.

The study found that inventory and evaluation was complete at one-third of the installations, partially complete at one-third, and not begun at the remainder. To date, however, more than 3,600 historic resources appear to meet National Register criteria, and four are National Historic Landmarks. The services are using the knowledge to improve management of these important resources and ensure their continued protection.

Beginning in the mid 1980s, a major DoD effort to remove World War II "temporary" wood frame buildings originally constructed in the 1940s, combined with a detailed look at the state of the military's housing stock, led to some major questions about the condition and appropriate use of DoD's historic and cultural assets at its installations throughout the continental United States.

Shortly thereafter, the end of the Cold War in 1989 precipitated major changes in the military. A large force structure was no longer needed and the numbers of both

uniformed and civilian personnel were reduced. With a smaller force, infrastructure needs changed, requiring a reduction in facilities. Pressure was exerted through legislation and budgeting to effect these reductions, including base closure and “realignment.” New approaches to overall management, including contracting for some services previously provided by the military and “privatizing” others, were also introduced throughout the 1990s to address the military’s changing needs.

At a DoD historic buildings conference in Annapolis, Maryland, in July 2000, the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Environmental Security observed:

The Department [of Defense] has a substantial property maintenance backlog and a shrinking DoD maintenance budget. Since 1995, many independent reports have concluded that DoD’s funding is not sufficient to produce, maintain, and operate quality housing. In addition, there is a perception on Capitol Hill that we are not doing enough to cut costs. Some fear that with over 70,000 additional structures eligible for historic status over the next 30 years that we will not be able to maintain our existing inventory without huge budget increases—increases that many in Congress will never accept. Our challenge in managing historic properties is to move beyond compliance—to pursue bolder resource management initiatives, and to adapt and reuse historic buildings for other uses.

The Deputy Undersecretary went on to note:

In some cases, historic building requirements do mean higher maintenance costs. In many cases, however, relevant factors are the size of the building, deferred maintenance, and sometimes-costly environmental requirements like lead and asbestos removal. We need to adapt historic resources to meet new and innovative functions, and to keep pace with technological advances. We also need to dispose of excess real property. Our challenge is to find appropriate adaptive uses for historic buildings, and economical mothballing practices to safeguard them during interim periods of disuse. We need to increase

the viability of our historic properties as operational and economic assets as well as cultural objects.

Pressure for additional military base closures and other operational efficiency measures, as well as accelerated modernization of military housing, active training facilities, and other high priority operational facilities (including those proposed to support National Missile Defense deployment) may be expected in the near future.

PUBLIC LANDS AND MULTIPLE USES

Bureau of Land Management

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) within the Department of the Interior manages the largest percentage of public land and associated resources in the Federal Government. BLM is responsible for 264 million acres of land—about one-eighth of the land area of the United States—and about 300 million additional acres of subsurface mineral resources. BLM is also responsible for wild-fire management and suppression on 388 million acres of Federal and State lands under interagency agreements, and works with the military services and other Federal agencies to jointly administer public lands withdrawn for special Federal uses (such as bombing ranges or western water projects). Most of the lands under BLM management are located in 12 States in the western U.S., including 87.3 million acres in Alaska. An eastern States office administers small parcels of land and reserved subsurface minerals in States bordering and east of the Mississippi River. BLM also maintains the records of public lands surveys, dating back to the Land Ordinance of 1785, and the records of the General Land Office, founded in 1812, chronicling the exploration, survey, mapping, and settlement of lands west of the original 13 American colonies.

BLM’s mission direction and its management focus have evolved considerably over the years, and while it remains dedicated to “multiple use” of public lands it has increasingly found itself involved in providing outdoor recreation opportunities for the urbanizing west. Recently BLM has acquired additional specific responsibilities for managing a number of newly designated National Monuments—Grand Staircase-Escalante in

Utah, designated in 1996, and three monuments in Arizona and California designated in 2000: Agua Fria, Grand Canyon-Parashant, and California Coastal National Monuments.

Currently, BLM has approximately 255 listings in the National Register of Historic Places, encompassing more than 3,610 contributing properties, 22 National Historic Landmarks, and five World Heritage sites comprising portions of the Chaco Canyon prehistoric outlier sites in New Mexico. New National Register listings are being added at a rate of approximately one per month. Portions of eight National Historic Trails covering 3,500 miles cross the public lands, while at least 5,000 additional trail miles occur along 10 other historic trails. Known historic structures on BLM lands include prehistoric pueblos, cliff dwellings, antelope and bighorn sheep traps, and agricultural features, as well as historic-period mining structures (such as smelters, mill sites, and charcoal kilns), ranch buildings, adobe forts, stagecoach and Pony Express stops, rail lines and associated structures, town sites, lighthouses, cabins, and Depression-era schoolhouses.

Approximately 228,000 archeological and historic resources have been recorded on the roughly 13.9 million acres of public lands that have been inventoried for cultural sites, which is only about 5 percent of all lands administered by BLM. Conservative estimates of the number of archeological and historic properties that may exist on BLM holdings range from four million to four and a half million.

Responsibilities for BLM's cultural resources programs are spread throughout the field structure, which includes State Offices and local Field of District Offices, as well as a headquarters Cultural Heritage, Wilderness, Special Areas, and Paleontology Group under the Assistant Director for Renewable Resources and Planning. Numerous historic properties are under active protection, many of them in established BLM interpretive sites or recreation areas, and many more are subject to regular patrolling, electronic surveillance, and other protective measures.

In Arizona, for example, BLM is responsible for 51 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern covering more than 800,000 acres; 12 of these areas were designated largely to protect historic and archeological resources. The new Agua Fria National Monument north of Phoenix, Arizona, covers 71,000 acres and contains one of the most significant collections of late prehistoric resources in the American Southwest—at least 450 sites are known, and there are likely many more in the area's rugged countryside. The area has long been under BLM jurisdiction, and much of the management will remain unchanged. Unlike a National Park Unit, livestock grazing, hunting, fishing, and similar activities will be allowed to continue, and the 1,440 acres of private property within the boundaries, or other valid existing rights such as water rights, will generally not be affected. However, new mining claims, geothermal leasing, and off-road vehicle use will be prohibited, and it is hoped that more funding will be available for resource protection, public interpretation, and visitor access.

The situation overall, however, is outlined by BLM:

The BLM manages the largest, most diverse and scientifically most important body of cultural resources of any federal land managing agency. However, much of this cultural resource base is seriously threatened. This "Great Outdoor Museum," which has the potential to document the full sweep of western prehistory and history, will soon lack sufficient integrity and representativeness to relate anything more than minor anecdotes.... Natural and human-caused threats are reducing our opportunities for interpreting sites, for providing long-term access to properties valuable to Native Americans and other ethnic groups, for promoting and facilitating scientific research, and for conserving properties for the future. Increasing visitation to the public lands is resulting in intentional and inadvertent damage through collection, vandalism, surface disturbance, and other depreciative behavior. Increasing land use authorizations for rights-of-way, mining, public facilities and other legitimate and necessary uses of the public lands continue to result in an ever-diminishing cultural resource base. With every year that

passes, the diversity of our cultural resources is reduced, and we lose more of our ability of tell the story of the public lands.³⁶

In the Bureau of Land Management, for example, “the Bureau’s budget has been flat over the last decade and has seen its workforce decline over this time period even though its workload has become more complex.” BLM’s operating budget amounts to \$2.82 per acre, compared to \$6.65 per acre for the Forest Service and \$16.85 per acre for the National Park Service. Similarly, the Forest Service manages 27 percent fewer acres but employs 28 percent more cultural heritage specialists, and NPS manages less than one-third the acreage of BLM but has more than five times the number of cultural heritage personnel.

On the plus side, a number of successful projects have been completed or are underway in Arizona, and provide an idea of the broader range of BLM’s programs throughout the West. These include an ongoing cooperative arrangement with the Sierra Club to help BLM record prehistoric rock art on its lands; a cooperative agreement with the Utah Wing of the Civil Air Patrol to conduct monitoring flights for protection of cultural resources north of the Grand Canyon; acquisition and protection of the Empire Ranch, part of what used to be one of the largest cattle ranches in the southwest and home to an adobe ranch house built in 1876; and management of the early 20th century copper mining town of Swansea, including use of an Arizona Off Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund grant to address public safety hazards and protect and stabilize some of the remaining structures.

BLM plays a major role in Arizona Archeology Month, one of the most comprehensive public awareness programs of its type in the country. BLM also participates in Arizona’s Site Stewards program, a public-private partnership under the direction and oversight of the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office that supports the work of citizen volunteers to monitor specific areas or sites and report incidents of looting, vandalism, and other destructive action.

³⁶ “Strategic Paper on Cultural Resources at Risk,” Bureau of Land Management, June 2000.

However, given the scale and scope of BLM’s responsibilities, funding and staffing remain inadequate. Many programs and projects must be pursued as limited time, money, and personnel resources permit, and BLM has looked for ways to leverage its resources through a variety of partnerships and cooperative ventures. In part this has been reflected in BLM’s willingness and ability to work with States, tribes, local communities, and others. These laudable efforts need to be supported and sustained throughout BLM. BLM itself has recognized the need for:

- raising the awareness and understanding of managers and supervisory staff as well as line range and commodities personnel;
- finding ways to achieve more effective integration of cultural resource considerations in project planning;
- taking full advantage of public-private partnerships (like those outlined above) that may help BLM meet its stewardship responsibilities more efficiently and effectively;
- making priority investments in non-project-driven planning to establish reliable context and management documents that are responsive to the values of the resources;
- identifying good, replicable models to improve public and tribal involvement to more fully consider and integrate their concerns and contributions; and
- looking for ways to achieve greater parity between cultural resource management needs, multiple use pressures, and other aspects of BLM’s mission.

U.S. Forest Service

The Forest Service, a bureau of the Department of Agriculture, manages 155 National Forests and 20 grasslands on more than 191 million acres of public land, 8.3 percent of the total U.S. land area. More than 85 percent (163 million acres) is within 12 western states. The

Forest Service manages many congressionally designated areas including Wilderness Areas (34.7 million acres), National Monument Areas (3.7 million acres), National Recreation Areas (2.7 million acres), National Historic Areas (6,540 acres), National Game Refuges and Wildlife Preserves (1.2 million acres), National Scenic Research Areas (6,630 acres), and National Wild and Scenic Rivers (4,348 miles, 95 rivers). The Forest Service administers these lands and resources under the Organic Administration Act of 1897, the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, and the National Forest Management Act of 1976, in addition to other mandates.

The Forest Service's principal responsibilities are reflected in its staff areas: Lands; Wildlife, Fish, and Rare Plants; Water, Soil, and Air; Range; Energy, Minerals, and Geology; Forest Vegetative Management; and Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness. Responsibilities for the heritage program are spread throughout the field structure, beginning with more than 600 ranger districts, which are the smallest administrative unit of the 250 individual National Forests.

The National Forests are grouped within nine regions. The Federal Preservation Officer oversees the program from the Washington Office, as part of the Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness Resources staff. Currently, the Forest Service employs approximately 350 permanent historic resource professionals, most of them archeologists.

Forest Service holdings encompasses a significant number of historic resources, with a combined total of more than 277,000 known resources on the roughly 38 million acres that have been inventoried. This represents about 20 percent of all lands administered by the Forest Service. Conservative estimates of the number of historic and archeological resources that may exist on Forest Service lands range from 1 to 1.5 million.

The Forest Service currently has approximately 900 listings in the National Register of Historic Places, 15 National Historic Landmarks, and one World Heritage Site (one of the Chaco Canyon prehistoric outlier sites, at Chimney Rock, Colorado). As documentation is pre-

pared, new National Register listings are being added at a rate of approximately two per month. All of these documented resources are listed in a variety of inventories kept at each forest and managed by heritage specialists.

The Forest Service's annual budget for the Heritage Program has been about \$15 million, less than .4 percent of the total Forest Service budget of \$3.4 billion. Funding reached its height in 1994 at \$29.9 million, and has remained flat for the past six years. The Forest Service has noted that its limited budget and staffing is affecting its ability to track and manage its holdings while lacking basic database capability as well as specific information on the nature, significance, and appropriate management of historic resources. Its ability to meet recreation, public education, and interpretation demands has been seriously curtailed, as well as its responsiveness to inappropriate uses, including serious vandalism and looting. As with BLM, road construction, timber harvesting, and other extractive uses and spin-off effects must all be addressed.

The Forest Service changed its budget allocation process a few years ago to direct far less to its heritage program overall, but in its place determined to provide monies for Section 106 compliance for whichever program needs such compliance. For example, funding for surveys in proposed timber sales has typically come through the timber program, and similar needs for fire management through the national fire plan. This has created a situation where there is very little money allocated directly to the heritage program for each Region and individual forest—certainly not enough to comply with the expectations and requirements of Section 110 of NHPA. In the mid 1990s, the Sierra Nevada Forests in California developed an archeological and environmental resources management initiative—the Framework for Archeological Resources Management (FARM). The initiative is designed to integrate cultural resource management into the Forest Service's planning process and overall management strategy.

Unfortunately, since development of the original plans, the Forest Service has not allocated the money necessary to implement them, and now the affected forests are

“horribly out of compliance” with the plans.³⁷ This situation may change somewhat as both agencies will be faced with substantial pressures (and additional funding) to improve land and resource management, in part because of recent emergency appropriations in connection with the serious wildland fire emergencies in 2000.

For the past 10 years, the Forest Service has also tried to put more emphasis on the Federal responsibility to share heritage information with the public. “Windows on the Past” is the umbrella for public programs and products whose goal is to make heritage sites, knowledge, and experiences accessible to the public. Windows on the Past covers a variety of efforts, including several national programs as well as numerous local interpretive programs and products, school programs, and community outreach efforts. The best known and most successful of these is Passport in Time, a volunteer program in which the public assists Forest Service archeologists with preservation activities. Archeological excavation, survey, historic structure restoration, archival research, and gathering oral histories have been prominent Passport in Time projects. The Forest Service has hosted more than 1,200 projects since the program’s inception in 1989. About 200 to 220 projects a year are undertaken by the nine Forest Service regions each year. Many of the projects are developed in cooperation with universities, local communities, and other Federal and State agencies.

A newer program is called Heritage Expeditions and is being developed under the Recreation Fee Demonstration legislation (P.L. 104-134). These are educational tours ranging from archeological excavations, to rock art restoration, to primitive tool use. Fees from the program are intended to fund protection and continued public access to heritage sites and experiences. The Forest Service hosts about 20 Heritage Expeditions each year, and more could be added in the future.

As with BLM, the Forest Service has been forced to find creative ways to integrate its stewardship and other mission needs. For example, the Sears-Kay ruin is a prehistoric archeological site on the Tonto National Forest just north of Phoenix, Arizona, which is located along the

Great Western Trail, a 3,000 mile-long backcountry, off-highway vehicle route. Site preservation, stabilization, interpretation, and construction of a picnic area and toilet facility were facilitated by a partnership that included the Off-Highway Vehicle Fund of the Arizona State Parks department, the Kactus Kickers Hiking Club of Arizona Public Service, the Desert Foothills Chapter of the Arizona Archeological Society, and assistance from a Federal Bureau of Prisons local inmate work crew.

The Forest Service is currently updating its Heritage Resource Management Manual, which is intended to address all aspects of cultural resource management from inventory to enhancement and includes direction on tribal consultation. The manual also includes a collections management policy to guide the agency in its effort to improve accountability for the management of artifact collections, and better distinguish Federal from non-federal holding in museums and other repositories. The Forest Service employs a full-time Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act coordinator to assist the agency to meet the requirements for existing collections and human remains, as well as new and inadvertent discoveries.

New Forest Service manual directions under development will address integration of Section 106 review with NEPA planning, with the objective of implementing a more comprehensive process that allows for a broader assessment of heritage resources and project impacts.

The Forest Service is also currently developing an agency-wide computerized data management plan of which heritage is a part. The National Heritage Information Management Initiative is working to integrate heritage information at all levels of the agency’s data management program. It is a daunting task, given the range of data programs in use at local and regional Forest Service field offices.

Common Concerns

The most substantial challenges the Forest Service and the BLM face concern limited staffing and funding of these programs compared to the scope of land

³⁷ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Historic Preservation Specialist C. Gleichman, personal communication, June 2000.

holdings, management issues, and the legal requirements that must be met. New policy and internal guidance in both agencies is directed at streamlining individual project reviews so that field specialists may invest more time in proactive work. While both agencies continue to search for more efficient and effective ways of meeting their heritage responsibilities, increased demands on public lands, coupled with the increased complexity of consultation with States, Indian tribes, and other parties, have increased the time and effort required to meet Section 106, NAGPRA, and other review responsibilities, negating much of the time savings that has accrued through such efforts.

The vast majority of Forest Service and BLM heritage assets have no annual maintenance performed on them. Currently, the Forest Service Heritage Program does not have the database capability to comply accurately with Deferred Maintenance requirements requested by the Chief Financial Officer. The approach for 1999 and 2000 has been to develop a strategic framework for annual reporting and identification of priorities with incrementally better data, while developing agency business tools to provide an updated, accurate inventory of heritage assets and funding needs.³⁸

Due to limited staffing in relation to workloads, many field offices have been unable to meet reporting needs and are falling behind in production of reports for review and use by planners and others. This is creating a continuing backlog of evaluations of historic resources for management purposes. The relatively common practice of saving time and money by avoiding identified properties through project redesign prior to evaluating them for National Register eligibility has contributed to the difficulty of managing resources whose values remain largely unknown. Funding and staffing levels have rarely permitted proactive inventories of areas with high potential for significant cultural properties and evaluations of known, important sites.

During the 1980s, the Forest Service prepared many forest plans to guide management decisions. Those

plans, currently under revision, focus primarily on biological resources, addressing cultural resources most frequently in terms of the NHPA Section 106 responsibility to consider them in other agency management actions. It is one of the Forest Service's biggest challenges, echoed by a similar need in the Bureau of Land Management—to proactively integrate heritage assets in land management planning efforts.

One of the ways to achieve this goal is to more effectively integrate NHPA responsibilities into the environmental planning process called for by the National Environmental Policy Act. Projects and programs that affect land areas such as timber harvest, oil and gas development, and land exchanges can affect hundreds of historic resources. Sometimes consideration of those properties under NHPA does not take place until late in the NEPA decision-making process. Delaying Section 106 review until specific undertakings are defined prevents historic resources from being an effective factor in decision making.

Staffing and funding constraints have also made it more difficult to respond to, much less keep up with, increasing demand for educational and participatory programs in archeology and history. A 1994 National Survey on Recreation and the Environment indicates that visiting nature centers and historic sites were the two most popular activities on public lands. Further, a recent publication on volunteer vacations states that “archeological excavations have more volunteer hours given to them than any other type of activity.” Still, while these demands grow, the Federal Government's ability to provide those experiences is declining. A good indicator is the Forest Service's Passport in Time program: the number of projects has increased from 37 in 1990 to more than 200 in 1999, but the Forest Service continues to turn away 20 to 25 percent of applicants, not due to lack of work to be done, but rather to lack of personnel and budget to organize it.

Inappropriate uses, vandalism, and looting continue to damage historic resources on BLM lands and in National

³⁸ Funding made available in the FY 2001 appropriations to address deferred maintenance needs and infrastructure improvement has largely been earmarked for offices and recreation facilities, not for historic resources.

Forests. As recreation visits, urban and suburban sprawl, and off-road use increase, vandalism and looting also increase. Rock art is defaced or removed; significant archeological sites are looted and artifacts scattered or stolen; burials are disturbed and human remains and grave items scattered or stolen; and historic period sites are scavenged for “collectibles.” Many of these items end up in local, national, and international black markets.

In addition to the illegal activity, an increase in visitor use is taking its toll on protected resources. In short, many historic resources on public lands are being “loved to death.” Proactive programs in both education and law enforcement are needed. Programs such as Passport in Time reduce the amount of inadvertent damage to cultural sites and increase public awareness of the need to protect sites, and Site Stewards help track such damage. However, commercial looting damages are much greater than that caused by increased use and visitation. Public education programs help, but cooperation between heritage programs and law enforcement is needed to pursue cases.

The Society for American Archeology (SAA), participating in discussions as part of the Council review of public lands management issues at the Phoenix, Arizona, meeting, has voiced concerns over policies restricting academic research on Federal lands. There is also a growing concern over control of access to information and academic freedom, particularly as it relates to the Federal Government’s responsiveness to tribal concerns and to the conduct of archeological studies on both public lands and tribal trust lands. Advances in knowledge, or in ensuring up-to-date public interpretations of the past, may be conflicting with ongoing resource management and protection priorities. SAA has suggested that opportunities for collaboration between Federal agencies and academic institutions be explored more fully, particularly with regard to scientific research that could lead to better resource management and public interpretation. These are certainly areas that need more attention in the future to ensure that the wide range of values and potential public uses represented by these historic resources are adequately served.

In summary, public interest in archeology and history, particularly as it relates to recreation on public lands, is at an all-time high. Demands for educational and participatory programs increase every year. Use pressures and illegal activity also increase every year, threatening the non-renewable cultural resources. Federal land managers increasingly seek information on past environments and environmental change in order to better manage current ecosystems and make more informed management decisions.

All these demands require increased effort on the part of agency heritage personnel to first and foremost know what resources exist and understand their value. At the end of FY 2000, the Forest Service was in the process of formally adopting its national strategy, called “Heritage—It’s About Time!” to set such priorities. BLM was engaged in a similar effort directed at managerial and budgetary support.

Without adequate funding, personnel, or baseline information about resource holdings, it is extremely difficult to provide land managers with accurate pictures of past land use, to provide opportunities for the public to gain knowledge of and enjoy heritage sites and experiences on public land, or even to protect the significant historic resources and make informed decisions about which ones to protect and invest further efforts in research and development.

PARKS, REFUGES, AND SANCTUARIES

National Park Service

The National Park Service in the Department of the Interior includes 379 units, approximately 83.6 million acres, ranging from major national parks and monuments, to scenic parkways, preserves, trails, riverways, seashores, lakeshores, and recreation areas as well as historic sites and battlefields.

NPS maintains several inventories of historic resources within the National Park System. An estimated 26,000 historic and prehistoric structures are included in the List of Classified Structures (LCS). The LCS is a

computerized inventory of all historic and prehistoric structures having historical, architectural, or engineering significance in which NPS has or plans to acquire legal interest. The LCS (and related inventories) assists park managers and technical staff in planning, programming, and recording decisions about appropriate management and treatment. Condition of these resources is continually threatened by weather, structural deterioration, erosion, and vandalism, as well as by other forces, such as fire or visitor use pressures.

As of the end of FY 1999, data on 24,255 structures had been updated. Approximately 44 percent were listed in good condition, 40.2 percent in fair condition, 12.2 percent in poor condition, and for 3.6 percent condition was listed as “unknown.” Unfunded costs for treatments of historic structures approved through park planning documents, which were developed with a broad and varied range of public involvement, “currently tops \$1 billion.” About 72 percent of that was for rehabilitation and preservation costs, and 17 percent for basic stabilization.

NPS understandably employs the largest number of historic resource specialists in the Federal Government. NPS also has the most extensive and comprehensive policies and technical guidance for managing these resources. Detailed management policies apply to resources in all units of the National Park System: all units have long-term general management plans that undergo public review, and most also have more specific development, land-use, and resource-specific plans as well as operating procedures for maintenance, visitor services, and other issues specific to the park or resource.

NPS management policies are currently under revision. They cover a wide range of topics from resource protection and interpretation to facilities management and visitor services and safety. The Cultural Resource Management guideline for NPS notes that according to the management policies,

pending planning decisions, all cultural resources will be protected and preserved in their existing

³⁹ *Cultural Resource Management Guideline* (NPS-28), p. 2.

conditions.... The National Park Service is steward of many of America’s most important cultural, natural, and recreational resources. It is charged to preserve them unimpaired for the enjoyment of present and future generations. All park management activities stem from these resources. If they are degraded or lost, so is the essence of the park.

It goes on to note that:

In reaching decisions about resource treatment, moreover, preservation should always receive first consideration. Data recovery, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction may sometimes serve legitimate management purposes. However, these treatments cannot add to and will likely subtract from the finite material, and sometimes even data sources, remaining from the past. Decisions about them should be based on awareness of long-range preservation goals and the interests and concerns of traditionally associated groups.... Internationally accepted historic preservation standards continue to stress the protection and perpetuation of authentic surviving resources.³⁹

This does not mean, however, that NPS stewardship is devoid of controversy, conflict, or major issues. Funding availability and deferred maintenance have long been a concern, and the manner in which priorities are set by park superintendents and others is often open to criticism.

Protection and management choices sometimes seem to pit natural and cultural resource values against each other, or protection of park values against public access and visitor services. Involvement of outside parties, including elected officials, concessioners and other business interests, or communities in gateway areas with an economic stake in management and use, is a constant reminder of the many public interests which the National Park System must address. Moreover, inholdings, special uses, permitted activities, and leases may also affect park management and other decisions, both inside and outside park boundaries. Finally, decisions to protect historic resources

may also be controversial—witness such recent examples as the relocation of the Cape Hatteras lighthouse, various redevelopment plans for Gettysburg National Military Park, or the imposition of climbing restrictions on Devil’s Tower in Wyoming (a sacred site to many Indian tribes).

A major independent review of the National Park System and its challenges was released in 1997 by the Natural Resources Defense Council and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Entitled *Reclaiming Our Heritage—What We Need to Do to Preserve America’s National Parks*, the report recommended a wide range of actions. These recommended actions included:

- Issuing an Executive order focused on resource protection;
- Enhancing applied science and ecosystem management;
- Enlisting the help of gateway communities;
- Enhancing the visitor experience by establishing a reservation system for the National Parks;
- Increasing appropriations;
- Making Federal transportation funding for all park transportation systems, not just roads;
- Creating a new National Park capital improvement fund financed through the sale of National Park Federal agency bonds ensured by the Federal Government;
- Creating a new National Park Authority as a fully guaranteed Federal agency to issue National Park bonds;
- Providing assurance that all revenue collected in the parks stays in the National Park System;
- Providing assurance that those who profit from park resources do more to protect them; and
- Taking the Land and Water Conservation Fund off-budget, thus ensuring that its funds will be spent for the purpose of land acquisition and state assistance for which the fund was created.

In summary:

What is needed is a comprehensive response to the park problems. More money is needed and

mechanisms must be put in place to ensure that the money that does go to the parks is spent in a way that protects the parks’ resources now and for the future. In addition, federal, state, and local agencies must recognize the impact of their decisions on park resources and act to protect them. Often what is happening near the parks is as consequential as what happens in the parks.⁴⁰

Given funding limitations as well as changing priorities and a diversity of management philosophies throughout the system, there remains a continuing tension between protection of natural and cultural resource values in parks, and between resource protection and visitor use needs.

For example, this issue of competing values has arisen at Elkmont Historic District in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in Tennessee and North Carolina; at Cumberland Island National Seashore in Georgia; in the Upper Mississippi National River and Recreation Area in Wisconsin and Minnesota; in Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado; and most recently, in Yosemite National Park in California.

At Yosemite, for example, the draft Yosemite Valley Plan analyzes alternatives for achieving NPS’s broad management goals for Yosemite National Park. These goals, as set forth in the park’s 1980 General Management Plan, include reclaiming priceless natural beauty; allowing natural processes to prevail; promoting visitor understanding and enjoyment; and reducing traffic congestion and crowding. Prior to the plan’s development, NPS undertook other planning efforts in more specialized areas, resulting in a draft Yosemite Valley Housing Plan, draft Yosemite Valley Implementation Plan, and Yosemite Lodge Development Concept Plan. Some organizations and members of the public objected, however, to this segregated approach to planning in the park, and thus each of these plans were incorporated into the current draft Yosemite Valley Plan.

Prior to the development of the draft plan, NPS, the California SHPO, and the Council entered into a Programmatic Agreement in 1999 for the operation

⁴⁰ *Reclaiming Our Heritage*, July 1997, pp. viii-x.

and maintenance of the park. The park's Section 106 responsibilities for the draft plan therefore are being addressed in accordance with the terms of the PA. Because the plan's preferred alternative would adversely affect historic properties, NPS must consult with the California SHPO and the Council. The PA would allow use of standard mitigating measures to address the adverse effects, but the California SHPO must first agree to their use following consultation.

In July 2000, the Council provided NPS with initial comments on the draft Yosemite Valley Plan. Although the plan identifies the protection of both natural and cultural resources as a priority, the Council voiced concern over an apparent emphasis on natural resource restoration over the protection of some important historic properties. For example, the preferred alternative includes the removal of the historic superintendent's house in order to restore area natural resources, removal of four historic bridges to restore the natural flow of the Merced River, and removal of 277 tent cabins that comprise the most significant and last remaining complex of this type of structure in the National Park System. Other historic preservation organizations, including the National Trust for Historic Preservation, raised similar concerns about the proposed plan.

NPS met with the California SHPO to discuss possible refinements to the plan that would better address concerns about treatment of historic properties in the Yosemite Valley. NPS subsequently responded thoughtfully and fully to the Council's comments, and agreed to modify or reconsider several of the proposed actions that would more fully protect historic resource values. The historic superintendent's house would be relocated; only one bridge will be removed and the removal's effects on stream flow studied further; and a representative sample of tent cabins would be retained. Adaptive reuse of other historic structures will also be considered.

The draft Yosemite Valley Plan illustrates the often competing interests of protecting and preserving both natural and cultural resources in national parks. There is a great deal of public interest in preserving both kinds of resources; in fact, the entire Yosemite Valley is

considered a cultural landscape with both natural and cultural resources contributing to its significance. In addition, the Merced River is designated a "Wild and Scenic River" under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This designation may affect how historic properties located in the river corridor, including archeological sites and eight historic bridges, are managed in the future.

In an effort to offer advice on the overall issues embodied in such tradeoffs, The Council has formed a task force to examine questions of balancing cultural and natural values in National Parks. The hope is that its findings and recommendations may ultimately be useful not only to the National Park Service but to other agencies facing similar dilemmas.

In order to begin to address long-term funding, maintenance, and related concerns, a demonstration program was begun in FY 1998 on a regional basis that is called "Vanishing Treasures." Intended to be used in National Park units in the arid West, it has three primary objectives. First, it focuses funding on emergency project needs where prehistoric and historic structures are in immediate, imminent danger due to natural deterioration and visitor use pressures. Second, it focuses on training and support for personnel with expertise in historic structures stabilization and restoration, and the transmission of crafts skills from aging specialists nearing retirement. Third, it promotes sustainability by slowly moving from an emergency mode to a continuing, in-place program that can meet these needs in the future, reduce the backlog of maintenance projects, and support a systematic approach to agency stewardship for these resource types.

Including base increases for personnel in selected parks, as well as small amounts for program administration and training of personnel, the authorized budget was \$1 million in FY 1998, \$1.987 million in FY 1999, and \$2.981 million in FY 2000. Mesa Verde National Park, for example, after years of trying to obtain much needed funds for ruins stabilization through cultural resources channels, has finally received some much-needed assistance through capital improvement allocations. More recently, the park received grant funds to stabilize the cliff dwellings, and to hire permanent staff.

NPS has also begun developing a broader national initiative known as the “Cultural Resource Challenge” to increase understanding and budgetary support for cultural resources in the parks. Modeled after a similar successful campaign to address natural resource issues, the initiative is currently in draft and has identified the following priorities:

Research and Knowledge—NPS must have credible research, documentation, and information in order to do the best job of preserving and interpreting our Nation’s past.

Planning—The American people expect their historic places to be preserved for them in the most efficient, informed, and comprehensive manner.

Education—Americans want to understand their shared history; NPS must address their needs in the most effective way.

Preservation and Maintenance—NPS must have the best tools and adequate resources to do the job.

Organization and Partnerships—Preserving our Nation’s past is everyone’s responsibility; the Federal Government is one of many.⁴¹

The draft action plan outlines priorities for budget and program initiatives to advance these goals over the next five years, but it is unclear if comprehensive support for the plan will be included in the FY 2002 budget. Early information indicates that at a minimum, the Bush Administration will be supporting funding to begin to address the widespread maintenance backlog throughout the National Park System.

A second initiative NPS recently launched in cooperation with the National Park Foundation, is not directed at cultural heritage alone, but could have a major impact on use and appreciation of such resources. Known informally as “the message project,” it is aimed at promoting the National Park System and bolstering public understanding, enjoyment, use, and attendance.

Marketed as “Experience Your America—365 Days, 379 Ways,” it includes a public advertising campaign and promotion of a new National Parks Pass for \$50 per year to cover entry to park units that charge a fee. What is not clear is how this initiative fits in with NPS plans to address overcrowding and use pressures in some parks, and whether the campaign will aggressively promote lesser-known and underused park units to try to help correct this imbalance.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) of the Department of the Interior is responsible for 521 National Wildlife Refuges as well as other facilities on 93 million acres. While principally regarded as a protector of biota and natural resources, FWS has a cultural resource management program, a Federal Preservation Officer, and some extremely important historic resources. FWS has documented more than 11,000 archeological and historic sites on a small percentage of its lands, and estimates that it is responsible for tens of thousands of additional sites yet to be identified.

Cultural properties range in age and type from the Sod House historic ranch on the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge in Oregon, to early 20th-century military fortifications in Fort Dade on Egmont Key National Wildlife Refuge in Florida. They also include a 10,000-year-old site on a refuge in Tennessee, a segment of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail on the Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge in Montana, and Victorian-era historic buildings on the DC Booth Historic Fish Hatchery in South Dakota. In FY 2000, Congress and the Secretary of the Interior designated the Battle of Midway National Memorial in the Pacific, to be managed by FWS as part of the Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge.

However, FWS only has about 20 specialized employees nationwide to deal with historic resource management issues on FWS’s vast holdings, many of which are not managed passively but modified to improve wildlife habitat and breeding grounds. It sometimes appears that FWS in general is unaware that it does have such

⁴¹ “Cultural Resources Challenge—The National Park Service’s Action Plan for Preserving Cultural Resources,” draft, September 2000.

resources or does little to manage these heritage assets. In other cases, refuge managers and local community organizations are taking an active role in both protection and successful public interpretation.

An Executive order signed in 1996 sets new direction for FWS's Refuge System as it approaches its centennial in 2003. For the first time, a conservation mission has been designed for the Refuge System "to preserve a national network of lands and waters for the conservation and management of the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States for the benefit of present and future generations."

The Executive order goes on to define six compatible wildlife-dependent recreational activities (hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation) as priority uses of the Refuge System, and directs the Secretary to provide expanded opportunities for these activities. It defines four guiding principles for management of the Refuge System: habitat conservation, public use, partnerships, and public involvement. It also directs the Secretary, in carrying out his trustee and stewardship responsibilities, to undertake actions in support of management and public use of the Refuge System.

In some ways, FWS has been overlooked by many within as well as outside of the Federal Government, and its stewardship of historic resources has not been subjected to a great deal of scrutiny. It has been assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that most of the agency's activities are benign or involve passive management of the refuge system, although clearly there is a wide variety of actions ranging from physical habitat improvement, to road, research station, and visitor center construction, to public access of various kinds. Pressures for new energy development and similar resource uses may be expected within some refuges. The public does not have a broad understanding and appreciation of FWS or its historic resource activities, but the agency's newly defined mission and upcoming anniversary might both offer opportunities to enhance awareness and a more proactive stewardship of its historic resource holdings.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) of the Department of Commerce, which includes the National Weather Service, manages 10 Marine Sanctuaries and several estuarine sanctuaries amounting to about 6.7 million acres of submerged lands and wetlands. Many marine sanctuaries and coastal areas contain historic shipwrecks and other kinds of archeological sites, and the wreck of the Civil War ironclad USS *Monitor* in the *Monitor* National Marine Sanctuary off the coast of North Carolina is a National Historic Landmark.

NOAA has or is in the process of developing management plans for its 12 current National Marine Sanctuaries, and these plans include sections on dealing with historic resources. NOAA also manages a number of National Estuarine Research Reserves in conjunction with various State Governments. As with other parks and refuges, there are increasing pressures from the general public as well as academic institutions for access and a variety of research and other uses in these sanctuaries.

Common Concerns

Two major issues face the National Park Service and related agencies as they attempt to meet their historic resource stewardship responsibilities. First, balancing protection of natural resources and values with care of historic and cultural resources is not a straightforward task. Funding priorities and competition for scarce money and hiring of technical experts are clearly factors. A second and related concern is agencies' ability to provide sufficient visitor access and services for ensuring public use and enjoyment without impairing the values for the park, refuge, or sanctuary. In the large natural parks and the refuges and sanctuaries, historic resources often play a decidedly secondary role in management as well as funding decisions, even though they may figure prominently in visitor use and services, provide employee housing and administrative facilities, and offer creative opportunities for public interpretation.

The social, economic, and political pressures for competing needs, uses, and priorities are many. Local communities rely on parks and similar areas for the

related employment opportunities they bring as well as the other economic development they attract. At the same time, local residents and user groups often chafe at the loss of tax revenues due to public ownership of park lands, raise concerns about access limits, or balk at other restrictions. More cooperative efforts with community-based organizations, “friends” groups, and State, tribal, and local governments need to be explored to help deal with these and similar issues.

PUBLIC WORKS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Many of the major public works and a great deal of the infrastructure for interstate commerce and transportation, energy production, and flood control were originally constructed as Federal projects. During the New Deal period of the 1930s and 1940s, Federal agencies like the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the regional power administrations (Bonneville, Western Area, Southwestern, and Southeastern) became associated with the development of major navigation systems, water control, and power generation, and spearheaded such public projects along with New Deal agencies like the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Following World War II, highway construction and expanding air service found Federal support through the Bureau of Public Roads and the Civil Aviation Agency, which eventually became the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration in the newly formed Department of Transportation during the 1960s.

Many of these programs now receive Federal assistance as State and local projects, but a number of major public works remain in Federal hands. The Department of Transportation retains management responsibility for historic resources such as Union Station in Washington, DC, as well as Federal Aviation Administration air traffic control and other facilities at many of the Nation’s airports.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers manages 459 lakes and other resources with a combined total of 11.7 million acres of land and water under its jurisdiction, and Corps projects provide more than 30 percent of recreational opportunities on Federal lands. With 41 districts in eight divisions, and several research, development, and training centers, the Corps is one of the most experienced Federal agencies in dealing with historic resources. It also has one of the larger agency staffs, with cultural resource specialists in most district offices. The Corps runs an Environmental Laboratory, an Engineering and Support Center, and a Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, and several Corps districts have established centers of expertise (in Seattle and St. Louis, for example) for historic resource stewardship work.

Unfortunately, the Corps is also currently under a great deal of internal and external scrutiny because of recent activities and responsiveness to executive and congressional directives and oversight. Media reports, too, have been extremely critical of Corps actions and command decisions. While the Council did not focus a great deal of time and attention on these agencies and their holdings during the course of this study, it is clear that some scrutiny is necessary.

Tennessee Valley Authority and Bureau of Reclamation

Other agencies need financial attention. The Tennessee Valley Authority, for example, ceased to receive a Federal appropriation in FY 2000 for its activities. While still operating as a Government corporation, and still responsible for several hundred thousand acres of land and miles of reservoir and riverine shoreline, it must manage these resources only with funds from electric power ratepayers in the Tennessee Valley system. Formed as a New Deal entity in 1933 to develop the Tennessee Valley area, it retains important archeological holdings, sites of traditional cultural value to the Cherokee and other Eastern Indian tribes, and resources from the settlement history of the nation’s fifth largest river system. In addition, many of Tennessee Valley Authority’s dams, power plants, and other facilities are themselves historic resources worthy

of attention and preservation consideration. It has only six staff members to address the special stewardship needs of these resources.

An examination of the Strategic Plan prepared by the Tennessee Valley Authority is instructive. Now a Federal corporation that no longer receives a Federal appropriation, TVA's plan is actually more supportive of stewardship needs than plans from many other agencies. Two strategic goals in the plan seem to bear on stewardship issues: Goal 3, "Manage the natural resources of the Tennessee Valley region in an environmentally sustainable manner," and Goal 4, "Maintain the value of federal assets entrusted to TVA, while supporting their wise use by and for the public in support of TVA's mission."

Unfortunately, the implementing strategies are incomplete. Strategy 3.C. focuses on "managing reservoir lands to protect cultural resources, reduce erosion, and provide wildlife habitat, but the performance measured is "critically eroded sites stabilized." Strategy 4.B. directs managers to "support public uses of federal assets under TVA management that are consistent with statutory responsibilities while protecting the value of those assets for the future," but performance is to be measured by "reservoirs with completed comprehensive reservoir land plans."⁴²

Nowhere is there explicit recognition of the historic value of TVA dams and power generation facilities, or of the recreation or regional tourism value of historic resources on TVA lands. At the same time, interviews with TVA staff indicate that historic information included in reservoir land plans is minimal, and more comprehensive studies and resource evaluations have been curtailed due to lack of staff and funding.

Over the last several years, the Bureau of Reclamation (BoR) in the Department of the Interior has been under similar pressures. It is the Nation's second largest power producer, after the Tennessee Valley Authority. BoR has gone through considerable downsizing and

reorganization, and must manage resources on millions of acres of lands withdrawn for project purposes from other public lands. At the same time it must continue to provide water for one out of every five western farmers (who produce 60 percent of America's vegetables and 25 percent of its fruit and nuts), as well as for the increasingly developing urban areas of the arid West. Recreation on BoR projects becomes increasingly important each year as well.

Many of BoR's dams, canals, hydropower generating stations, and other facilities are historic resources, and four are National Historic Landmarks. The historic Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River near Phoenix, Arizona, was de-designated in 1999, however, and three of the remaining National Historic Landmarks are included by the National Park Service on its watch list of threatened landmarks. Indian tribes have major interests in BoR project lands, and have been increasingly involved in discussions affecting those interests, such as the changes in the operation of the Glen Canyon dam in portions of the Colorado River/Grand Canyon system.

Other signs of strain are showing. As reported by the Bureau of Reclamation in its strategic plan, "A Department-wide Inspector General's audit found deficiencies in managing artwork and artifacts within the bureaus and identified management of Museum Property as a Material Weakness under the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act. To address this issue, we and all other bureaus will catalog their museum properties, cultural resources, and artifacts and provide input into the Department's Annual Performance Plans."⁴³

Common Concerns

The public works agencies, and in particular the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, deserve specialized attention beyond the scope of this study. They have substantial resource holdings, many of which are historic dams and navigation facilities that are complex and costly to

⁴² *Government Performance and Results Act Strategic Plan, FY1997-2002*, Tennessee Valley Authority, September 30, 1997.

⁴³ Strategic Plan 2000-2005, Bureau of Reclamation, draft, October 22, 1999.

maintain and manage. They also administer large tracts of project lands that are managed for recreation and other related uses. All are under budgetary and staffing pressures. As expressed by BoR's preservation officer:

As the agency's budget shrinks, so does program accomplishment and the ability to keep staff at a number sufficient to meet program requirements. This is particularly true as construction related activities are reduced. At the same time that Reclamation's budget is in decline, new unfunded mandates are placed upon offices.... However, Reclamation has not fully embraced the financial requirements for a healthy cultural resource management program, including historic preservation planning, Section 110 surveys and related Section 106 compliance, heritage education, museum property management, and NAGPRA compliance. The agency must identify and maintain professional cultural resource management staff at levels that meet annual program management goals.⁴⁴

Focused discussions with these agencies should seek to identify the most cost-effective and efficient ways to maintain their historic resource programs within the context of their specialized missions, privatization, and reorganization.

AREAS OF INTEREST TO NATIVE AMERICANS

In the last decade, most Federal agencies have established formal policies for consulting with Indian tribes, in keeping with both their statutory and Executive order obligations as well as long-standing treaty and trust responsibilities. Emphasis on tribal sovereignty and self-determination have increasingly contributed to Federal Government relations with tribes. Moreover, under NHPA and other statutes, Native Hawaiian Organizations have also been singled out for enhanced roles in consultation on issues of interest and concern to them, as have Native

Alaskans under more specialized legislation like the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

Most Federal land managing agencies have created positions or offices for liaison with Indian tribes, and several of the agencies with holdings or activities in Hawaii have identified Native Hawaiian liaison as a priority in their organizations.

During the course of its meetings in New Mexico and Hawaii, members of the Council met with representatives of the Pueblo of Jemez as well as Native Hawaiians from several organizations and community groups. The views expressed in each of these meetings provided insight into the interests and concerns of both Indian tribes and Native Hawaiians regarding preservation of traditional lifeways and historic places as well as the Federal Government's responsiveness.

Indian tribes have become more involved in consultations regarding Federal undertakings subject to Section 106 of NHPA, and in Federal land management decisions. The 1992 amendments to NHPA establish that properties of traditional religious and cultural significance to Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations may be eligible for inclusion in the National Register. This sometimes involves the identification of very large geographic areas, or landscapes, of traditional cultural and religious significance to Indian tribes and Native American practitioners.

Large land areas proposed as National Register-eligible districts include geographically distinguishable areas such as the 17,284 acre Yamsay Mountain Cultural Landscape in south central Oregon, a place of spiritual significance to the Klamath Tribes, and the Zuni Salt Lake in west-central New Mexico, which was recently expanded to include a buffer zone of 182,000 acres of land. The National Register-eligible Medicine Lake Area Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) District of northern California (23,650 acres) comprises 21 individual TCPs within and close to a volcanic caldera important to several tribes for religious activities.

⁴⁴ Bureau of Reclamation Federal Preservation Officer's Memorandum to Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, November 15, 1999.

Similarly, the summit cluster of Mauna Kea on the island of Hawaii has recently been determined to be eligible for the National Register as a historic district for its traditional and religious significance to Native Hawaiians. The district includes many features that are historically, culturally, and visually linked and remain important to present-day practitioners. Future decisions about this area and its use, home to an array of telescopes and other scientific facilities supported in part by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, are embroiled in controversy.

Traditional cultural landscapes such as these offer new challenges to Federal land managing agencies, who are used to working with a variety of user groups, but not necessarily Native Americans. Federal agencies are now being forced to examine their land management decisions through a different cultural lens, that of Native American traditional culture, and to understand the differing values these groups ascribe to lands that have traditionally been managed for public recreation, grazing, and resource extraction.

Increasingly, and often with strong opposition from other groups, the participation of Indian tribes in the decision-making process results in decisions that shift land uses to better accommodate traditional cultural practices. For example, after substantial controversy and pressure from a coalition of tribal groups and traditional practitioners, Bighorn National Forest, Wyoming, has developed a Historic Preservation Plan for the protection of sites within an 18,000-acre area surrounding the Bighorn Medicine Wheel, a Native American TCP and National Historic Landmark.

Indian tribes view the Federal Government's stewardship responsibilities in the broader context of the trust relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes: through treaty rights, and the requirement for government-to-government consultation with Federally recognized Indian tribes. The relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes is based on the sovereign status of tribal governments and, thus, is very different from the Government's relationship with Native Hawaiian organizations. However, Indian tribes and Native Hawaiians often want to be actively involved

in Federal land management decisions, and to be considered partners or co-managers of lands within their traditional homelands. The challenge to Federal agencies is to balance the needs and desires of recreationists, permittees, and resource user groups with the protection of these traditional cultural landscapes and the needs of traditional practitioners.

Jemez Pueblo, New Mexico

The Pueblo of Jemez, New Mexico, in an area rich in archeological and historic sites noted for its attraction to tourism, has an important relationship with its Federal land management neighbors. The tribe has just over 3,000 members, most of whom live in the sole remaining village and the immediate vicinity. Reservation trust lands total about 90,000 acres, but the Pueblo recognizes a much larger area as its traditional homeland.

The Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Department of Energy all manage and control resources of traditional interest to the Jemez people, and the tribal Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation has cooperated actively with these agencies, especially with the Forest Service, on identification and evaluation studies as well as protection of many of these sites. These include 62 major ancestral village sites, some very large, and 12,000 recorded sites in the tribe's database. One known archeological site contains the remains of more than 3,000 rooms. Sophisticated Geographic Information Systems and Global Positioning Systems as well as other remote sensing and computerized data recording and analysis techniques are being used to help identify these sites, with research organizations underwriting much of the cost.

The tribe also has historic relationships to far distant cultural areas in southwestern Colorado and west-central New Mexico, and is pursuing various claims for repatriation of human remains and cultural items taken from Federal lands in these areas.

The tribe has major concerns about management of and public (as well as commercial) access to these sites, particularly off tribal lands, and is pursuing efforts to forge

management partnerships that permit some access and interpretation when properly balanced with public education as well as training for Federal employees. It is also attempting to negotiate with Federal land managers over what it deems adequate protection and restriction of public access to areas containing sacred sites. Unfortunately, the tribe has been hampered in these efforts by public disclosure and freedom of information requests, turnover of responsible Federal officials, and academic concerns over research access. Conflicts over intellectual property rights and the public's "right to know" have begun, and promise to grow in the future. For example, as the Jemez note in a tribal fact sheet:

A few popular misconceptions regarding the Pueblo of Jemez exist in the published literature. For example, the name "Jemez" does not mean "mirage people" or "people of the canyon." Likewise, the name "Walatowa" [the name of the main village] does translate to "village of the bear." The true definition of these words constitute intellectual property that the Tribal Leaders choose not to share with those of the outside world.

Medicine Lake, California

The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management concluded consultation in June 2000 with Indian tribes regarding the proposed construction of two geothermal projects in the Medicine Lake Highlands in northern California. These would be the first of a series of geothermal developments proposed for Highlands. The projects involved the construction of well fields, power plant facilities, and transmission lines on Forest Service lands. BLM issued leases for both projects in the 1980s before it realized the extent of Native American interest in this geographic area or the historic significance ascribed to the area by Indian tribes whose traditional territory included the Highlands.

One Indian tribe and many traditional practitioners from other tribes opposed any industrial development in the Medicine Lake Highlands, fearing that the noise and increased activity in the area, and the visual intrusion of steam plumes and large transmission lines would deter traditional cultural use of the area.

In addition, traditional practitioners expressed a genuine concern that geothermal development in the area would diminish the spiritual power of the area.

Consultation to resolve the effects of the proposed developments on the Medicine Lake Area traditional cultural properties district and other historic properties, carried out pursuant to Section 106 of NHPA, represented a clash in cultural perspectives. The Federal agencies and developers saw a vast area of untapped energy resources with little observable traditional use. Traditional practitioners were hesitant to divulge the extent and locations of their religious activities. From the Native American perspective, the introduction of even one power plant would significantly alter the quiet and relative seclusion of the Highlands and open the door to unlimited industrial expansion.

Despite these disparate perspectives, consultation concluded in an agreement to deny approval of one project, located within the Medicine Lake Area TCP District, and impose strict monitoring and mitigation for the approved development. The agreement reached required the Forest Service to work in partnership with several northern California Indian tribes to develop a Historic Properties Management Program for the Medicine Lake Highlands; to assess the need to amend its land and resource management plans to better protect the traditional cultural values of the area; and to minimize auditory and visual impacts of the project on traditional use and the natural environment.

The agreement did not satisfy all parties: tribal representatives opposed to geothermal development and Calenergy, the developer for the denied project, were disappointed at this outcome, but the solution represented a good faith effort on the part of the Federal agencies to accommodate Native American concerns into their present and future land management decisions. It also demonstrates that despite an inauspicious beginning, with highly polarized views on the appropriate management of the Highlands, it is possible through consultation with the affected parties to integrate traditional Native American perspectives into management decisions affecting large land areas.

Devil's Tower, Wyoming

When Federal agencies propose to manage traditional cultural landscapes in a manner that protects traditional cultural and religious practices and beliefs, they often meet considerable resistance from recreationalists or commercial outfitters who, until recently, have enjoyed unrestricted use of an area. When a TCP is also a sacred site, agencies face even greater challenges, because of lawsuits raising the free exercise and establishment clause of the first amendment to the Constitution.

For example, at Devil's Tower National Monument, Wyoming, the interests of rock climbers clashed with the American Indian's reverence of the landform known as Devil's Tower. The first site to be declared a National Monument (under the Antiquities Act) by an American President, Devil's Tower is a property of tremendous religious and cultural value to Indian tribes that in the past inhabited northeastern Wyoming. In seeking to balance the cultural preservation needs of tribes with the legal and economic interests of Euro-American rock climbers who view the tower as a world-class site for technical climbing, the National Park Service in 1995 issued a climbing management plan calling for a moratorium on climbing during June each year, the busiest climbing month at the tower.

Despite a high success rate for voluntary compliance with the closure, NPS was sued by an organization representing commercial climbing outfitters who argued that the closure was an impermissible establishment of Indian religion by NPS.⁴⁵ Although NPS prevailed in the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals, this and other recent lawsuits have created some reluctance among Federal agencies to prohibit or restrict recreational activities to protect the ability of Native Americans to engage in religious activities at TCPs.

Hawaii and Native Hawaiian Organizations

The issues of concern to Native Hawaiians regarding Federal stewardship are very similar to those of Indian tribes and were discussed at the spring 1999 Council meeting in Honolulu, Hawaii. Council members met with Native Hawaiian representatives to learn about

Hawaiian culture and practices and how they influence cultural resource management decisions.

As illustrated over the course of the meeting, Native Hawaiians define "historic properties" and "consultation" within their own cultural context. Overall, connections between the natural, cultural, and spiritual landscape, including traditional and continuing use of historic places and resources, must be considered in Federal agency planning. In essence, there is no distinction between the natural, cultural, and spiritual aspects of a landscape that includes flora, fauna, natural features, viewsheds, and intangibles.

The challenges of managing such a landscape were also discussed by Council members, representatives from the Army, and the surrounding Native Hawaiian communities at the Makua Military Reservation (MMR). MMR encompasses Makua Valley on the Waianae coast on the island of Oahu. *Makua* means "parents," a place where the earth mother and sky father meet. Not only is the entire coastline from Makua to Kaena Point a sacred place but it was, and still is, home to many communities.

MMR is the largest training area on Oahu that supports both maneuver and live training. The Army took over the entire Makua-Kaena Point in 1941 after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, but the valley was home to limited military use since the 1920s. Intensive joint service and Army training activities including ground maneuvers, amphibious landings, naval and air bombardment, helicopter strafing, and mortar and artillery fire have been conducted at MMR for decades. Military occupation and training activities have precluded access to cultural and religious properties and caused extensive damage to historic sites.

Makua Valley stretches from a moderately high ridge line to the ocean. The valley is approximately 4,000 acres and includes caves, terraces, forests, and beaches. It embodies many of the concepts and values of Hawaiian culture both in legend and in current practices and beliefs. It also

⁴⁵ "Bear's Lodge or Devils Tower: Intercultural Relations, Legal Pluralism, and the Management of Sacred Sites on Public Lands," Lloyd Burton and David Ruppert, *Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy* Vol. 8, No. 2, 1999.

contains physical evidence of a thriving lifeway, with heiaus, platforms, walls, habitation sites, agricultural terraces, shrines, caves, and imu ovens. One of the sites, Ukanipo Heiau, is listed in the National Register.

The Army has recently implemented Integrated Training Area Management, a land management program to integrate Army training and other mission requirements for land use with sound natural resource principles, at MMR. Under this program, the Army has begun conducting revegetation projects at Makua to strengthen the environment and provide a more realistic training environment. It has also suspended training to evaluate its fire management strategies and training activities. The Army has proposed to limit the types of weapons it uses in Makua as well as prohibiting other, more destructive weapons and ammunition. The current proposal also acknowledges that Makua is a place of importance in Hawaiian history.

The Army has also taken a positive step towards involving the Native Hawaiian community in its management of Makua Valley. In 1998, the Army began a process to establish a cooperative program with the Native Hawaiian community on the Waianae Coast and the State of Hawaii (which also owns some land along the coast). The program opened Ukanipo Heiau to religious practitioners under the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and helped establish an advisory council to develop appropriate protocols, act as curators, and to make recommendations about rehabilitation and preservation for the site. The Army works cooperatively with the advisory council on other management issues such as site protection, fire prevention, and ordnance removal. The Army and the community maintain liaison positions to facilitate the cooperative program and ensure timely and effective communication.

Native Hawaiian representatives also discussed with Council members concerns regarding consultation by other Federal agencies and confidentiality of information.

The oral nature of Hawaiian culture can make it difficult for Native Hawaiians to participate fully in Federal planning and review processes that rely on written documentation and communication. Native Hawaiians may also be unwilling to share certain information with Federal officials because of prohibitions or concerns that such information may be publicly disclosed. Finally, the large number of Native Hawaiian organizations and the lack of a governmental status and structure for these organizations has been viewed by Federal agencies as a barrier to consultation.

In response, the Council members voted to write to Federal agencies to encourage them to establish liaisons with Native Hawaiian organizations to facilitate consultation. The Council subsequently received positive responses from several agencies, including the National Park Service and the Department of Agriculture, indicating that they either had liaisons in place or were willing to establish such positions. The Department of Agriculture has since created two such positions in Hawaii.

CONCLUSION

The Federal Government is already carrying out many activities under established policies and programs to meet its responsibilities for stewardship of historic resources. However, the challenges are tremendous. Unfortunately, many Federal agencies have been struggling to meet their myriad responsibilities and to balance conflicting priorities, and there has been a lack of firm leadership and funding support to reverse this trend.

While it is indeed encouraging to see that there are successful, established programs for taking care of the Nation's publicly owned historic resources and carrying out related activities, it is also daunting to see how far the Government must go to fully implement public stewardship policies and make the commitments necessary to achieve those goals.

While many of the historic resources under Federal care are well-protected, and are being managed and used for a variety of important public purposes, many are not for a variety of reasons. If we could be assured that Federal agencies were following carefully developed plans to maximize and leverage the funding and staff resources they have, engaging in proactive work to identify, protect, and preserve the genuinely important places and structures that define and preserve our national character, and consulting with the interested public about these choices in a meaningful way, we might be able to rest easier. But we have no such assurance, and the evidence to the contrary is alarming.

Many of the historic and cultural resources under Federal care—even some of the better known resources administered by the National Park Service—are being neglected or are in danger of being lost entirely through lack of funds and insufficient attention. In some cases, these resources are threatened with thoughtless development, insensitive uses, and poor management judgment. Neglect, deferred maintenance, and resulting deterioration are also taking their toll.

Based on the Council’s review of Federal stewardship of historic resources, it found:

Finding 1: There is a rich legacy of American history and culture in Federal care.

The Federal Government owns, controls, manages, or administers a substantial and significant array of historic and cultural resources that collectively make up a major portion of the Nation’s heritage. These resources include some of the most important historic properties in the Nation and are inextricably woven into the fabric of community life and experience throughout the country. They include not only historic sites and monuments in the National Park System, but also great public architecture, public works, and the evolution of America’s technological prowess, and vivid reminders of our military history, our rich prehistoric past, and the diverse cultural traditions that have contributed to modern American society.

Finding 2: Federal historic resources are valuable public assets.

The Federal Government has a vested interest in its historic resources. In addition to their historic value, these resources include major public buildings, engineering works, military installations, and other capital improvements that embody a wide range of public values. The public value of these resources is enhanced by their unique historic qualities. Moreover, federally owned historic resources should be recognized and treated as both national and local assets, not only for the part they play in the infrastructure of the Nation, but also for their role in the local community.

These public values—and the long-term investments associated with them—demand that Federal managers do their utmost to care for heritage assets. In this way, they fulfill their stewardship responsibility to the American public.

Finding 3: Many successes have been achieved and much progress has been made by Federal agencies in caring for and preserving these resources over the last 30 years, but chronic problems exist.

As recently as the 1970s, there were few formal policies or programs for protecting and managing historic resources in Federal hands, aside from the units of the National Park System. Since then, there has been considerable progress in Federal attention to the preservation and use of these resources. Today, most Federal agencies with stewardship responsibilities have historic preservation programs—at least on paper. Major departments and independent agencies have designated Federal Preservation Officers, as NHPA requires. Many have made significant progress in inventory, planning studies, and onsite preservation, interpretation, and adaptive use of historic buildings, sites, and structures.

The National Park Service has the clearest mission to protect and interpret historic resources, but some other agencies, such as the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, have made creative use of volunteer programs, limited recreation funding, and heritage

tourism opportunities to support their stewardship efforts. The military services have made good use of special program funding to experiment with collaborative and resource-based planning and maintenance initiatives.

Overall, though, most Federal agencies lack a unified strategy or implementation plan for identifying, evaluating, protecting, and managing the historic resources entrusted to their care. Historic preservation policies, procedures, and techniques vary greatly from agency to agency. Few comprehensive programs are in place that fully integrate preservation into agency missions and activities. Preservation activities are largely decentralized and left to individual managers, and often conflict with other priorities. Significant dedicated funding is virtually nonexistent, and money for preservation activities often must come from a variety of unrelated sources. Funding and other attention are not necessarily keyed to priority need or to importance of the resources, but to other factors that may be impossible to predict.

Finding 4: Funding and staffing as currently structured are inadequate to meet the needs.

Asset management problems related to funding shortfalls are growing daily. Maintenance is often deferred, and the backlog of deferred maintenance needs is increasing. In spite of this, cultural heritage program funding is not considered to be a high budget priority. For example, for the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, the two public land-managing agencies with combined responsibility for more than 460 million acres of land and significant public recreation and interpretive programs, heritage funding amounts to less than 1 percent of their respective budgets. This translates into unmet needs and backlogs in inventory, evaluation, protection, and monitoring. In areas subject to significant population pressures and public recreation needs, similar difficulties are affecting interpretation, visitor access, and safety.

Nationally, of more than two million civilian Federal employees, only about one-tenth of 1 percent are trained cultural resource professionals who have these program responsibilities as their primary duty. Perhaps another one-tenth of 1 percent of employees are occupied with

archival and museum preservation. More commonly, facilities management staff and environment protection specialists are assigned related historic resource management, planning, or review responsibilities as an “extra” duty. Often these individuals have little expertise or training for this work, and its relationship to their principal duties is poorly defined.

Finding 5: In addition to funding, adequate institutional and organizational support for historic resources is often lacking in Federal agencies.

Some agency managers try to avoid controversial decisions, or practice risk management in deciding not to comply with legal requirements. “corporate culture” and the agency perception that historic preservation is not part of the overall mission of the agency continue to be major obstacles to better stewardship by some Federal agencies. Many Federal employees are working diligently and creatively to understand and care for the historic resources entrusted to them. Too often their efforts have not been adequately recognized or supported by supervisors and agency policy. Too much good work is not institutionalized but dependent on individual staff commitment and initiative. This is laudable but neither sustainable nor transferable.

Both procedural and technical training are needed for line and management employees, along with educational efforts that raise consciousness and awareness among executives and decision makers at all levels within the responsible agencies. Historic resource professionals who have responsibilities for carrying out the agency’s historic resource stewardship mandates need to be empowered to participate more fully in resource management decisions and to provide meaningful input to budget formulation and policy discussions.

Finding 6: Public policymakers and managers need to be reminded that the Nation’s rich legacy is important and their actions can affect its stewardship.

Federal agencies need to demonstrate leadership in stewardship of historic resources by positive action and

example. Leadership from both the executive and legislative branches is critical to agency recognition and appreciation of the importance of maintaining this legacy for future generations. While many of the heritage assets under Federal care are well protected and managed and used for a variety of important public purposes, many more are not. With a few notable exceptions, individual Federal agencies have not met their responsibilities, and there is a lack of leadership and committed funding to reverse this trend.

Many of the historic and cultural resources under Federal care—even some of the better known properties administered by the National Park Service—are being neglected or are in danger of being lost entirely through lack of funds, ignorance, and inattention. In some cases, they are threatened with thoughtless development, insensitive uses, and poor management judgment. A cultivated and developed commitment to stewardship, flowing down from agency leadership, as well as going up from an agency’s field staff (where the consequences of daily operations are understood and most management decisions are made), is the essential antidote.

Finding 7: Lingering problems exist in the identification and evaluation of Federal holdings by their managers, which often lead to management difficulties.

By and large, Federal agencies do not have adequate information about the full scope, number, distribution, and condition of the historic and cultural resources they are supposed to manage. Federal holdings total more than 650 million acres of land and some three billion square feet of building space; less than 15 percent has been inventoried for historic resources. Without adequate baseline information, sound management is impossible. As a result, Federal agencies are having difficulty keeping track of their historic resource inventory, assessing, and understanding the condition of their assets, and taking corrective actions.

Federal agencies have a tendency to “warehouse,” rather than actively manage, many of the resources under their care without consideration for their historic value. In practice, this means that many agencies maintain a list of resources that might be historic, but have

never been fully evaluated for their significance. These sites and structures are kept in a suspended status that in effect keeps them in storage for some future evaluation and management treatment that may never come. In practice, many of these resources may be neglected, abandoned, and permitted to deteriorate without an explicit decision or plan for their disposition that is subject to public scrutiny and debate.

There is a clear need for Federal personnel to better collect and manage data about their resource holdings, and to be more explicit about the decisions they make that have management consequences. Federal agency managers, too, must better understand the significance and important characteristics of their historic resources and use this information to manage them more effectively. For example, Federal stewardship would benefit from an objective evaluation of the way in which Federal resource specialists and managers make judgments about the significance and relative value of historic resources. The evaluation should include a comparative study of the relative importance of historic resources throughout an agency’s holdings, as well as cooperative projects that examine similar resource types across agency boundaries. Such studies should support management plans and audits to help establish resource protection funding priorities.

Finding 8: Historic resource management is inadequately integrated with other needs.

Only a small portion of the Federal Government’s historic resources are managed primarily to preserve and interpret their historic values. The vast majority must serve the contemporary needs of Federal agency missions and programs. Federal agencies need to increase the use of historic resources to meet their respective agency missions, while maintaining those resources’ essential integrity. Most Federal agencies do not have comprehensive plans to identify and preserve the best of these resources—the places and structures that define the national character—or have established mechanisms to use key historic resources to meet their various missions.

All historic resources require consideration in planning, but they do not necessarily warrant uniform treatment

or management. Unfortunately, budget and staffing problems have led to huge backlogs in evaluations of historic resources to determine their significance and value for agency uses. Such problems are also some of the reasons for the enormous backlog in deferred maintenance, which is emerging as one of the most serious impediments to successful resource management. A further result is that Federal agencies warehouse, rather than actively manage, many of the resources under their care without consideration for their historic value.

Federal management of historic resources needs to be better supported, more proactive, and directly tied to comprehensive planning. Agencies need to operate more holistically. This is especially true when long-term facilities plans are being prepared, land-use decisions are being made that may affect historic resources, or multi-year budget needs are being identified. Federal agencies are missing important opportunities to set and operate under priorities that have been developed in consultation with other interested parties and potential public and private partners.

Finding 9: Barriers to preservation often outweigh factors that would support and encourage preservation efforts.

Few incentives exist that encourage Federal agencies to do a better job and devise more creative solutions to stewardship of historic resources. At the same time, there are impediments to preservation in some agencies' authorizing legislation, in the appropriations process, and in related policies that favor demolition, new construction, and replacement rather than repair, rehabilitation, and preventive maintenance of older structures and facilities.

For example, many existing facilities held and used by these agencies are of historic significance—some of them are of national importance—yet the process of cost-benefit analysis, employing rigid and outdated funding formulas, rental and lease-return margins, floor area ratios, and similar planning and accounting requirements takes no account of intangible values or the superior quality of historic structures, and often tips

the scales against rehabilitation and continued use. Directives to reduce building inventories and simplify property management through demolition, inactivation, abandonment, and disposal may be in direct conflict with historic resource preservation objectives.

Federal agency missions also need to be viewed more broadly by managers as they relate to public trust and stewardship needs, if these and similar obstacles are to be overcome. Performance incentives should be identified that will help Federal managers incorporate historic preservation into their work when it is called for. Historic and cultural values need to be addressed more fairly and openly in stewardship decisions, so they can be fully weighed in facilities development and land use decisions.

Finding 10: Existing laws are generally adequate, but their implementation and the accountability under them could be improved substantially.

The legal framework for Federal stewardship of historic resources is comprehensive, and there are numerous statutes addressing Government-wide responsibilities, as well as targeted agency resource management. Periodic oversight occurs through the appropriations process or congressional program reauthorization, supplemented by General Accounting Office studies. Most of these mandates, however, are self-policing. There is little accountability and few incentives through established performance standards, regular program monitoring, or reporting for meeting the requirements.

Currently, few Federal strategic plans and annual reports developed to comply with the Government Performance and Results Act specifically acknowledge historic resources, much less offer direction to their employees on their responsibilities for these holdings. Most do not set specific performance goals or measures that relate to legal stewardship mandates. Those that do, provide scant mention of stewardship requirements focused on heritage.

Until recently, accountability reports required under the Chief Financial Officers Act and other related financial management laws also paid little attention to this issue.

However, in 1996 guidance was developed by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) for agencies to begin reporting on their heritage assets. This assets reporting, including listing of significant natural and cultural resources under agency administration, was intended to ensure that agencies assemble information on such assets, reveal and consider the management costs and liabilities associated with them, and characterize deferred maintenance needs.

Early reports intended to comply with these standards have been seriously deficient and poorly documented by the agencies' own standards as well as those of the FASAB. Considerable more work is needed to develop accurate baseline information in the future.

Finding 11: Federal agencies need to improve their understanding of the views of public and private parties who have particular interests in historic resource preservation and use.

Federal agencies need to expand—and focus—efforts to consult with concerned parties when deciding what resources are important, to whom they matter, and how they should be managed. This is particularly true when it comes to representatives of the communities in which resources are located. Public disclosure and consultation is required by law when agencies are considering various undertakings, but many agency managers view these requirements as time-consuming hindrances rather than opportunities for creative problem solving. While Federal agencies must consult with a wide range of stakeholders when they make major land use or property management decisions, a number of agencies could make major improvements in the way in which they identify stakeholders and seek their views in planning and decision making.

Understanding requires effective communication. Agencies need to develop mechanisms to better inform and engage communities and business groups, such as those involved with heritage tourism, in decisions about resource protection and access. They also need to develop better means for addressing the concerns and interests of groups who have a special affinity with particular historic resources, such as Indian tribes and other Native Americans.

Finding 12: More emphasis on effective collaboration and partnership could help achieve common goals.

Federal agencies need to enter into more public-private partnerships to leverage resources for promotion, protection, and enhancement of historic values. “Partnership” has become a popular term, but Federal agencies are not adequately exploiting the potential for partnerships with the private sector to preserve and use historic resources, often because of legal or administrative impediments. Some laws and policies that are intended to restrict questionable lobbying activities or potential conflicts of interest for Federal employees have the unintended effect of limiting the nature and extent of partnerships with the private sector.

Moreover, the most successful current partnerships and related agency program initiatives are neither well known nor widely emulated throughout the Federal Government. This is due in part to lack of staff and funding for proactive program planning, but may also be attributed to poor information sharing and pooling of resources among Federal agencies or Federal, State, and local government organizations with similar missions.

FIGURE 7

**MAJOR FEDERAL STEWARDSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES:
DID YOU KNOW...?**

- Four Federal departments (Agriculture, Defense, Energy, and Interior) manage more than 665 million acres of public land, nearly 30 percent of the United States.
- Federal agencies own nearly three billion square feet of building space nationwide in more than 425,000 buildings, with the Defense Department owning the most, followed by GSA-administered Federal buildings, Postal Service facilities, veterans centers, and other holdings.
- Federal agencies own or control land and buildings in 1,419 historic districts out of approximately 10,000 districts that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
- Aside from historic districts, Federal agencies nationwide own or control 3,185 historic properties containing 7,804 individual contributing buildings, sites, structures, and objects, out of approximately 61,000 non-district listings in the National Register of Historic Places.
- Federal agencies are entrusted with more than 200 buildings, sites, structures, and objects that have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as National Historic Landmarks, out of 2,231 listings.
- Federal agencies have inventoried about 750,000 archeological sites on public lands, but more than 85 percent of Federal and tribal lands remain unsurveyed.
- Each year, nearly 100,000 Federal and federally assisted construction projects and other actions are reviewed nationally for their possible impact on important historic resources as part of the planning and decision process.
- The National Park Service and the Smithsonian Institution together hold more than 175 million historic and cultural objects and scientific specimens, and other Federal agencies also have large and diverse artifact and museum collections.
- The National Archives and Records Administration's 33 public records facilities hold about 21.5 million cubic feet of original textual materials—more than four billion documents, maps, charts, and architectural drawings—as well as nearly 14 million still pictures and posters, more than nine million aerial photographs, 300,000 reels of motion picture film, 200,000 sound and video recordings, and 7,600 computer data sets. Other Federal agencies also have significant historic archival holdings.
- Federal preservation programs and activities account for less than 1 percent of Federal budgets, and full-time professional historic resource personnel make up just over 0.1 percent—about 2,000 professionals—of the total Federal workforce of approximately two million employees.

A large part of the Nation's heritage is in Federal hands, but the Government does not always meet its basic public stewardship responsibilities to that heritage. Section 110 of NHPA directs Federal agencies to "assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties which are owned or controlled by such agency," and to establish and carry out preservation programs to meet the purposes of the law.

During its two-year study, the Council drew a number of conclusions from our observations on Federal stewardship and how well Federal agencies meet their responsibilities. We have identified a number of general needs, and have concluded that change is warranted in several specific areas that are essential to better Federal stewardship. These areas fall under three broad themes: Leadership, Commitment, and Accountability.

The Council also believes there are certain key ingredients to achieving success in this complex endeavor, and there are some good current programs and practices that could serve as useful agency and government-wide models. Enhanced collaboration and partnership, among Federal agencies as well as between Federal and non-Federal parties, is one important implementation strategy that needs special attention.

LEADERSHIP: BUILDING A HISTORIC RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP ETHIC

Appropriate leadership is critical. Leadership in historic resource stewardship has many facets. An atmosphere that can support a national and Government-wide preservation ethic must be established, and basic principles and policy direction laid down. If stewardship of historic resources is to be successful and realize its true potential, it is important that everyone in the Federal Government who is in a planning, decision making, or implementation position understands the importance of the issues, and that stewardship has been determined to be a national priority that has an accompanying commitment from the top.

A vision for the value of the Nation's heritage needs to be shared with both Federal employees and the American people, and the potential benefits associated with the

protection and enhancement of this heritage made clear to all. The case must be presented publicly, capitalizing on startling images and symbols to drive home the message that this is important. Not only must policies be articulated, but some assurance must be given that the means to carry out the policies must be actively sought and secured.

But other requirements also come into play. Leadership involves offering successful examples and ideas, offering encouragement, and finding and providing material support. It also involves incentives for potentially competing interests to work together in creative ways, and to promote solutions to common problems through partnerships among diverse parties.

Leadership Needs

Leadership Need 1: Emphasize the importance of heritage as a national priority.

Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966, it has been the official policy of the Federal Government to exercise leadership in historic preservation. To meet that mandate, framed by Congress and approved by the President, it is imperative first, that the branches of Government explicitly recognize, support, and encourage preservation as a national priority, and second, that each agency of the executive branch have the internal capability to conduct its actions in a manner that promotes the protection and enhancement of historic values while it also avoids unnecessary harm to historic resources.

The First Lady, the White House Millennium Council, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service have demonstrated leadership with the creation and promotion of "Save America's Treasures" (see Appendix 3). Awards programs, such as the Department of Defense cultural resource awards, the Design Awards administered by the General Services Administration and the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Department of Transportation environmental awards, offer positive incentives to employees and others. When the National Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior decided to go forward with the National Park Service's well-publicized demolition of the

Gettysburg National Battlefield Tower during summer 2000, it captured media and public attention.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation also dramatizes the importance of heritage successfully with its “Eleven Most Endangered List,” announced each year. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has no mechanism similar to the Trust list. A clear and firm message is needed from the highest levels of Government that promotes the protection and enhancement of the Nation’s historic resources as a national priority.

Leadership Need 2: Make it clear that stewardship is a part of every agency's mission.

Many agencies acknowledge the difficulties of integrating historic preservation into their missions if they are not explicitly directed to do so in authorizing or enabling legislation. They also acknowledge that it is difficult to overcome the existing corporate culture and attitudes about the relative importance of historic and cultural stewardship.

Some agencies have detailed internal guidance, even beyond obvious procedural compliance matters involving Section 106 of NHPA or other legal mandates. However, much of the existing direction contains deficiencies long-recognized by agency specialists and others. Some of it is outdated, incomplete, or misdirected in relation to current concerns and problems. Much of it is impractical as guidance for direct field resource management use. Some of the technical guidance is not widely available or accessible, and for practical (often budgetary) reasons, it has not been disseminated through the most efficient and effective means, such as through electronic media.

Existing internal procedures may be inconsistent with current agency organization, planning and decision-making steps, policies, programs, or budgeting. Different agencies with similar missions and resource holdings may still have widely differing policies, standards, and guidance on common resource concerns or issues. The bulk of many agencies’ internal operating manuals and policy guidance may have been developed as much as 15 or 20 years ago, and in many cases pre-date the 1992 amendments to NHPA.

The few agencies that have relatively large staffs of historic preservation professionals and a large and diverse portfolio of historic resource assets often bear an internal agency “culture” problem that may hamper agency efforts to successfully integrate Section 110 historic resource management needs into other activities of the agency. Ingrained attitudes about mission priorities or agency operating practices may be difficult to modify. Unless this problem is addressed, through better educational programs and more effective performance measures developed by the agencies internally, efforts to integrate historic preservation activities into the policies, procedures, and operations of many agencies will be superficial and ineffectual over the long run.

Leadership Need 3: Promote a vision for successful stewardship and lead by example.

A number of agencies have been developing vision statements and goals for their heritage stewardship programs in recent years. In 1999 and 2000 the General Services Administration, the National Park Service, and the Forest Service have each gone through this process and developed priorities for policy and budgetary implementation. Other agencies, such as the Department of Energy, have begun similar efforts. The Department of Defense, in having to respond to such a vision developed externally rather than internally (for example, through legislation establishing the Legacy Resource Management Program), has embraced and begun to internalize much of this vision.

Such visions are important first steps to implementation. However, in order to have some effect on agency behavior and practice, they require detailed follow-through and nurturing, and must be supported and sustained over the long term. Adequate funding and staffing support are critical. It remains to be seen whether many of these agency visions can be successfully internalized and gain staying power and usefulness beyond their initial promotion.

Leadership Need 4: Facilitate historic resource stewardship through both direct and indirect means.

Federal agencies have both direct and indirect tools at their disposal for accomplishing good stewardship. On the one hand, they need to actively solicit and take

advantage of opportunities to cooperate with non-Federal parties as well as other Federal agencies who may have complementary preservation goals. On the other hand, they need to appreciate their power to persuade and encourage others by positive example and by the leveraging of financial and other resources.

Where federally owned historic resources contribute significantly to the fabric, character, and social and economic viability of local communities, or where poor stewardship would have serious consequences for localities or regions, the demonstration of Federal leadership in preservation becomes even more critical. Many important historic resources under Federal ownership or control are important local landmarks or offer unique opportunities to become centerpieces for community revitalization plans. Debates about the fate of closed or downsized military installations, unneeded post offices, energy facilities, and other potentially valuable historic assets must consider all of their special values and the educational, inspirational, and economic opportunities they represent.

Leadership Need 5: Engage and educate the public about heritage values.

The responsibility to be stewards of our collective heritage can, and should, include educating the public about the historic resources on the public lands or in Federal property holdings.

The National Park Service is in the forefront of these efforts, because of its particular mission to “preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations.”⁴⁶ NPS uses many programs and approaches to carry out this charge. However, the responsibility and opportunities for meeting these needs do not stop with NPS.

For example, “Intrigue of the Past” is a program that was developed and supported by the Bureau of Land Management that attempts to engage the public, in particular young people, about their cultural heritage through

participatory archeology and other related activities. The program has been suffering from a lack of funding support, but could play a valuable role in enhancing public education about our heritage. BLM has also developed a publication highlighting many of its most significant areas for public visitation and recreation use, in part to help celebrate and recognize its 50th anniversary in 1996.⁴⁷ The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is contemplating similar public outreach and other projects for its centennial observance in 2003.

At many historic Federal buildings and courthouses, the General Services Administration’s “First Impressions” initiative is highlighting and promoting some of its premier public buildings through public brochures and other materials that point out key historic features of courthouse and Federal building public spaces. There is great public interest and potential support for public tours and onsite interpretation of historic resources at military installations, within national laboratories, and at other Federal holdings throughout the country. Educational programs directed at K-12 education enhancement, or in conjunction with scouting and other youth organizations, present numerous opportunities to Federal agencies if developed and carried out with appropriate public and private sector institutions, organizations, and businesses.

Recommendations

The Federal Government must emphasize its role in protecting and preserving the Nation’s heritage, and seek and advocate historic resource stewardship in partnership with non-Federal parties. Periodic reminders from the President, the Cabinet, and agency leadership, as well as from Congress, would help to reinforce and emphasize the importance of historic resource stewardship throughout the Federal establishment. A significant component of such a message could be a directive to executive branch agencies to take the lead in caring for the resources under their stewardship and demonstrating the value of these resources as important assets for a variety of public benefits.

Leadership Recommendation 1: The President should clarify the executive branch’s leadership role in promoting historic values and preserving historic

⁴⁶ *NPS Cultural Resources Strategic Plan*, National Leadership Council, National Park Service, 1997.

⁴⁷ *Beyond the National Parks: A Recreation Guide to Public Lands in the West*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, 1998.

resources, and direct the highest levels of the Federal Government to make a sustained commitment to history and historic preservation.

The President should direct his Cabinet and other executive branch agencies to carry out their stewardship responsibilities in a more effective and consistent manner. Such a directive would ensure better implementation of existing mandates and improved accountability by:

- Clarifying and emphasizing the Federal Government’s leadership role in promoting historic values and the preservation of historic resources.
- Providing a sound basis for planning, budget formulation, and decision making by directing Federal agency heads to establish the state of the Nation’s historic resources by assembling baseline information and ongoing assessments of the number and condition of important historic resources under Federal ownership and control.
- Ensuring better management accountability through integration of historic preservation program responsibilities into agency regulations, management policies, and operating procedures, and designation of a senior agency official with oversight responsibility for historic preservation activities.
- Promoting intergovernmental cooperation and partnerships, especially with State and local governments, Indian tribes, and Native Hawaiian organizations as well as the private sector, and fostering private initiative and investment in the preservation and use of historic resources.
- Mandating policies and guidance that give preference to historic resources in management decisions, including allowances for a public interest “intangible values” component in cost-benefit analyses and other fiduciary decisions.

- Providing a means for private contributions to be used for the preservation and enhancement of Federally owned or controlled historic resources.
- Directing the development of a focused training program responsive to basic Federal stewardship needs and the responsibilities of Federal managers and policy makers.

Leadership Recommendation 2: Congress should commission an independent policy study on the public costs and benefits of preserving historic resources that could be used to help set future legislative priorities.

Such a study would offer an objective analysis that could be used as a basis for legislative changes in such areas as public resource management, tax policy, public infrastructure modernization, and Federal appropriations. The National Research Council or a similar, publicly chartered institution should be so charged.

Leadership Recommendation 3: Congress should provide funding for the National Trust for Historic Preservation to pursue partnerships with Federal agencies in order to enhance stewardship of his - toric resources, especially through public outreach.

The National Trust should provide assistance with promotional publications, public educational activities, an electronic clearinghouse for potential private partners, and similar efforts in keeping with its congressional charter.

Leadership Recommendation 4: The National Park Service, the Council, and Federal agencies should cooperatively develop and maintain more effective training for agency personnel at all organizational and program levels. These programs should include government-wide historic preservation awareness training for policy-level officials keyed to stewardship performance.

NPS should seek sufficient funding and other continuing support for its Federal Preservation Institute initiative, established at the National Center for Preservation

Technology and Training in September 2000. A cooperative endeavor among NPS, the Council, several major cabinet departments, Northwestern State University of Louisiana, and other organizations, academic institutions, and governments, the institute can form the nucleus for senior executive training, inter-agency educational cooperation, and information sharing.

COMMITMENT: TAKING CARE OF THE NATION'S HISTORIC PUBLIC ASSETS

In association with leadership actions, a clear commitment needs to be made to follow through in caring for the Nation's historic public assets. Individual Federal agencies and their leaders and other key decision makers must understand and appreciate the value and management potential of the historic resources for which they are responsible. Sufficient financial and personnel resources must be found and sustained to carry out the job. Agencies must ensure that appropriate resource management priorities are set that are consistent with national policy objectives and leadership direction. Management practices must be developed and carried out that integrate preservation goals with specific mission needs.

Commitment means thinking strategically, knowing the inventory of historic resources as well as its significance and value to meet public needs, and being able to set responsible priorities for dealing with those holdings. Planning and resource management activities must be integrated and responsive to the varied and extensive needs of modern land and property management, and ways must be found to maintain, manage, and use assets wisely while making informed decisions about them. Ability to make such decisions, with an appropriate level of input from affected and interested stakeholders and other affected or interested parties, assumes an adequate level of information and analysis. Mission objectives and other needs must be balanced effectively and responsibly.

It is clear, however, that as we enter the 21st century, we have not truly accepted, or even acknowledged, the responsibility entrusted to us. We have not given the men

and women chosen to be the caretakers, promoters, and advocates of the Government's historic resources the right tools or sufficient resources to do the job we ostensibly are asking them to do. We have also not done our best to retain talented individuals, and ensure that their talents and knowledge are passed on to others and succeeding generations of public servants.

Commitment Needs

Commitment Need 1: Provide adequate funding and personnel.

All agencies are desperately short of funding and staff to meet their basic obligations. To do anything beyond the absolute minimum is even more problematic.

In many agencies, the lack of dedicated budgets for preservation activities is endemic. Agency historic resource management personnel must make do with limited support from operations and maintenance accounts, facility management accounts, or environmental protection and remediation funding. Often, such personnel are forced to compete for funds with costly environmental cleanup activities, such as decontamination, asbestos removal, and lead paint abatement. They also compete against maintenance activities that include grass cutting, snowplowing, and road resurfacing.

As outlined in a recent report on stewardship of Federal facilities:

Inadequate funding for maintenance and repair programs in the federal government is a long-standing problem. Plans and programs for maintenance have received little support from executive or legislative decision makers for several reasons. First, there is a tacit assumption that maintenance can always be put off for a month, a year, or even five years in favor of current operations and more visible projects with seemingly higher payoffs. Second, managers of federal agencies have generally failed to convince the public or political decision makers that funds invested in preventive and timely maintenance will be cost effective, will protect the quality and functionality of facilities,

and will protect the taxpayers' investment. Thus, decision makers, who tend to have short-term outlooks, have not often been swayed to support actions with results that are realized over the long term.⁴⁸

Very limited funds are available for land use planning, including identification and evaluation of historic resources on agency-controlled lands. Often these activities must rely on construction projects or redevelopment schemes, and are assigned a small percentage of this money.

Most agencies and historic resource staff try to meet their funding, staffing, and other program needs through a variety of mechanisms, including begging and borrowing from other agency programs, or by entering into cooperative agreements where possible and collaborating with other programs, Federal agencies, or non-Federal parties.

Since NHPA was amended in 1992, some agencies have done a better job than others in creatively using and focusing the financial and other resources at their disposal, and a few (notably the Department of Defense) have had congressional support for "fenced" conservation and preservation funding.⁴⁹ So what is the solution to this and other aspects of the situation?

One approach would be to dedicate funding and make it available on a matching, competitive basis for award to Federal agencies with significant resources that have demonstrated serious threats, like the current Save America's Treasures fund. Save America's Treasures has provided critical dollars that are targeted or "fenced" for preservation work. It is also an excellent example of a public-private partnership. To date, \$60 million in Federal funds has been made available, which has helped to leverage \$37 million in private funds. Historic resources owned or controlled by a wide range of Federal agencies have benefitted.

A second approach would be to increase funding overall for agency historic resource stewardship and related activities, based in part on agency holdings,

responsibilities, and internal and external threats to resources. Beginning in FY 1991, a very successful program in the Department of Defense known as Legacy was established under the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. Legacy is another major program involving "fenced" funds, and has enjoyed, and continues to enjoy, bipartisan support and the support of both the Bush and Clinton administrations. Begun at an appropriation level of \$10 million (including both natural and cultural resources), the program reached a high of \$50 million in the three consecutive years of FY 93-95. It is currently funded at \$15 million, of which just over \$14 million had been released by early September 2000, and \$12 million was requested for FY 2001 (appropriations pending). In the past four fiscal years alone, DoD has received \$45 million, with probably about 40 percent of that amount being spent on historic resource concerns and 60 percent on natural resources.

A third approach would be to use a combination of dedicated funding, reapportionment of existing agency budgets, and other revenue-generating techniques such as private user fees or commercial concessions contracts. Perhaps the most far-reaching and ambitious targeted funding at the present time is the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program, which was authorized by Congress in 1996 by the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions Act (later amended and extended). The program has now been authorized through FY 2001 by the FY 1999 Interior appropriations bill. Four agencies—the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Forest Service—were authorized to retain 100 percent of funds collected at selected sites in the form of entrance and user fees, with 80 percent of those funds to be retained onsite and used for improving visitor facilities, protecting resources, and administering the program. Results to date have been extremely successful. Surveys of public visitors and the local land managers have found that both are supportive of this approach, as long as the fees are used for onsite needs rather than being collected and returned to the General Treasury.

⁴⁸ *Stewardship of Federal Facilities: A Proactive Strategy for Managing the Nation's Public Assets*, National Research Council, 1998, p. vi.

⁴⁹ This includes, for example, DoD's Legacy Resource Management Program, passed in 1991 as part of the Defense Authorization Act.

Resources like prominent National Park lodges have benefitted from concession contracts that have required creation of Capital Improvement and Cyclic Maintenance accounts. In some cases, 20 percent of gross revenues have been dedicated to such investments, 10 percent each for capital improvement and regular, continuing maintenance.

Other possibilities to improve funding in general for Federal stewardship include revolving funds, trust accounts, and public bonds.⁵⁰

Commitment Need 2: Ensure adequate expertise, training, and retention of a professional work force.

Training and incentives to retain an experienced and professional work force need to be developed. The retention problem for experienced preservation personnel is acute, and widespread downsizing, hiring freezes, and the lure of the private sector are contributing to this. In GSA, for example, asset managers are attracted to the private sector for both economic and other reasons. Experienced individuals who understand the complexities of Federal policy and operations (including public sector funding constraints) are enticed to leave, and training is needed on a continual basis that can never quite keep up with the Federal workforce turnover.

In the Department of Defense, the Civil Engineers Corps Officers (CECOS) naval school offers courses in compliance with historic preservation laws that are open to staff of all the services and the U.S. Coast Guard. These courses have been offered consistently over the past several years and have been integrated into the CECOS curriculum.

More recently, the National Park Service has announced the establishment of the Federal Preservation Institute at the National Center for Preservation Technology and

Training in Natchitoches, Louisiana. The intention is to increase training opportunities for Federal agency personnel responsible for stewardship of historic resources. In cooperation with other Federal agencies and the preservation community, the institute will coordinate education and training for policy makers as well as other Federal employees whose decisions affect the preservation of the Nation's heritage assets.

The goals of the institute are "to be a national leader in preservation training, to provide all Federal employees with the skills needed to carry out the National Historic Preservation Act and related laws, and to instill a stewardship ethic throughout the Federal workforce." The institute is organizing its activities into four principal areas: a stewardship awareness program aimed at senior Federal executives; a preservation training clearinghouse on the Internet; a program of special subject, targeted training seminars on a variety of technical, legal, and policy-related topics; and establishment of training and certification standards.

The institute is working closely with Northwestern State University of Louisiana, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and representatives from Federal agencies. Funding and other organizational support is needed to fully realize and continue this effort. Other programs, and a new look at more effective ways to develop and retain experienced and credentialed staff to meet Federal stewardship responsibilities, need to be explored in depth.

Commitment Need 3: Establish adequate knowledge of the historic resources that agencies manage.

Responsible stewardship and associated decisions must rely on available information on resources held by agencies: their significance, condition, management status, and potential for agency or other use. Unfortunately agencies

⁵⁰ The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for 2001 (P.L. 106-291) recently increased funding for stewardship and related programs in several of the Interior bureaus and the Forest Service, although much of this funding is committed to general land management activities, payments to local governments in lieu of taxes, or infrastructure improvement and repair on resources that are not heritage assets. Earlier efforts to boost funding support through passage of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act were not successful. However, money is provided to continue the Save America's Treasures initiative, and to increase funds for BLM land use planning, NPS condition assessments, historic trails, and battlefield protection, and other support directly related to historic resource stewardship. Title VIII of the law creates a six-year Land Conservation, Preservation, and Infrastructure Improvement program within the budget; "this action recognizes land conservation and related activities as critical National priorities and provides a mechanism to guarantee significantly increased funding for critical land acquisition and other land protection programs. [However], the program is not mandatory and does not guarantee annual appropriations" (*Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee Conference*, H.R. 4578, House Rep. 106-914, September 29, 2000).

are often working with incomplete, outdated, or otherwise inadequate data about their resource holdings. The National Park Service has estimated that with a concerted effort it may be able to catch up with simple cataloging of its museum collections in another 20 years.⁵¹

Part of the problem seems to be time and money; part of the problem is one of perception. When asked about the number and condition of its heritage assets and deferred maintenance needs for historic resources, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service responded that it might be able to answer that question if given 10 years to do so.⁵² The National Aeronautics and Space Administration noted that its heritage assets amounted to 20 buildings and structures, 103 “air and space displays and artifacts,” and six miscellaneous items, but apparently overlooked not only other prehistoric and historic resources on its lands, but also the active and historic launch facilities that it operates at the Kennedy Space Center in Florida that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district.⁵³

The Federal Preservation Officer for the Department of Veterans Affairs has recently completed revisions to the agency’s database of historic resources. This and similar examples should be promoted, and information about the cost and time to develop such information should be made available to other Federal agencies. In decentralized agencies, mechanisms for summarizing existing information for headquarters and other use—similar to the historic resources publication produced by the Department of the Navy on its holdings—could be pursued cost-effectively in a variety of ways.

Both short-term and long-term means should be pursued for supporting and improving upon this track record and offering incentives to improve databases and evaluations.

Commitment Need 4: Set appropriate stewardship priorities within Federal agencies.

Many property managers, such as the General Services Administration, are encouraged by Congress, their Chief

Financial Officers, and the Office of Management and Budget to adopt a businesslike approach to managing the properties under their jurisdiction and control. This is difficult to dispute as a general policy. However, business portfolio management needs to be able to recognize the broader public interest and intangible public values being served and supported by Government agencies. The characterization of historic resources as “assets” should not lose sight of the fact that monetary value must be balanced with community value and meaning to the national patrimony.

For example, the U.S. Postal Service may not think that a particular building fits in with its “asset portfolio” priorities, but this view may be at odds with community views of what is a local landmark and should be preserved. Too often business practices have offered insufficient provisions for these intangible values, which cannot be laid out on a spread sheet or figured simply into market return. Such values need to be included in the equation.

Commitment Need 5: Integrate historic resource management with other activities and mission requirements.

Most Federal agencies lack a unified strategy or implementation plan for identifying, evaluating, protecting, and managing the historic resources entrusted to their care. Preservation activities are largely decentralized and left to individual land, property, and program managers; this approach has both strengths and weaknesses. However, significant funding is in short supply, and money for preservation activities often must come from a variety of sources only indirectly related to historic resource stewardship.

The Sierra Nevada National Forest Framework for Archeological Resource Management is a good example of an agency establishing a way to determine relative importance of historic resources (principally archeology) and establish priorities for preservation, conservation, or release from special management constraints. On a

⁵¹ *Accountability Report*, National Park Service, FY 1997.

⁵² *Annual Report*, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1997.

⁵³ *Accountability Report*, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1998.

broader, agency-wide basis, the Army is promoting the development of Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans for each of its installations that are intended to take an account of maintenance and repair needs, demolition, training activity impacts, and other concerns, and establish standard operating procedures as well as funding and decision priorities.

There is an intrinsic value of Federal properties, and the Federal Government presence in the local community—i.e., the post office, courthouse, lease, forest, national park unit—represents the “face” of the Federal government in that locale. The General Services Administration’s Design Excellence Program is a good example of this sort of creative thinking. Its essence is the assumption that if a local community is going to have only one Federal building or courthouse, that property should be a source of community pride and support rather than an object for derision as in some previous Federal building projects.

The theme of Federal agencies acting as “good neighbors” must be taken seriously by executives and managers. Agencies need to actively work with the communities in which they are housed. One of the most frequent complaints the Council hears about Federal agencies is that they are housed “over there” and do not interact with the local community. In Butte, Montana, for example, the rather significant Federal presence had no representation on the local Chamber of Commerce. The Federal Government had little interaction with the community until it had nearly decided to move to other quarters. The proposed move galvanized the community, and relations improved.

Given the increased importance of security issues, particularly since the Oklahoma City Federal building bombing several years ago, the Federal presence can seem like an armed camp that is hostile to the local community. When a local Federal agency cannot get funding to fix the roof and the building is deteriorating, community activists and local government officials may not be aware of the situation. More effective communication, and active cooperation between Federal managers and local governments as well as other interested organizations, could be of great assistance in garnering public support for stewardship.

Recommendations

The Federal Government must provide consistent, reliable, and adequate funding to meet its stewardship responsibilities. It should also provide dedicated funds for historic resource stewardship, while removing obstacles to cost-effective care and use of resources.

Commitment Recommendation 1: The Administration and Congress should work together to improve Federal funding levels, based on performance and needs in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act.

- Special multi-year funding for specific agencies that is earmarked for historic preservation activities (similar to the Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program) should be considered.
- The Administration and Congress should work together to expand and permanently authorize a Recreation and Conservation Fee program, based on the current Recreation Fee Demonstration program authorized by Section 315 of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions Act of 1996 and amended under P.L. 104-134. Currently authorized fee collection agencies (National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management) should be expanded to include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.
- The Administration and Congress should work together to continue to fund the Save America’s Treasures grants program at a responsible level.
- The Administration and Congress should consider adding a provision to the Historic Preservation Fund or a similar authority that sets aside a small amount of funding for grants of less than \$50,000 on a 75/25 matching basis to be used for project or program seed money, resource condition assessments, feasibility studies, and emergency resource stabilization and protection. Such funds are basic to successful stewardship of historic resources, but often

difficult to segregate for these uses within existing agency budget priorities.

- The National Park Service should develop and maintain an information base that is accessible to other Federal agencies and the public on National Park System concessions and concessioner agreements. NPS should share its experience in working with concessioners to establish capital improvement and cyclic maintenance account set-asides, as well as other mechanisms for rehabilitation, restoration, and maintenance of historic resources.

Commitment Recommendation 2: Congress should amend Section 111 of NHPA to permit Federal agencies to continue to use historic properties or portions of historic properties that are leased or exchanged with non-Federal parties, through lease-back arrangements or other mechanisms.

- Agencies should be authorized to carry over proceeds from leasing under Section 111 if necessary in order to expend them on related preservation projects and activities.
- Congress should enact an amendment to the Department of Defense’s leasing authorities under 10 USC 2667 that is similar to the amendment recommended for Section 111 of NHPA. Both the House and Senate versions of the FY 2001 Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 4205) have variants on language that would authorize DoD to lease properties that are not excess to its needs. This legislation should be passed, with the language amended to explicitly include mention of historic resources.

Commitment Recommendation 3: Federal agencies should identify and remove accounting barriers and other administrative impediments within their control to the use and leasing of historic resources in accordance with Sections 110(a)(1) and 111 of NHPA.

Federal agencies should work with the National Park Service, the General Services Administration, and the

Council, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, to overcome apparent policy impediments to effective outleasing and other use of historic resources where the National Historic Preservation Act authorities appear to conflict with other management practice.

ACCOUNTABILITY: MAKING PRESERVATION DECISIONS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Federal agencies need to be accountable for their decisions related to stewardship of historic resources, and be able to demonstrate that those decisions are in the public interest. At the same time, accountability can be used as a tool—an “action forcing device”—to ensure that the process of management and the act of decision making includes adequate information, sufficient public involvement, and appreciation and understanding of the consequences of agency actions.

Agencies with resource management responsibilities are regularly exhorted to operate in a businesslike manner and be publicly accountable. That should mean more than justifying stewardship activities and results in profit-loss terms, although such justification is obviously important. It should also mean that the agency’s activities are well-informed, responsible, appropriate, and generally cost-effective. Unlike commercial enterprises, the Federal Government sets other policies and goals to advance the public interest, and these public interest considerations need to explicitly provide for an adequate accounting of how the Nation’s heritage is being protected and enhanced for present and future generations.

Accountability Needs

Accountability Need 1: Set appropriate goals, monitor performance, measure success, and open decisions to public scrutiny.

As articulated in a recent report on stewardship of Federal facilities (not just historic ones) by the National Research Council:

The ownership of real property entails an investment in the present and a commitment to the future. Ownership of facilities by the federal government, or any other entity, represents an obligation that requires not only money to carry out that ownership responsibly, but also the vision, resolve, experience, and expertise to ensure that resources are allocated effectively to sustain that investment. Recognition and acceptance of this obligation is the essence of stewardship. Yet, despite the millions of stakeholders and expenditure of hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars in federal facilities, we have not been good stewards of our public buildings. The continuing deterioration of federal facilities is apparent to the most casual observer and has been documented by numerous studies. Still, little has been done to check the decline, and few people in government are willing to accept responsibility for it.⁵⁴

The Government Performance and Results Act requires not only agency strategic plans for periods of six years (currently through 2003), but also annual performance plans that link budgets to achievement of strategic goals. Periodic audits and reports from Chief Financial Officers, as required by the Chief Financial Officers Act, and agency Inspectors General may also be of assistance in monitoring progress or needed adjustments.

Unfortunately, specific direction on carrying out national preservation policies and orders in these accounting and reporting tools is often non-binding or completely lacking, and the protection and enhancement of historic resources remains at a distinct disadvantage in relation to other national priorities or agency missions. Many provisions have never been fully implemented, and are not likely to be anytime soon. Despite the Government Performance and Results Act and other management and financial accounting reforms, there remains a lack of accountability. Few Federal agency mission statements, strategic plans, performance standards, and accounting systems specifically acknowledge or offer direction to their employees on their responsibilities for historic resources. Most do not set specific performance goals or measures that relate to stewardship mandates, and they should.

⁵⁴ *Stewardship of Federal Facilities*, National Research Council, National Academy Press, 1998.

Accountability Need 2: Ensure financial accountability and legal compliance.

Some agencies, such as the military services of the Department of Defense, conduct periodic Environmental Compliance Audits to identify problems and establish priorities for corrective action. Each DoD service has an environmental audit system: The Army has the Environmental Compliance Assessment System; the Air Force, the Environmental Compliance Assessment Management Program; the Navy, the Environmental Quality Assessment. These systems provide for both internal auditing by installation personnel and external auditing by superior commands. Although originally designed to track RCRA and CERCLA compliance, all the systems now also look at cultural resource management. The systems are designed to flag and lead to the correction of deficiencies.

Under the Chief Financial Officers Act, Federal agencies were to begin reporting their “heritage assets” and deferred maintenance needs beginning with the FY 1998 reporting period. The Federal Accounting Standards Advisory board, established in 1990 by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Comptroller General, issues various Federal Financial Accounting Standards for use by agencies in their financial reporting. Standard 8, which deals with Supplementary Stewardship Reporting, was published and disseminated in July 1996. Amendments were issued or proposed in 1999 to offer additional guidance on stewardship reporting and on accounting standards for heritage assets with multiple Government uses.

Accountability Need 3: Balance potential conflicts over resource protection and use, with due consideration for the views of community leaders, stakeholders, and the public.

There are impediments to preservation in some agencies’ authorizing legislation, appropriations, and policies that favor demolition, new construction, and replacement rather than repair, rehabilitation, and preventive maintenance of older structures and facilities. Many existing

facilities held and used by these agencies are of historic significance, some of national importance, yet funding allocation formulae are often not sympathetic to historic rehabilitation opportunities or needs.

Recommendations

The Federal Government must improve its accountability for historic resource stewardship and fully integrate historic resource management concerns with other priorities.

Accountability Recommendation 1: The President should direct Federal agencies to document and report regularly on the condition of important historic resources under their control as a basis for responsible planning, budgeting, and decision making.

- The President should direct agencies to report annually to the Council and the National Park Service with a listing of their 10 most-endangered historic resources, for inclusion in the Council's annual report, beginning at the end of FY 2001.
- Congress should provide funding to NPS for the quadrennial review of significant threats to properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, as called for in NHPA, Section 101(a)(8).

Accountability Recommendation 2: The President should direct Federal agencies to enhance the organizational placement and role of the Federal Preservation Officer (established under Section 110(c) of NHPA) to ensure that each agency has an effective focal point for preservation activities.

The Federal Preservation Officer should be the agency's principal program officer for preservation activities, and this program responsibility should complement any senior official who may be designated to provide policy and budget oversight responsibility in accordance with other Presidential direction (see Recommendation 1, above).

Accountability Recommendation 3: The Administration, with support from Congress, should ensure that Federal agencies fully integrate historic preservation responsibilities and needs into strategic plans, performance standards, performance measures, and management and accounting systems, consistent with the Government Performance and Results Act, the Chief Financial Officers Act, the Performance Management and Recognition System, and related mandates.

- The Director of the Office of Management and Budget should amend its guidance on the Government Performance and Results Act to ensure that strategic plans, desired outcomes, and annual performance plans of Federal agencies that own or manage public property include measures and reporting on resource stewardship such as the management of historic resources under agency jurisdiction or control.
- The Director of the Office of Management and Budget should request the Financial Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) to establish a Task Force on Cultural Resources, and to charge the task force, in consultation with the Council, with reviewing and, if appropriate, revising or clarifying the FASAB guidance on heritage assets contained in the Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 8, "Supplementary Stewardship Reporting," in order to improve consistent and comparable data collection and reporting on historic resources under Federal ownership or control.

Accountability Recommendation 4: Federal agencies should establish and maintain internal audit programs to monitor compliance with historic preservation laws and regulations and recommend corrective action for critical resource protection needs.

Federal agencies, through the Office of Management and Budget or the Chief Financial Officers, should be encouraged to share information on environmental compliance auditing systems that might assist them in directing funding to critical resource protection needs.

Accountability Recommendation 5: Federal agencies should improve the effectiveness and consistency of how they seek and consider the views of outside parties, including the general public, in their stewardship decisions.

Federal agencies, with the assistance of the Office of Management and Budget, should share information on effective public involvement in planning, decision making, and ongoing resource management. This should include Federal experience with citizen advisory councils and support foundations, coordination with tribal, State, and local governments, and consultation with private stakeholders, as well as the laws governing public disclosure and involvement in Federal decisions. Potential best practices for public involvement and stakeholder consultation should be disseminated among agencies through electronic clearinghouses, training programs, and other means.

Accountability Recommendation 6: Federal agencies should develop awards programs and performance incentives to support historic preservation.

Federal agencies should be encouraged to establish national awards for historic resource stewardship, similar to those that have been established by the military services, and to submit agency award winners to the Council for consideration of “Lasting Impact” awards every three years (see Council Commitments, page 76).

COLLABORATION: FINDING AND WORKING WITH PARTNERS

Many Federal agencies have realized for a long time that they cannot meet their stewardship responsibilities alone. Collaboration is a way agencies can successfully meet the needs and recommendations outlined above. Beyond finding additional funding or people power, such partnerships offer many other benefits.

⁵⁵ *Working Together: Achieving Cultural Resource Management Goals through Partnerships*, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Legacy Project, 1997.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

For several years, the regional offices of the National Trust for Historic Preservation worked with military installations and preservation organizations to encourage them to work together on a variety of joint projects. The success of that venture is illustrated by a publication prepared by the National Trust and funded by the Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program and the National Park Service, entitled *Working Together: Achieving Cultural Resource Management Goals through Partnerships*.⁵⁵ This publication provides excellent examples and advice on partnership and collaboration that all Federal agencies, not just DoD, can use.

It highlighted four benefits for Federal agencies from initiating and fostering partnerships. In particular, preservation organizations working together can lead to “sharing of the workload, a proactive approach to compliance, improved public relations, and an enhancement of morale.”⁵⁶ We would add two additional benefits to this list: the ability to gain not only expertise but focused interest and enthusiasm that might otherwise be lacking for a particular project, and encouragement for Federal agencies to “buy-in” to the idea of being stakeholders actively participating in management outcomes that they care about.

Collaboration Needs

Collaboration Need 1: Stretch scarce resources through partnerships.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) prepared a study of Federal building and facility partnerships in 1999. It noted that “our work and that of others over the last several years has identified several important weaknesses in Federal agencies’ management and maintenance of facilities and real property,” and went on to list some of these weaknesses. They included strategic thinking and capital planning; dealing with deferred maintenance; inability to address underutilized and unneeded properties; and lack of adequate or consistent data on condition of facilities, maintenance and repair costs, and operating versus capital improvement budgetary needs.

GAO observed that “federally owned buildings and land need to be strategically acquired, managed, and disposed of so that the taxpayer’s return on the investment is maximized.” One possible solution is for Federal agencies to enter into partnerships with the private sector through contracts or agreements. “These arrangements typically involve a government agency contracting with a private partner to renovate, construct, operate, maintain, and/or manage a government agency contracting with a private partner to renovate, construct, operate, maintain, and/or manage a facility or system, in part or in whole, that provides a public service.”⁵⁷

GAO found that five key factors were present in the successful partnership projects that it examined: 1) there had been some key catalyst for change; 2) Congress had enacted legislation to provide a statutory basis for partnership and allow the agency to keep the revenues from the partnership; 3) new organizational structures and expertise were provided for to facilitate agency interaction with private partners; 4) business plans or some similar mechanism were created to help guide informed decision making by the agency and the partnership; and 5) the partnership had key support from the local community and other project stakeholders.⁵⁸ While GAO believed that all of these factors were important, they singled out Congress’ role and appropriate legal authority to act creatively as perhaps the single-most critical factor.

Collaboration Need 2: Promote incentives and minimize disincentives affecting partnerships.

The Department of Defense offers an example of how tweaking existing authorities could facilitate agencies obtaining private funds. DoD is currently authorized to accept private gifts if in connection with the maintenance and operation of a school, hospital, library, museum, etc. (10 USC 2601). Such authority could be expanded to include receipt of gifts for preservation of specific historic resources.

⁵⁷ *Public-Private Partnerships*, General Accounting Office, February 1999, p. 1.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, p. 3.

⁵⁹ The new National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act (P.L. 106-355) is intended to facilitate the transfer of these unique and desirable resources for preservation, recreation, and public interpretation purposes.

Collaboration Need 3: Learn from successful and innovative partnerships.

The recent renovation of the Washington Monument is certainly a premiere example of pooling of public and private sector funds. Another high-profile example is the work of the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation, Inc. (in cooperation with the National Park Service), established to raise funds for the restoration of the Statue of Liberty (\$87 million) and key buildings on Ellis Island, notably the Main Building (\$162 million).

The National Park Foundation is a nonprofit partner of the National Park Service that was chartered by Congress, and offers one model for public-private partnership support. Another somewhat different example is provided by the Maine Lights program, through which Coast Guard lighthouses have been both successfully leased and also conveyed out of Federal ownership.⁵⁹

A number of Federal agencies have worked with partners, contractors, concessioners, or on their own to develop successful Facilities Tours of their active facilities. Some of these public tours and related events are offered daily; others are more limited for security, safety, privacy, or other reasons, and are arranged around special open-house days a few times each year. NASA has had a great deal of success with this, and works with commercial as well as non-profit organizations to accommodate the 2.75 million annual visitors to the Kennedy Space Center in addition to its other centers.

Collaboration Need 4: Promote interagency cooperation and pooling of resources and knowledge.

There is a strong need for more collaboration and resource pooling between Federal entities, although there are often practical and organizational barriers to be overcome. Faced with the difficulty of managing and caring for aging space hardware and other artifacts of

the manned space program, NASA entered into a cooperative agreement with the Smithsonian Institution to offer the National Air and Space Museum long-term loans for display, as well as right of first refusal for items or high-tech components that were no longer needed by NASA for active space programs.

The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management often work together on their adjoining lands in the western United States, and all land management agencies have realized in the last few years that there are increasingly compelling reasons to do so. On a modest scale, at Lake Tahoe, the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management were engaged in a land exchange that resulted in Forest Service acquisition of a historic mansion and its land, the Whittier Estate. Under the terms of the exchange, the house is being rehabilitated and will be managed by a nonprofit organization as a conference center.

More broadly, under the National Fire Plan and wildland fire emergency appropriations established in the FY 2001 budget, this type of cooperation and common approach for BLM and the Forest Service is actually mandated by law, and all of the land management agencies participating in the National Fire Center or subject to catastrophic wildland fires will have to share common agenda and resources.

Collaboration Need 5: Capitalize on public support from active volunteers.

There are many excellent examples of voluntary efforts that do or could offer support for historic resource stewardship needs. In the National Parks, more than 70,000 persons volunteer their time and talents annually to work as a Volunteer in the Parks in National Park Units across the country. Each park unit has a coordinator who matches needed skills with volunteers. The volunteers serve in many capacities, many of which relate to the protection, enhancement, management, and interpretation of historic resources. Among other things, volunteers work at information desks; present living history demonstrations; write or design visitor brochures; and give guided walks or evening campfire programs.

Passport in Time (PIT), begun in 1989, is a volunteer program of the Forest Service. PIT provides opportunities for the public to work with professional archeologists and historians on National Forests and grasslands across the country. Projects include diverse activities such as archeological excavation, survey, oral history, or historic structure restoration. There is no registration fee. A semi-annual newsletter announces current and upcoming volunteer opportunities, age and skill requirements, if any, and minimum time commitment expected. The goal of PIT is to preserve the Nation's past with the help of the public. A related, informal network called Friends of Pit includes private individuals dedicated to supporting PIT and all heritage management efforts within the USDA Forest Service. Through letters and personal visits, Friends of Pit makes sure that Forest Service officials know how important the opportunity is to the public to contribute to heritage resource management.

These and other models need to be explored, and lessons learned from their successes and failures made available more broadly for Federal agencies to apply and adapt to their own situations and needs.

Recommendations

Collaboration Recommendation 1: The Administration and Congress should work together to establish appropriate mechanisms for Federal agencies and the private sector to promote successful public-private partnerships. This should include removing legal impediments to the establishment and financial support of non-profit educational groups and volunteer associations who can assist with Federal stewardship work.

Congress should request that the General Accounting Office prepare an analysis of legal impediments that may exist to the establishment and financial support of nonprofit educational groups and volunteer associations who might otherwise assist with Federal stewardship of historic resources. Congress should use the results of this analysis to craft legislation that facilitates such support to land and property management agencies, including fund-raising activities.

Collaboration Recommendation 2: The Administration should encourage Federal agencies to outlease or expedite conveyance of surplus historic resources that could be better managed, preserved, and used by other Government entities or the private sector.

Congress should consider currently proposed (and possibly additional) changes to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act that would facilitate transfer of historic resources for preservation and public use purposes.

COUNCIL COMMITMENTS

The Council will work with Federal agencies, other appropriate public and private partners, and the President's Council on the Arts and Humanities to develop and present a consistent and powerful message linking American history, cultural values, and Federal stewardship. This message will promote historic preservation as a valid and important national priority.

The Council will explore the development of a series of video productions focusing on the Federal Government's historic resource stewardship role, in cooperation with the President's Council on the Arts and Humanities, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and a cable outlet such as The History Channel or The Learning Channel. Several individual films could examine different agencies, their resources, and the challenges they face in caring for historic properties and develop human interest in the employees and citizen volunteers engaged in such work.

The Council will work with the Administration and selected Federal agencies to promote appropriate policies and implementing guidance on property management, new facilities construction, and rehabilitation of existing facilities to give preference or equal weight to historic resource management decisions, and include allowances for a public interest component in cost-benefit analyses and other decisions involving the public trust.

The Council will examine opportunities for new joint guidance with agencies as well as the creative use of various existing programmatic tools at its disposal that are contained in its regulations implementing Section 106 of NHPA, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800).

The Council will also work with Federal agencies to develop administrative and other incentives for proactive Federal management planning that is responsive to historic resource management needs, promotes public-private partnerships, and increases effective public involvement in stewardship planning.

The Council will propose for funding support the "Lasting Impact" Awards for Federal Historic Preservation. The awards would be presented to Federal agencies for projects and programs that have had or are likely to have a lasting impact on historic resource stewardship and the promotion of a public preservation ethic in the U.S., and that best exemplify Federal leadership and commitment in the spirit of the National Historic Preservation Act. If funded, awards would be given for both Stewardship and Partnership initiatives every three years, beginning in FY 2002.

AFTERWORD

The Federal Government has a rich and varied array of historic resources under its care. They portray the major themes of American history, celebrating the achievements of the Nation and serving as important icons to communities across the land. Managing these unique public assets presents many challenges, but the Federal Government has the capability, if effectively mobilized, to ensure the sound stewardship of these irreplaceable resources for future generations.

The Council's recommendations provide a blueprint for meeting these challenges. We look forward to working with the executive and legislative branches of Government, as well as many other public and private parties, to further the goal of effective Federal stewardship of our national patrimony.

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. 1994. *Defense Department Compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act: Section 202(a)(6) Evaluation Report*. Prepared in partnership with the Department of Defense, Legacy Resource Management Program. Washington, DC: Author.
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. 1991. *Balancing Historic Preservation Needs with the Operation of Highly Technical or Scientific Facilities*. Report to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives. Washington, DC: Author.
- Barnes, Christine. *Great Lodges of the West*. 1997. Bend, Oregon: W.W. West.
- Buccino, Sharon, Charles Clusen, Ed Norton, and Joanna Wald. 1997. *Reclaiming Our Heritage: What We Need to Do to Preserve America's National Parks*. Washington, DC: Natural Resources Defense Council and National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- Bureau of Land Management. 2000. "Strategic Paper on Cultural Resources At Risk." Unpublished manuscript.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1999. *Public Rewards from Public Lands*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1999. *Your Lands, Your Legacy—1998 Annual Report*. Washington, DC: Office of the Chief Financial Officer.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1998. *Beyond the National Parks—A Recreation Guide to Public Lands in the West* (Mary E. Tisdale and Bibi Booth, Eds.). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Burton, Lloyd, and David Ruppert. 1999. "Bear's Lodge or Devil's Tower: Intercultural Relations, Legal Pluralism, and the Management of Sacred Sites on Public Lands." *Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy* Vol. 8, No. 2.
- Department of Defense. 2000. *Defense Environmental Quality Program: FY 1999 Annual Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Department of Defense. 2000. *Environmental Security: Defending Our Future*. Department of Defense Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health Report. Washington, DC: Author.
- Department of Defense. 1994. *The Benefits of Cultural Resource Conservation—Commander's Guide*. Washington, DC: Legacy Resource Management Program.
- Department of Energy. No date. "Stewards of a National Resource." Washington, DC: Author.
- Department of the Interior. 1999. "Cultural Resource Management, Bureau of Land Management." Audit Report No. 99-I-808. Washington, DC: Office of Inspector General.
- Department of Transportation. 1999. *DOT Consolidated Financial Statement FY 1998*. Washington, DC: Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

- Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. 1999. "Amendments to Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment, Measurement and Reporting for Multi-Use Heritage Assets" (draft). *Statement of Recommended Accounting Standards* No. 16.
- Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. 1999. "Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting." *Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards* No. 14 (April 1999). Washington, DC: Author.
- Field, Donald R., et al. 1998. "National Park Service Managers' Views Toward the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program, 1997." Pennsylvania State University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Utah State University.
- General Accounting Office. 2000. *BLM and the Forest Service: Land Exchanges Need to Reflect Appropriate Value and Serve the Public Interest* (GAO/RCED-00-73). Washington, DC: Author.
- General Accounting Office. 2000. *Federal Buildings: Billions Are Needed for Repairs and Alterations*. (GAO/GGD-00-98). Washington, DC: Author.
- General Accounting Office. 2000. *Military Housing—Continued Concerns in Implementing the Privatization Initiative* (GAO/NSIAD-00- 71). Washington, DC: Author.
- General Accounting Office. 1999. *Public-Private Partnerships: Key Elements of Federal Building and Facility Partnerships* (GAO/GGD-99- 23). Washington, DC: Author.
- General Accounting Office. 1998. *Deferred Maintenance Reporting: Challenges to Implementation* (GAO/AIMD-98-42). Washington, DC: Author.
- General Accounting Office. 1998. *Implementation of Federal Historic Preservation Program Can Be Improved* (GAO/RCED-88-81). Washington, DC: Author.
- General Accounting Office. 1991. *Federal Buildings: Actions Needed to Prevent Further Deterioration and Obsolescence* (GAO/GGD-91- 57). Washington, DC: Author.
- General Services Administration. 1999. *Held in Public Trust: Public Buildings Service Strategy for Using Historic Buildings*. Washington, DC: GSA Public Buildings Service.
- General Services Administration. 1996. "Federal Real Property Asset Management Principles." *GSA Bulletin* D-240. 61 FR 201: 53295-53929 (October 16, 1996). Washington, DC: Author.
- General Services Administration. No date. *Proceedings of the Roundtable and Public Forum: Determination of Reuse for a National Historic Landmark Property, General Post Office*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Kelly, Marion, and Nancy Aleck. 1997. *Makua Means Parents—A Brief Cultural History of Makua Valley*. American Friends Service Committee, Hawaii Area Program.

- Lewis, Andrew, Karen Waddell, T. Luke Young, and Elizabeth Johnston. 1998. *Working Together—Achieving Cultural Resource Management Goals through Partnerships*. Washington, DC: National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration. 1999. *1998 Accountability Report*. Washington, DC: Office of the Chief Financial Officer.
- National Endowment for the Humanities. 1999. *My History Is America's History—15 Things You Can Do to Save America's Stories*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Park Service. 2000. "Cultural Resources Challenge" (September 2000 draft).
- National Park Service. 2000. "Dam Good Archeology—The Bureau of Reclamation's Cultural Resources Program." *CRM* Vol. 23, No. 1.
- National Park Service. 2000. *Vanishing Treasures—Year End Report, Fiscal Year 1999*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Park Service. 1999. *America's Historic Landmarks at Risk: Report to the 106th Congress*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Park Service. 1998. *Management Policies to Guide the Management of the National Park System*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Park Service. 1998. *National Park Service Accountability Report—Fiscal Year 1997*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Park Service. 1998. *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Program*. 63 FR 79: 20495-20508 (April 24, 1998). Washington, DC: Author.
- National Park Service. 1997. "A Challenge for the Military Mission—Preservation in the Armed Forces." *CRM* Vol. 20, No. 13.
- National Park Service. 1997. "Cultural Resource Management Guideline." Release No. 5. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Park Service. 1997. *Cultural Resources Strategic Plan*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Park Service. 1996. "1996 Survey of Federal Agencies' Historic Preservation Programs." Prepared for Hon. James Hansen, Chairman, Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Lands, U.S. House of Representatives. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Research Council. 1998. *Stewardship of Federal Facilities: A Proactive Strategy for Managing the Nation's Public Assets*. Committee to Assess Techniques for Developing Maintenance and Repair Budgets for Federal Facilities; Board on Infrastructure and the Constructed Environment; and Commission on Engineering and Technical Systems. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

- Tennessee Valley Authority. 1997. "Generation to Generation—A Short History of TVA." Washington, DC: Author.
- Tennessee Valley Authority. 1997. "Tennessee Valley Authority Government Performance and Results Act Strategic Plan, FY1997-2002." Washington, DC: Author.
- Tennessee Valley Authority. 1996. "Dams and Power Plants." Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Army. 1999. *Historical and Archaeological Resources of the U.S. Army Garrison, Hawaii*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Army. No date. "Army Environmental Programs." Washington, DC: U.S. Army Environmental Center.
- U.S. Conference of Mayors, Special Committee on Historic Preservation. 1966. *With Heritage So Rich*. New York: Random House.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1999. "Forest Service Timber Sale Environmental Analysis Requirements, Washington, DC." *Evaluation Report No. 08801-10-At*. Washington, DC: Office of Inspector General.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. *Shared Commitments to Conservation, 1997 Annual Report*. Washington, DC: Chief Financial Officer.
- U.S. Forest Service. 1999. *Heritage—It's About Time! A National Strategy*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Forest Service. 1999. "A Legacy of Hope: Managing America's Natural Resources in the 21st Century." Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Forest Service. 1998. "Heritage—It's About Time." *Southwestern Region News* (December 1998).
- U.S. Navy. 1997. *Historic and Archeological Resources Protection Planning Guidelines*. Washington, DC: Author.

Appendix 1

POLICY AND PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS PROVIDED TO SPECIFIC AGENCIES AS PART OF THIS STUDY

During the course of the Council's two-year initiative to study Federal historic resource stewardship, Council members and staff met with a number of Federal agencies and offered specific advice and recommendations to improve their stewardship efforts. The recommendations made to these agencies are outlined below. Work with several of these agencies is ongoing, and three agencies (GSA, Department of Energy, and Army) have existing or nascent agreements with the Council for mutual cooperation on program improvements and training initiatives.

General Services Administration

GSA should carry out the recommendations and commitments contained in its 1999 report, *Held in Public Trust: Public Buildings Service Strategy for Using Historic Buildings*, and should make the report available to a broad Federal audience.

GSA should work with the Council to:

- Build on progress it is making to “institutionalize” a preservation ethic within its regional offices through further training and education, in cooperation with other parties.
- Develop and implement model procedures for public involvement and consultation on site selection, lease acquisition, and use changes for GSA projects. Such procedures should be designed to be used as “best practices” by other agencies for these same issues.

Develop model documents and standard conditions for transfers/disposal of historic resources, given the increasing number of GSA excessing/disposal actions for its own properties as well as those of other agencies. These models should be designed to streamline and coordinate the regulatory process and increase the potential for public access and use.

Department of Energy

General

- DoE should develop a strategy and Standard Operating Procedures to ensure that its immediate short-term needs do not preclude long-term preservation options. Such a strategy should ensure that preservation values are fairly considered, along with budget constraints, security, contamination and environmental cleanup concerns, and changing mission requirements.
- DoE should take steps to ensure protection, retention, inventory, and long-term preservation and interpretation of historic artifacts, records, drawings, and archival materials associated with its historic facilities.
- DoE should consult with NASA, its contractors, and support groups on mechanisms for developing or improving visitor interpretation facilities and site tours at its major laboratories, including Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Hanford.
- DoE should work with the Council to:
 - Develop historic preservation training and education for staff to more effectively meet the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act.
 - Streamline departmental procedures to ensure timely, comprehensive, and cost-effective compliance with Federal preservation laws, particularly in situations where historic properties are in secured areas, or must be decontaminated.

Appendix 1 Continued

- Develop guidance on alternative mitigation strategies for historic properties scheduled for demolition and the significant equipment and artifacts contained in them that is scheduled for removal, and how to increase use of museums and other public outreach mechanisms to accomplish preservation goals.
- Explore ways to make the application of environmental standards for the decontamination of contaminated properties sensitive to historic preservation concerns.

Specific to Manhattan Project (summary from “Recommendations and Preservation Options for Manhattan Project Signature Facilities at Oak Ridge and Hanford Reservations,” February 2001)

- DOE’s efforts to preserve and present the legacy of the Manhattan Project through identification of its Signature Facilities is a laudable first step toward recognizing the significance of these facilities. The Expert Panel commends the Secretary of Energy for creating the Corporate Board on Historic Preservation to ensure consideration of historic preservation issues at the highest levels of DOE management.
- The long-term value of the Signature Facilities lies in their historic significance, not as operating facilities. DOE should not be expected to assume all financial costs for preserving this historic significance, and should foster partnerships with other Federal agencies, the private sector, and State and local governments to ensure the preservation of these historic sites.
- DOE should pursue, in consultation with the National Park Service and other interested parties, National Historic Landmark designation for the Signature Facilities. The ultimate goal should be the formal establishment of these historic properties as a collective unit administered for preservation, commemoration, and public interpretation in cooperation with the National Park Service.
- DOE should ensure that historic preservation concerns are addressed by its facility contractors early in the planning and environmental review process to decontaminate and decommission its Signature Facilities and other historic properties. Priceless artifacts and records associated with and located in Signature Facilities and other historic structures must not be lost due to misguided or insensitive maintenance and cleanup operations.
- Continued cooperation between DOE and interested State and local organizations must take place to ensure that the Graphite Reactor at Oak Ridge and the 105-B Reactor at Hanford serve as museums to interpret the story of the Manhattan Project. Working with the American Museum of Science and Energy at Oak Ridge and the 105-B Reactor Museum Association and the Columbia River Exhibition of History, Science, and Technology at Richland, DOE should consider making these two Signature Facilities the focal points of education and tours of these respective facilities.
- DOE must ensure that the historic significance of its two remaining working Signature Facilities, the Y-12 Beta-3 Racetrack at Oak Ridge and the 221-T Chemical Separations Plant at Hanford, is considered early and comprehensively in their management and operation.
- A comprehensive examination of alternatives to total demolition should be undertaken as DOE proceeds with the decontamination and decommissioning of the K-25 Building at Oak Ridge. All feasible preservation options need to be reviewed by all interested parties before determining a final course of action.

Department of Defense, Department of the Army

The Department of the Army should work with the Council to:

- Continue to support an Office of Historic Properties under the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment, to better deal with the Army’s conflicting responsibilities to protect historic resources while cost-effectively operating and maintaining Army installations, and reducing unneeded and costly installation infrastructure.

Appendix 1 Continued

- Pursue refinement of privatization initiatives, particularly those dealing with military housing, that address historic preservation concerns.
- Continue work on streamlining Army policies and procedures and integrating historic preservation activities with installation land use and management planning needs.
- Build on and support advisory groups similar to the Ukanipo Heiau Advisory Group in Hawaii and the Friends of Fort Sam Houston in Texas as examples of workable and exemplary community partnerships.
- Continue to support means for raising Army personnel awareness of historic resource stewardship as a key part of the Army mission, including sustaining an annual Army historic preservation awards program to recognize installation management excellence, innovation, and partnership.

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

- BLM should adopt and follow the recommendations contained in its staff paper, “Strategic Paper on Cultural Resources at Risk” (June 2000), including those recommending awards recognition; upper management support; evaluating and establishing appropriate budget allocation strategies; priorities for “at risk” resources; assembling more complete program statistics; developing a cultural training module; and balancing proactive work with Section 106 reviews.
- BLM should seek additional funding for cultural resource programs to support adequate professional staff and enable it to plan and carry out specific protection and development strategies for significant threatened resources.
- Funding for cultural resources activities should be specifically provided for in the budget process in such a way that multi-year preservation activities, as well as interdisciplinary resource management planning, can more fairly compete for appropriations.
- Given the extent of its holdings and overlapping interests, BLM should place a high priority on joint projects with the Forest Service and other Federal agencies within the Department of Interior, as well as with the Department of Defense, to take advantage of economies of scale, cost-share area interpretive and educational programs, and cooperate in collecting and sharing data on historic resources.
- BLM should undertake greater efforts to support public-private partnerships in protection efforts through challenge grants and other seed money, including creative use of Recreation Fee Demonstration money. It should also take maximum advantage of the important contributions now being made by private volunteers in site protection programs (such as Arizona’s highly successful Site Stewards program) and in inventory, stabilization, and interpretation programs (such as the national Passport in Time program).
- A high priority should be placed on proactive steps to inventory and evaluate BLM resources, consistent with recent findings of the Office of Inspector General of the Department of the Interior, and consistent with some successful prototype efforts in National Forests in the Sierra Nevada area of California. Such efforts should benefit from a grand design (if possible, at a multi-State or regional level) and/or integrated planning approach, rather than the current, predominantly piecemeal, project-driven survey efforts. Such inventory and evaluation work should be developed and priorities set in consultation with State Historic Preservation Officers and Indian tribes, and should place primary emphasis on gaining a better understanding of the quality, significance, and condition of historic resources rather than simply on locational and quantitative analysis.
- Law enforcement efforts to protect sites from vandalism should be increased and targeted to especially critical areas, again with assistance from a broad range of private and public partners.
- A means for building upon and learning from the most successful public interpretation programs and sharing model approaches with the Forest Service and the National Park Service should be pursued, particularly for interpreting the historic resources within special management areas such as national monuments.

Appendix 1 Continued**Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service**

- The Forest Service should adopt and follow the recommendations contained in its staff paper, “Heritage—It’s About Time! A National Strategy” (September 1999), as well as adopt the following implementation strategies:
 - gain the commitment of the Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness Resource leadership to make the heritage vision a shared vision;
 - develop a communications plan to heighten the awareness of Forest Service leadership, the Department of Agriculture, and Congress regarding the untapped opportunities and public benefits of the heritage program;
 - assess the national heritage program funding level in terms of the Forest Service’s ability to implement the strategy and the benefits to be derived, and making adjustments;
 - implement a plan to provide the heritage workforce the training, tools, and resources needed to make the strategy a reality; and
 - begin to forge alliances with other agencies, local communities, tribes, private sector partners, the professional community, and others whose cooperation and support are needed to achieve the vision.
- The Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service should seek additional funding for cultural resource programs to support adequate professional staff and enable it to plan and carry out specific protection and development strategies for significant threatened resources.
- Funding for cultural resources activities should be specifically provided for in the budget process in such a way that multi-year preservation activities, as well as interdisciplinary resource management planning, can more fairly compete for appropriations.
- Given the extent of its holdings and overlapping interests, the Forest Service should place a high priority on joint projects with the Bureau of Land Management and other Federal agencies within the Department of the Interior, as well as with the Department of Defense, to take advantage of economies of scale, to cost-share area interpretive and educational programs, and to cooperate in collecting and sharing data on historic resources.
- The Forest Service should undertake greater efforts to support public-private partnerships in protection efforts through challenge grants and other seed money, including creative use of Recreation Fee Demonstration money. It should also take maximum advantage of the important contributions now being made by private volunteers in site protection programs (such as Arizona’s highly successful Site Stewards program) and in inventory, stabilization, and interpretation programs (such as the national Passport in Time program).
- A high priority should be placed on proactive steps to inventory and evaluate Forest Service resources, consistent with some successful prototype efforts in National Forests in the Sierra Nevada area of California. Such efforts should benefit from a grand design (if possible, at a multi-State or regional level) and/or integrated planning approach, rather than the current predominant piecemeal, project driven survey efforts. Such inventory and evaluation work should be developed and priorities set in consultation with State Historic Preservation Officers and Indian tribes, and should place primary emphasis on gaining a better understanding of the quality, significance, and condition of historic and cultural resources rather than simply on locational and quantitative analysis.
- Law enforcement efforts to protect sites from vandalism should be increased and targeted to especially critical areas, again with assistance from a broad range of private and public partners.
- A means for expanding, building upon, and learning from the most successful public interpretation programs and sharing model approaches with the BLM and the National Park Service should be pursued, particularly for interpreting the historic resources within special management areas such as national monuments.

Appendix 2

POLICY, BUDGET, AND STRATEGIC PLANNING INITIATIVES RELATED TO HISTORIC RESOURCES STEWARDSHIP BEGUN BY AGENCIES DURING THE COURSE OF THIS STUDY

Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service

Recreation Summit (October 1999)

“Heritage—It’s About Time! A National Strategy” (September 1999)

Department of Defense, Department of the Army

Army Residential Communities Initiative (no date)

Managing the Army’s Historic Properties: A Blueprint for Preservation and Reuse (no date)

Department of Energy

Corporate Board on Historic Preservation (formed October 1998; first report January 2000)

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

“Strategic Paper on Cultural Resources at Risk” (June 2000)

Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Federal Preservation Institute initiative (September 2000)

“Cultural Resources Challenge: The National Park Service’s Action Plan for Preserving Cultural Resources” (draft; September 2000)

General Services Administration

Held in Public Trust: PBS Strategy for Using Public Buildings (May 1999)

Appendix 3

OTHER RECENT INITIATIVES: AMERICA'S TREASURES, LEGACY, AND "MY HISTORY"

Recently, several noteworthy initiatives were created to raise awareness and funding for preserving some of the Nation's most important historic artifacts and properties. One of these is a national effort to promote and protect a variety of historic treasures; a second initiative of longer duration is internal to the Department of Defense; and a third is directed at preserving personal history and community heritage. The three initiatives are instructive and offer suggestions about how relatively small amounts of funding might be used in a focused and effective way for these purposes.

With assistance and encouragement from former First Lady Hillary Clinton and the White House Millennium Council, a number of important efforts are being pursued under the theme, "Honor the Past, Imagine the Future." The **Save America's Treasures** initiative is advancing this theme with a four-pronged campaign to 1) foster pride in American heritage; 2) educate Americans on preservation problems facing the buildings, sites, monuments, objects, and documents that represent America's diverse cultural legacy; 3) raise concern for the urgent preservation needs of this country's historic treasures; and 4) stimulate broad-scale involvement in these campaigns, including securing necessary resources and support, organization of grassroots preservation projects, participation in community preservation, and educational initiatives.

Save America's Treasures has two major components: a Federal fund administered by the National Park Service to help support preservation of nationally significant resources; and a private fund-raising effort advanced by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, in partnership with the National Park Foundation and Heritage Preservation. In 1999, \$30 million was awarded to 62 projects in 24 states, the District of Columbia, and Midway Islands, and \$15 million was available in 2000. In 2001, \$35 million has been appropriated. More than \$40 million has been raised to date from the private sector.

A second major initiative, the Department of Defense **Legacy Resource Management Program**, was established under the Department of Defense Appropriations Act in 1991. Legacy, a major program involving dedicated funding to support cultural and natural resource management, has enjoyed and continues to enjoy bipartisan support. Begun at an appropriation level of \$10 million (including both natural and cultural resources), the program's funding reached a high of \$50 million in the three consecutive years of FY 1993-1995. It is currently funded at \$15 million, and \$12 million was requested for FY 2001. In the past four fiscal years alone, DoD has received \$45 million, with probably about 40 percent of that amount being spent on historic resource concerns and 60 percent on natural resources.

A third initiative, **My History is America's History**, is being advanced by the National Endowment for the Humanities, with assistance from the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities, the Department of Education, several genealogy organizations and publishing companies, and the National Association of Broadcasters. My History has published a handbook on preserving family history, and has established a Web site that is intended to serve as a virtual "front porch" for those who want to learn more about their own history and the history of others. Teachers across the country are being encouraged to use family history to engage their students more broadly about American history.

Information for this report was gathered from a variety of sources. Ideas from a broad range of organizations and individuals was solicited on the future of Federal historic preservation via the Council's Web site, through a discussion forum established especially for the Millennium initiative. The Internet forum was online from February 1999 until September 2000.

Regular meetings of the Council were devoted in part to focused examination and discussion of critical issues connected with the Federal Government's role in historic preservation. The six meetings in this series were held in Santa Fe and Los Alamos, New Mexico (November 1998), Honolulu, Hawaii (February 1999), Washington, DC (June 1999), Oak Ridge and Great Smoky Mountains, Tennessee (November 1999), Phoenix, Arizona (March 2000), and Portland, Maine (June 2000).

In addition, Council members and staff made formal presentations at the Statewide Preservation Organizations Annual Meeting in Honolulu, Hawaii (February 1999), the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers in Washington, DC (March 1999), and the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Annual Preservation Conference in Washington, DC (October 1999). They also participated in special agency conferences and meetings on historic preservation and cultural resource management throughout the period.

A Council member Task Force on the Millennium provided policy oversight for the project, and the Council's professional staff conducted this study in consultation with that task force and other parties as indicated on the preceding pages.

This study has been published in two parts. Single copies of both the special illustrated summary version of the report, and this full report, with references, examples, and additional explanatory material, may be requested from the Council. This full report is also available on the Council's Web site at www.achp.gov.

A ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
HISTORIC PRESERVATION

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
1100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW - SUITE 809
WASHINGTON, DC 20004
202-606-8503

www.achp.gov