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Cultural preservation efforts have evolved from traditional, site specific projects administered by a single agency, to regional, multi-jurisdictional projects administered by a cooperative partnership. The projects administered cooperative partnerships are a recent phenomena and are often termed heritage preservation projects.

An analysis of the evolution of cultural preservation efforts is undertaken through historical and case study research. The selected cases are examples of innovative regional cultural preservation efforts of their era. The results of the analysis provide a descriptive evolution of the cultural preservation efforts, and a description of the components of both traditional preservation efforts and heritage preservation efforts.
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INTRODUCTION

There is an increased interest in the preservation of our heritage in America. As a result, historic and cultural preservation planning efforts have become more prevalent, particularly within the past decade. These efforts provide a means for the identification and protection of the historic and cultural resources of our heritage. The increased prevalence of historic and cultural preservation efforts (hence referred to as cultural preservation) and the changing context in which these efforts are being employed has led to the need to gain insight concerning the elements and effectiveness of this process.

Cultural preservation projects have existed for many decades and continue to emerge. These efforts have become more diversified, and the planning techniques more sophisticated. Cultural preservation has evolved from attention to a single structure (traditional historic preservation), to regional landscapes and the elements within them (heritage preservation). The methods utilized to preserve these elements have also evolved from federal designation, ownership and government administration (primarily the National Park Service), to designation, multi-ownership and cooperative partnership administration. With the diversity of the project types and the ever increasing detail in the preservation planning process, it is necessary to gain a clearer understanding of the context of preservation planning efforts. The examination of components of past and present preservation planning efforts can illuminate trends and issues within this realm. It is both ironic and necessary that individuals in the field of the identification and preservation of the past must look back at their own history to gain insights and understandings of preservation planning, where current preservation planning efforts are, and where they may, or should, be heading.
PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

Several basic assumptions are made for this research and will be substantiated through related literature. One, there has been a shift, or evolution, from traditional historic preservation planning (encompassing the preservation of a single site or structure) to heritage preservation planning (encompassing the preservation of historic, cultural and natural resources within regional areas, with a combined aspect of economic development).
Two, this shift reflects trends towards integrated resource preservation and management, for example the effects of adjacent land-use on a historic site.
Three, the shift towards regional scale cultural preservation projects has led to an increased need for cooperative partnership (versus total government) administration in terms of designation, implementation and management of cultural, historic and natural resources.

Three primary questions arise which will be addressed in this research:

1. How has the process for the development of regional preservation efforts changed from a traditional to heritage preservation planning process?

2. Why has this process changed?

3. What influence can these changes have on future preservation planning applications?

The purpose of this research is to examine these questions through the application of case study analysis of two regional cultural preservation planning projects. In order to accomplish this purpose the research incorporates three principal realms. One, an examination of the evolution of cultural preservation planning within the National Park Service is conducted in order to illuminate the role of the National Park Service in preservation planning efforts and the effects of legislation on this evolution. Traditionally, the National Park Service has been the lead federal agency in historic and cultural preservation and for this
reason provides a context in which to examine the evolution of the preservation planning process. Two, the context and planning process incorporated into the establishment of two innovative regional cultural preservation planning efforts will be examined. The first project examined is the Blue Ridge Parkway, a project established in the early 30's, and America's Industrial Heritage Project, a recently established project. This examination will illuminate key components, trends and issues in the cultural preservation planning efforts and allow for a comparison between the past and current efforts. Finally, the conclusions and insights generated from this analysis will provide the basis for the exploration of potential applications to future preservation planning efforts.

CONTENTS OF RESEARCH DOCUMENT

The first chapter contains a review of literature related to cultural preservation, and the changing character of cultural preservation planning from traditional preservation to heritage preservation. In the second chapter, a description of the methodology used in this research is detailed. The methodology consists of a case study approach which incorporates a multi-case exploratory process. This section details methods incorporated into the process, and the analysis undertaken for the purposes of this research. The third chapter contains a review of literature related to the evolution of planning and preservation efforts within the National Park Service. A comprehensive look at the trends in cultural preservation and planning within the National Park Service provides a background for the examination of preservation planning efforts within the case study projects. Heritage preservation planning and the role of the National Park Service in this planning process will be examined in chapter four. This chapter will also include the examination of supplementary cases in the development of an evolution, or continuum, of cultural preservation
planning efforts. Chapter five consists of a description of the primary cases, the Blue Ridge Parkway and America's Industrial Heritage Project, utilized in this research. This section includes an examination of the primary cases in terms of the origins and establishment, land acquisition measures, administration structure and aspects of the planning process. This examination provides the basis for a comparative analysis between the two cases. The following section, Chapter Six, contains the results of the survey which was administered to professionals working in the planning process of the primary case study projects. The primary focus of the survey is to examine the perceptions of these professionals in terms of important elements for a successful project, and important measures for the collection and distribution of information in the preservation planning process. Chapter Seven contains a comparison of the case study projects with an emphasis on the planning and establishment processes. Key factors and elements of the process and their relationship to the preservation planning field are illuminated and explored. This chapter will also include a comprehensive analysis of the results of this research, final conclusions, potential applications and questions posed for future exploration.

Incorporated into the thesis document are several appendices to provide necessary supplemental information. The appendices include: a chronology which summarizes key events and legislation related to aspects pertaining to this research, summaries of the open-ended interviews, the survey questionnaire, the codebook for data collection from the surveys, a summary of the data analysis results of the survey, and the summary of the report analyses.
CHAPTER ONE  —  CULTURAL PRESERVATION

The first chapter will provide a basic overview of the need for historic and cultural preservation and the changing role of preservation efforts. This changing role of preservation will be discussed in terms of traditional preservation efforts and heritage preservation efforts.

AN OVERVIEW OF HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION

Historic preservation has been encompassed in the evolution of our nation since its inception. There is a prevalent interest in our past and many efforts have been made to preserve the elements which represent or convey images of our history (Hosmer, 1987; Parrish, 1987). This need for preservation is reflected in With Heritage So Rich, the preamble to the 1966, National Historic Preservation Act, which stated 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" (Mackintosh, 1986, p.viii). When society is unsure of itself, there is a tendency to look back at our roots, to seek those elements in our urban and rural landscapes which give the feeling of stability (Hosmer, 1981). Perhaps it is the constant change and uncertainty of the present and future which brings us back to the past. Perhaps it is the need to identify with past ancestors and their cultures to obtain a sense of connectedness and stability.

Preserved artifacts, structures, cultural resources and landscapes give people a basis, a foundation of where we have come from, not only individually, but as a nation. In his discussion of symbolic landscapes Meinig states, "Every mature nation has its symbolic landscapes. They are part of the shared set of ideas and memories and feelings which bind a people together" (Meinig, 1979,
p. 164). The methods, meanings, and elements have changed over the years; however, the basic need to be connected to the past is an underlying issue which prevails (Hosmer, 1981; Foresta, 1984). Elements of the past have meaning to every person, whether it be a symbolic landscape which represents a particular kind of place and moment in time, or an artifact such as a lead bullet spotted on a Civil War military site. The medium which convey these meanings are varied, hence the quandary of what (elements), how (to what extent), and when (what period of time) preservation should be undertaken.

The methods utilized to preserve elements of the past are varied, and continue to change and evolve as time proceeds; however, the need to preserve elements of the past and maintain ties to past cultures, be it by preserving built form, landscapes, or particular elements which portray that culture, remains constant. These preserved elements create a basis and provide stability to the current culture, helping give people an identity of where they have come from, to help in the ever changing world of where they are going to.

THE CHANGING CHARACTER OF CULTURAL PRESERVATION

The difficulty of how to go about preserving our past can be reflected in the ever-changing methods, bureaucracy, and need to increasingly define the components which make up what is being preserved (Comp, 1992; Grosvenor, 1987). The examination of the role and context of traditional preservation planning and of heritage preservation planning will provide a greater understanding of the nature of past and current preservation efforts.
Traditional Historic and Cultural Preservation

Historically, the focus of historic and cultural preservation efforts has been placed upon the preservation or restoration of a specific structure, site, or locality (Foresta, 1984). Typically, historic designation has been of specific places with defined boundaries, within the boundary is history, outside is not, and some of the most important elements in understanding the whole history and meaning of a place are lost (Lewis, 1979). A dilemma in this approach is evident in a quote from Kevin Lynch, "While the historic associations of certain special places are a common subject of planning attention, the usual aim is to save a few old places just as they 'used to be'. How an entire working landscape might connect us to the present time, or to the recent past, or to the future – indeed, to the unending passage of time – still seems a remote question" (Lynch, 1976, pp. 27, 28). The problems associated with the traditional role of historic preservation can lead to the selection and preservation of only fragmented pieces of the historic resources. The preserved areas lose their context and true meaning of what was actually trying to be preserved. In our attempt to preserve the past in an orderly and systematic way, we may deny a true picture of what was (Lowenthal, 1979).

The broad scope and variety of terminology related to and incorporated into preservation planning, is a reflection of a multi-dimensional field in which a variety of professionals are involved. Each profession has developed its own terminology, or has created further nuances in the meanings of the terminology. The identification process of significant historical elements for preservation has become increasingly complex and customized to the particular professionals currently working in this realm. The variety of 'heritage' projects and related terminology to these projects is a reflection of the current frustrations to the traditionally limiting definitions in the field of historic preservation (Comp, 1991;
Johnson and Schene, 1987).

Any literature relating to historic preservation is likely to contain a variety of terminology, *historic preservation* being one of such terms. The definition of broad terminology: *historic preservation, cultural resource management, heritage preservation,* and *preservation planning process,* will clarify the associated meanings of the terminology. The definition of specific terms, for example: *historic site, historic landscape,* or *cultural landscape,* will illustrate the degree to which this terminology has been refined by professionals working in the realm of preservation.

*Historic preservation* is a broad term which typically refers to a process in which elements of historical significance: objects, structures, buildings, and sites, are protected. This process, often termed *preservation planning,* incorporates a series of activities which develop goals, priorities and strategies for the identification, evaluation, registration and protection of historic properties (NPS, National Register Bulletin No. 16, 1991).

*Cultural resource management* is a fusion of traditional historic preservation and the expanded responsibilities of resource stewardship. The base for cultural resource management includes not only the preservation of sites and structures, but also the preservation of objects representative of people and cultures (Johnson, 1987). Within the National Register programs, the term *culture* is to mean "the traditions, beliefs, practices, lifeways, arts, crafts, and social institutions of any community, be it an Indian tribe, a local ethnic group or the people of the nation as a whole" (Parker and King, 1990, p. 1).

*Historic preservation* and *cultural resource management* can at times be used interchangeably, however, when referring to a particular resource or profession they can be quite different. *Historic preservation,* a term coined predominantly by architects and historians, typically relates to buildings and
structures. *Cultural resource management*, a term predominantly applied by anthropologists and archaeologists, usually relates to the inclusion of elements other than built form (Johnson and Schene, 1987).

In terms of the federal agencies, particularly the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service, more specific terminology is utilized under the broad scope of cultural resource management and historic preservation. With the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and the establishment of the National Register of Historic Places, specific terms have become necessary to ascertain, describe and document preserved areas (Mackintosh, 1986; Foresta, 1984). These terms reflect the diversity of the nation's history and culture: buildings, structures, sites, districts, landscapes, properties; all of which must reflect significance in the realm of architecture, history, archaeology, engineering and culture (Parker and King, 1990). The terminology is increasingly defined in various publications, primarily within National Register Bulletins and Cultural Resource Management publications. Just within the realm of landscapes, these terms range from *designed historic landscape*, *landscape character*, *rural landscape*, *socio-cultural landscape*, and *landscape value* (Melnick, 1984; Keller, 1987; NPS, National Register Bulletin 16; McClelland, et. al, 1990; and Parker and King, 1990).

According to National Register Bulletin Number Sixteen, a *historic site* is the "location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure" (NPS, National Register Bulletin, Number 16, Appendix IV:3). A *historic landscape* builds upon this definition in that a historic landscape contains historic sites and gains importance from form and layout of the landscape and/or significance of the
designer. A cultural landscape is a geographic area (including wildlife and domestic animals) which reflects human activity or was a background for an event or significant individual in history (Melnick, 1984). Landscape characteristics are defined as "the tangible evidence of the activities and habits of the people who occupied, developed, used, and shaped the landscape to serve human needs; they may reflect the beliefs, attitudes, traditions, and values of these people" (McClelland, et. all. 1990, p. 15).

As the terminology and definitions illustrate, the methods utilized to describe aspects of preservation are narrowly defined and suited to a particular focus and purpose. A defined focus can be beneficial, however, not at the cost of losing the cognizance of the whole. This fragmentation can precipitate the loss of the primary goals and objectives of the preservation efforts. Much of this problem can be founded in the lack of a comprehensive structure or coordination in the traditional preservation efforts. Preservationists repeatedly point out that the United States has no major government department devoted to culture and heritage (Storey, 1987). There is little coordination between federal agencies in terms of exchange of technical information, establishment of compatible programs or encouragement for federal officers and staff to undertake cooperative efforts. There is little to no centralized guidance and development of individual agency processes for historic preservation, which has led to fragmentation and variations in agency practices (Ramirez and DeGarmo, 1987). Traditional preservation while providing a well defined and selective process suiting the needs of past efforts, has not provided the means for the coordination of the comprehensive preservation efforts of the present.
**Heritage Preservation**

The recent trends in historic preservation reflect a new level of awareness in the preservation and management of historic and cultural resources. Current preservation tactics have shifted to involve a more comprehensive approach, principally, how the parts, (site, structure, and surrounding region) fit together as a composite unit (Johnson and Schene, 1987). Preservation today reflects more than just the physical structure of the elements of a space – of importance today is the preservation of the essential elements which contribute to the quality of a space. In this light, preservation strategies do not simply recreate the past; strategies encompass the preservation of "the sense of place" and the affects of the changing cultural dimensions upon that landscape and region (Lamme, 1989). What is being portrayed is an increased understanding of the complex process of political, social, economic, and technical forces; and the influence of these forces on the history or heritage of a region (NPS, Heritage to Horizons, 1991).

Recent historical and cultural resources which have been preserved at a regional scale have been coined under a variety of names; however, and for the purpose of this research, they will be termed as _heritage preservation projects_. These projects, although widely diversified, share common components in their make-up: regional scale inter-agency cooperation, conservation of resources, education, recreation and economic development (Bolin, 1990; NPS, AIHP, 1991).

Numerous heritage preservation projects are currently ongoing and tend to be geographically located in the Eastern portion of the United States. These projects range in size from a geographic area within a single local community to land areas incorporating several states. Regardless of the size and designation, most efforts incorporate federal, state and local cooperative measures. The projects with significant federal support tend to be the most successful in their
mobilization, however their ongoing success is not always as evident (Eugster, 1992; DiBello, 1991).

**Establishment Process**

Currently, there is no comprehensive framework for the development of these heritage projects. It appears the broad scope and vague designation of heritage projects can be attributed to the relative infancy, limited structure, and grassroots development of these project areas. The terminology, or designated names, associated with these areas are vague and assigned somewhat arbitrarily, according to their physical form and character. A *Heritage Corridor* usually describes a linear land area with a common resource. A *Heritage Park* usually refers to an urban type park with cultural significance. A *Heritage Project* incorporates a large non-linear or unconnected land area with a common resource. All of these designated areas usually combine public and private ownership (Oldham, 1991; Eugster, 1992).

A major focus of heritage preservation efforts is the establishment of regional cohesion through the development of multi-jurisdictional partnerships and cooperative decision-making (Eugster, 1991; NPS, AIHP, 1991). Coordinated efforts for the preservation of historic and cultural resources, natural resource management and economic development are important aspects of the viability and success of a regional heritage project. Cooperative regional relationships, for example, through the establishment of compatible land management practices (land use designation, regulation and management) can play a significant role in the preservation of the resources (Coupe and Fairclough, 1991).

The mobilization of a heritage preservation project often revolves around the basis of this cooperation and collaboration between individuals, groups and organizations (NPS, Coal Fields, 1991). The project becomes a rallying point for
new relationships between multi-jurisdictions through the establishment of a heightened regional sense of place (Thomas and Means, 1991). A description of regional character by Rupert Vance (1968), reveals the underlying element important to the success of heritage preservation projects, "A region is a homogeneous area with physical and cultural characteristics distinct from those of neighboring areas. As a part of a national domain, a region is sufficiently unified to have a consciousness of its customs and ideals and thus possess a sense of identity distinct from the rest of the country" (Hilhorst, 1990, p. 54). Successful heritage projects identify a significant historic theme or themes. These themes provide a focus for the development of a regional identity and the establishment of a "sense of place" through the identification of the elements which contribute to the character of the region.

Public Involvement

Education of the public in terms of the purpose of a heritage project is vital and often developed in three realms. One focus is the dispersement of information and the call for public involvement. Strong local support is critical in the success of a heritage project. Local support and involvement through public participation measures, create a cooperative exchange of information and develop individualized ties to the project (Hargrove, 1991).

The second focus is the education of the public in terms of the history of the area. The growing interest in the history of ethnic cultures: vernacular architectural forms, the history of the everyday lives and the alteration on the landscape by these cultures; plays a significant role in the development of heritage projects. A wealth of information can be obtained from the local public in terms of the past ethnic or cultural history. Incorporating this local knowledge into the project generates valuable information and substantiates
local ties to the project through increased connectedness to the culture and history of the region (NPS, AIHP, 1991).

The third realm is the education of the public in terms of the potential tourism attraction of the region (NPS, Delaware & Lehigh, 1991). Economic development through tourism and the subsequent supporting industries is often incorporated into the conservation planning strategies. Preservation is often viewed as a means to attract the economic benefits of tourism; however, the impacts of tourism have been a principal concern stemming from the development of heritage preservation projects. Along with economic benefits come the impacts of increased commercialization, traffic and use upon sometimes fragile historic areas. Specific measures are often incorporated into the preservation planning process in order to maintain a balance between these extremes. Such measures include the implementation of local planning efforts (for example, design review boards, building codes and regulations, the establishment of historic districts). Often, the development of an association or commission with strong local ties and a well defined purpose is developed. These associations or commissions have a comprehensive focus and provide a means to maintain the balance between resource management, preservation and tourism (Parrish, 1987).

The changing processes and elements of preservation planning reflect a changing perception of what preservation is. This evolution began with a primary focus on the preservation of a single structure or element (traditional historic preservation). The role of preservation has evolved to encompass these elements within a larger context, to include the elements of the site and the intangible elements of the past cultures associated with that location (cultural resource management). This evolution has proceeded to encompass a regional, more comprehensive context, to encompass the preservation of a culture's influence upon a region (heritage preservation).
CHAPTER TWO – METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the methodology, or process, undertaken for the research will be discussed. The discussion will included the rationale for the selection of a case study approach, the selection of the primary cases incorporated into the research and the methods utilized for the collection and analysis of data. Finally, the methods incorporated into the comparative analysis of the primary cases and the comparative analysis of traditional and heritage preservation will be defined.

APPROACH

A case study approach can illuminate an individual or set of processes, events, or decisions. This type of study can help define why such factors were undertaken, how they were implemented and with what result (Yin, 1984). The examination of two innovative regional cultural preservation projects provides a structure in which to compare similarities and differences in their preservation planning approach. These projects were selected to include an early established regional cultural preservation project and a recently established project. This provides the ability to compare the context and cultural preservation planning process within two different time frames. This examination will define components of the process, the context in which they have occurred, and outcomes which have emerged as a result of these efforts. Through further analysis, the role of the National Park Service in this process, changes which have occurred in this process, and key components and issues associated with the preservation planning process are illuminated.
PROCESS

The primary cases selected for the case study are exemplary and innovative projects in which regional preservation is incorporated. As will be established, these projects, at the time of their establishment, were on the forefront of applying new methods and procedures of preservation and management for regional land areas which incorporated historic and cultural preservation components. Two primary cases were selected, a regional land management project which utilizes National Park Service planning and design processes, the Blue Ridge Parkway, and a regional land management project which utilizes current heritage preservation processes, America's Industrial Heritage Project.

The Blue Ridge Parkway (BRP) was selected because it is perceived as an early regional cultural preservation project. It moves beyond the traditional historic preservation focus of the protection and preservation of a single site, to encompass a regional scale focus. Thus in the developed continuum in Chapter Five, it falls as not an example of traditional preservation, but as an example of what could be termed an early heritage preservation project. The Blue Ridge Parkway (BRP) was also selected as a representative of an early project because it incorporates cultural preservation planning measures within the traditional administrative structures of the National Park Service, is regional in scope, and has a long track record for quality planning and design. The Parkway is owned and managed by the National Park Service, but due to its size and designation, preservation planning must respond to a variety of issues both within and outside the designated physical boundaries of the parkway. These issues include the effects of land-use practices, the influence of multi-jurisdictions and agencies on these land-use practices, and the incorporation of public participation into the planning process. Accessibility in terms of the location of the park and to the personnel knowledgeable in the preservation
planning process within the Blue Ridge Parkway, was also a factor considered in the selection of this site for use as a primary case in this research.

America's Industrial Heritage Project (AIHP) was selected because it is determined the largest and most developed heritage preservation project outside the traditional role of ownership and designation by the National Park Service, and it utilizes an administrative structure incorporating cooperative partnership measures. The preservation planning process within the AIHP project must address multi-jurisdictions, land-use designation and management, and the incorporation of public input into the planning process. Accessibility in terms of the location of the park and to the personnel knowledgeable in the preservation planning process was also a factor considered in the selection of this site.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection included the review of related literature, open-ended interviews, a survey administered to key individuals in the planning process, and a systematic analysis of planning and management documents.

The review of related literature was a vital component of the data collection for all aspects of the research. For the larger context, literature review was utilized to examine different aspects of preservation planning and the evolution of preservation planning within the National Park Service. The review of documents and legislation provided the means to examine the affects of legislation and the role the National Park Service has played in this evolution. This review provided a structure in which to place the conclusions generated from the case study analysis. The literature reviewed for the primary cases was also an important means in which to examine the context and components of the primary cases. The application of the information generated from the literature
review was utilized not only to establish the background information and the basic context, but also was incorporated into the final analysis and conclusions.

Open-ended interviews were conducted in order to gather basic information concerning the primary cases. The interviews were conducted of several key people in the administration and involved in the planning and design process of the primary cases. The interviews were conducted in order to define sources of relevant information, provide an overview of the project and the planning process utilized, and to identify individuals knowledgeable in the preservation planning process. The summary of these interviews is included in Appendix B. The information generated from these interviews was utilized in the development of the primary case descriptions, in the development of the survey, and for the identification of the survey respondents. The information provided by the key informants was a valuable tool for the structure and development of this research.

A survey was administered to professionals identified as being knowledgeable and who have participated in the cultural preservation planning process of one of the primary case study projects or in a heritage preservation project. These individuals were identified through the information generated from the open-ended interviews and through the literature and document review. The survey was incorporated as a means to obtain the perspectives of these professionals in terms of the current planning preservation process of a project which was established within a past context and structure (BRP) and a project established within the current context and structure (AIHP and other heritage preservation projects). The survey was not structured to be the primary focus of the research, but as a supplemental source of data collection and analysis pertaining to professionals currently working in the realm of regional cultural preservation.
The survey focused on the methods utilized in the planning process and the effectiveness of the component parts of the planning and design process as perceived by the surveyed professionals. Attitudinal surveys are useful to determine the problems and issues as perceived by members of an organization (Miller, 1978). The analysis of the survey will identify important components for the success of a preservation project and key concerns and issues in the planning process as perceived by professionals in the field. Appendix C contains the survey questionnaire, and Appendix D, the survey codebook. Further detail of the structure of the survey, the procedure for the analysis of data generated from the survey responses and a summary of the results of this analysis are provided in Chapter Six, Survey Results. Appendix E provides the specific data generated from the analysis of the survey responses.

A report analysis was conducted in which the key management and planning documents of both primary cases were examined. The analysis of the reports was conducted through the use of a developed database. The data based primarily served as a means to systematically evaluate the documents through the development of key topics or components for analysis. This analysis provided key information for the comparative analysis of the two primary cases. The information produced from the report analysis is contained in Appendix F.

Descriptions of the primary cases and a focused examination of pertinent topic areas are incorporated into Chapter Five. These topics were selected as a result of the information generated from the interviews, surveys, report analysis and literature review. The topics were then analyzed more specifically within each case in terms of their advantages and disadvantages. The information discussed in this chapter lays the groundwork or basis for the comparative analysis between the two cases discussed in Chapter Seven.
In the final portion of the research methodology, a comprehensive analysis drawing from all the research undertaken is discussed. This section, Chapter Seven, first examines the results of the case comparison. The topic areas illuminated in the case study description (Chapter Five) are utilized for a broad comparative analysis discussed between the two cases. These primary components include the origins of the project, land acquisition and management measures, administration, and the planning process for both cases. This section then examines the significant results of this research and explores the potential applications these results may have to the realm of future preservation planning efforts.
CHAPTER THREE - THE PARK SERVICE AND PRESERVATION

In this chapter, the evolution of the preservation planning process within the context of the National Park Service (NPS) will be examined. First the role of preservation in the National Park Service will be discussed, and then three time periods in a developed evolution will be examined to include a review of key legislation pertaining to preservation planning.

THE ROLE OF CULTURAL PRESERVATION

The charge of the National Park Service is "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" (Jolley, 1987). This charge has led the NPS to be responsible for the protection, interpretation and administration of the country's natural and cultural treasures. As a result of this mandate, the National Park Service has typically been the lead federal agency for historic and cultural preservation efforts (Foresta, 1984; Conservation Foundation, 1985). There are two basic wings within the National Park Service System. The natural wing is responsible for the acquisition, management and interpretation of areas of exceptional and unique natural beauty. The historic wing is responsible for the preservation and interpretation of areas of national historic significance. Within the National Park Service historic preservation can be categorized into two broad realms. One is the direct management of cultural resources under its own jurisdiction and ownership. The second realm is through the sponsorship and coordination of a variety of both government and non-government agencies on behalf of properties which are predominantly privately owned (Grosvenor, 1987).
The perceived core responsibility within the National Park Service has been of the significant natural areas. The historic wing of the National Park Service has traditionally played a secondary role to the purposes and objectives of the natural wing (Foresta, 1984; Mackintosh, 1986; Conservation Foundation, 1985). In 1982, of the 334 units in the National Park system, 194 units, were managed specifically as cultural and historic units. Although the historic and cultural units comprise 57 percent of the total units within the National Park system, they represent only a small percentage of the total land area owned and mandated by the National Park Service (Reid and Humphrey, 1982). Other factors, besides the smaller total acreage of the cultural and historical units, have contributed to the lesser significance of the historic wing. The most significant reason the historic wing is primarily at a disadvantage is due to interagency competition for status and resources. The career ladder is based primarily in the natural wing. Superintendent positions in these parks are viewed as the training ground of top agency management, and most agency personnel are trained in a natural resources profession, for example forestry, natural resources management. Another factor contributing to the greater status of the natural areas results from the influence of outside interest groups for natural resources which tend to be very active and vocal (Foresta, 1984).

However dominant the natural wing over the historic wing, the National Park Service still plays an important role in the preservation of our nation's heritage. An examination of the history and evolution of the National Park Service is important to understand the factors which have affected the type and direction of the preservation planning process. To do this one must look at the various periods in the evolution of the National Park Service, the context of the times, the affects of legislation, and the changes in the planning process and preservation efforts.
THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 1900 – 1950

The National Park Service was first established in 1916, in response to the accumulation of established parks which were under a variety of management arrangements (i.e. Army, Department of Agriculture). Stephen T. Mather was appointed the first director and Horace Albright his assistant. According to Roderick Nash, the establishment of the National Park System depended on four factors: the unique experience with nature in North America, democratic ideals, the vastness of the public domain, and the affluence of the society (Nash, 1970). However, Foresta expands upon this to say that "the system Mather and Albright inherited in 1916, was too disparate in origins to have been invented, it accumulated" (Foresta, 1984, p. 11).

The National Park Service Agency Manual states five long range objectives in its formal expression of agency purpose (Foresta, 1984, p. 15):

1. To conserve and manage for their highest purpose the natural, historical and recreational resources of the National Park system.
2. To provide for the highest quality of use and enjoyment of the National Park system by increased millions of visitors in the years to come.
3. To develop the National Park system through the inclusion of additional areas of scenic, scientific, historical and recreational value to the nation.
4. To communicate the cultural, natural, inspirational and recreational significance of the American heritage as represented to the National Park system.
5. To cooperate with others to protect and perpetuate natural, cultural and recreational resources of local, state, regional and international importance for the benefit of humankind.

In these beginning years outright acquisition and ownership were the preferred way of establishing new parks because it meant a full measure of protection and control in terms of park management (Foresta, 1984; Conservation Foundation, 1985). This reflects the attitudes of Americans towards the land at this time in history - that of dominance and ownership, and of the reverence for the unique and majestic (Foresta, 1984; Jackson, 1979). These very attitudes
however, led to the disregard of the significance of the land areas close by which reflected the cultural and everyday life of society (Lowenthal, 1968).

Historic preservation became more firmly established as an important component in the National Park Service agency goals in the mid 1930's. In 1933, President Roosevelt, issued an executive order to transfer all military historic areas from the War and Agriculture Departments to the National Park Service. These sites, consisting of primarily Civil War sites, significantly increased the number of units in the system at that time (Foresta, 1984; Conservation Foundation, 1985). In 1935, the Historic Sites Act assigned the National Park Service responsibility for a national survey of historic and archeological sites, buildings, and objects. This was to be undertaken in order to identify sites which had significant value as being commemorative of United States history. These sites were to be included into the federal system or for the protection and management by states, local government or individuals in cooperation with the federal government (Ise, 1961; Conservation Foundation, 1984).

These mandates and the inclusion of the historic sites forced the National Park Service to look at management methods other than full acquisition. This is also reflected in the development of the parkways, The Blue Ridge Parkway and the Natchez-Trace Parkway. The National Park Service used less-than-fee acquisition to place restrictions on the use of land bordering the parkways. Restrictions included such things as prohibiting the building of billboards, cutting trees, and construction along the parkway borders (Foresta, 1984).

This era incorporated development planning and the use of acquisition as the primary measure of preservation and management. Historic preservation encompassed the identification and preservation of specific structures and sites. The planning focus moved beyond the boundaries of the Park system and incorporate such control measures as less-than-fee acquisition.
THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 1950 – 1976

Many changes in the perception and structure of historic preservation and the planning process within the National Park Service occurred during this time period. Two key legislative mandates were the primary cause of these changes: The Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which had a major influence on preservation issues, and The National Environmental Protection Act of 1969, which had a major influence on planning issues. The 1972 Plan was an attempt to develop a comprehensive plan for the identification and inclusion of new park systems with a focus on historical themes (Foresta, 1984). The development of the 1972 Plan reflects an effort to move towards standardization. Alternatives to development of new park systems other than traditional full-acquisition measures were established through legislation promoting cooperative intergovernmental measures, and sources of additional appropriations through the establishment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Greenline parks and less-than-fee acquisition were measures incorporated in response to increasing limitations of outright purchase and of the management of park systems by the federal government.

The Historic Preservation Act

The Historic Preservation Act was prompted by the increase in urban commercial development as a result of the great construction boom of the 50’s and 60’s, and the ensuing concern for the destruction of significant historic structures (Foresta, 1984). The Historic Preservation Act established the legal and administrative context within which local historic preservation commissions would relate to and participate in the National Historic Preservation program (Parker, 1987). The policy set forth within the Act was to promote conditions and measures in which historic properties could be preserved in harmony with
modern society (Parker, 1987). The Act established primarily four methods by which to accomplish this mandate: the establishment of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, the establishment of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the establishment of the National Register of Historic Places, which also incorporated a grants-in-aid program (Mackintosh, 1986, Foresta, 1985).

An important aspect of the Historic Preservation Act was the mandate for all federal agencies to seek ways to carry out their activities in accordance with the purposes of the Act, and to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment on any such undertaking. This measure established certain procedures to protect registered sites and buildings from federal or federally assisted undertakings (Foresta, 1985; Parker, 1987).

The National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) had a significant impact on the planning process of all the federal agencies. A general review of the impacts and outcomes on the planning process is necessary to understand the evolution and context of planning within the National Park Service.

The purpose of NEPA was "to declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality" (Randolph, 1985, p. 293). In Section 101 part B, Number 4, the policy mandates that the federal government coordinate plans, functions, programs and resources to "preserve
important historical, cultural and natural aspects of our national heritage and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice" (Randolph, 1987, p. 294).

A component of NEPA mandates that a systematic interpretive approach be utilized to ensure an integrated use of the natural and social sciences and environmental design arts in the decision-making process. This component led to the incorporation of the rational-comprehensive planning approach within the National Park Service, which incorporates five basic steps. The first step includes the identification of issues, concerns, resource opportunities and overall objectives. Two, the collection and analysis of information. Step three, the formulation of alternatives. Four, the assessment of the impacts of all the alternatives. Finally, step five, the evaluation of alternatives and the selection of a preferred plan (Randolph, 1985).

A requirement of NEPA is the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) applied to all federal agency actions which have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. The EIS provides a means by which the impacts of a proposed action (for example, effects of a management plan on resources, project development actions) would be communicated and evaluated by other agencies, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the general public (Randolph, 1985). In the National Park Service, environmental information and public participation methods were incorporated early in the process to allow public input even prior to the draft EIS (DeFranceaux, 1987).

In 1979, new regulations for NEPA and the EIS process were put into place by the Council on Environmental Quality. These regulations were in response to the previous incorporation of EIS late into the planning process, often only taken into consideration for the proposed action. The regulations changed the EIS process to include and earlier "scoping" phase, and for the EIS process to
become easier for the agencies to incorporate into their planning process. The scoping process was established to uncover issues, concerns and the identification of interested parties early in the planning process. The Park Service incorporates an Environmental Assessment into the process to determine if an EIS is required. If it is determined that one is not, a Finding of No Significant Impact is filed and the Environment Assessment is incorporated into the General Management Plan (Randolph, 1987).

NEPA assisted in the transition from a development planning approach to a comprehensive planning and multi-disciplinary team approach within the National Park Service. The transition affected the components of the Master Plan from the inclusion of primarily development projects, to the inclusion of concepts for park administration, resources management and visitor use (DeFranceaux, 1987).

The 1972 Plan

The 1972 Plan was developed as a comprehensive plan for the identification of gaps in the representation of historic and ecological themes within the National Park System and to provide guidelines for inclusion of new systems. The plan incorporated a comprehensive categorical approach to the establishment of a framework which included the history of man on the North American continent. This framework included nine major themes, and 43 sub-themes which were broken down even further into sub-categories of "facets" (Foresta, 1985).

The 1972 Plan did more to initiate imaginations as to what the park system might include rather than serve as guidelines, or limitations, for future expansion in the park system. The Plan incorporated goals which were narrower than the historic goals of the system and did not include elements of land
conservation. As a result of these limitations, the 1972 Plan had limited influence on the process for the identification and selection of new park areas during this era (Conservation Foundation, 1985). However, the 1972 Plan illustrates an attempt to identify historic themes and to develop guidelines for the inclusion of new systems into the National Park system.

**Denver Service Center and Harper's Ferry Center**

The Denver Service Center and Harper's Ferry Center were established in the early 1970's to provide specialized technical and professional expertise to all units in the National Park System. The Denver Service Center was established to provide design, planning and construction expertise through consultant architects, engineers, historians, landscape architects, planners and other professional personnel. The planning approach is fairly segmented between the design, the planning, and the construction phases. Harper's Ferry Center was established to provide interpretive expertise to all parks in the system (Conservation Foundation, 1985).

**Park Land Acquisition Measures**

The early parks were established through setting aside areas of National Forest, donations of state lands, or the purchase and donations of wealthy philanthropists, such as the Rockefellers. These measures could no longer be reliable by the 1960's and alternatives had to be sought. These alternative methods included full-acquisition through the use of funding established through legislation which promoted intergovernmental cooperative measures, less-than-fee acquisition, and the establishment of greenline parks.
Legislative Measures

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) was established in 1964, primarily to enable the National Park Service and other federal land managing agencies a means in which to acquire recreational land from private owners. This fund has had considerable impact on park appropriations. Funding from the LWCF over the past 20 years has averaged 25% of the Park Service's total appropriations. By the end of 1983, over 1.9 billion had been utilized to acquire 1.5 million acres of land for national parks (Foresta, 1984).

In 1968, the Wild and Scenic Rivers System and the National Trail system were established. The Wild and Scenic Rivers System incorporates three categories of rivers: wild, scenic and recreational, managed under the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture. The river can be owned by state and local governments and at times can be managed in part with the federal government (Conservation Foundation, 1985). The National Trail Systems Act encouraged intergovernmental cooperation between federal, state and local agencies for the establishment and preservation of scenic trail systems under federal, state or local ownership. The primary goal is to preserve the natural setting and develop protection from incompatible development.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has led to opportunities for the provision of additional funding sources and land acquisition measures. Acquisition of large land areas has become increasing difficult and because of these difficulties the LWCF has provided a crucial means to acquire public land, often regional in scope. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act established measures for cooperative partnership management of regional resources. These partnership measures are playing an increasing role in regional scale land management.
Greenline Parks

A summary statement on greenline parks and less-than-fee acquisition is important to include due to their influence in this era and their potential influence and application to heritage preservation planning. Greenline parks and less-than-fee acquisition are two alternatives to out-right and complete ownership of parks within the National Park System.

Greenline parks utilize regional planning efforts as a means to establish new parks where traditional parks were inappropriate or difficult to establish (Foresta, 1984). Greenline parks stem from a British concept of efforts to "preserve areas of the countryside which contain scenic, recreational or cultural resources and are almost totally privately owned" (Melnick, 1984, p. 56). Local boards regulate private land use, negotiate public access agreements, and acquire lands for public facilities. This concept allowed for the protection of major landscapes without high costs of land acquisition and the displacement of existing significant residential communities and economic activities (Conservation Foundation, 1985).

Greenline parks incorporated the determination of the level of protection necessary against future incompatible uses of land areas, the establishment of public access, cooperation between the various levels of governments and the general public, and the development of a complex management system (Conservation Foundation, 1985). Intergovernmental cooperation was incorporated in the overall planning, yet allowed for each level - federal, state and local, to maintain their own distinct responsibilities (Foresta, 1984). The hesitations for the implementation of the greenline park process stemmed from concerns related to inadequate management and the potential of legal complications (Conservation Foundation, 1985).
Greenline parks illustrate a move towards the inclusion of both public and private land areas in order to obtain a regional park system. These areas led to increased development of intergovernmental cooperation in order to designate and regulate the park area. Planning efforts play a significant role in the development of a Greenline park system and both the positive and negative aspects of Grenline Park development should be incorporated into future regional planning efforts.

Less-Than-Fee Acquisition

The use of less-than-fee acquisition continued to be utilized for the establishment of new park systems. In 1968, the National Park Service had 10,000 acres of land under less-than-fee rights, by 1981, it had increased to 63,000 acres. Even with this increase in land under less-than-fee acquisition, this amount comes to less than 1% of that which is owned outright by the National Park Service (Foresta, 1984).

Less-than-fee was seen as a method to reduce the cost of land acquisition and a means to eliminate some of the problems of outright condemnation of private property. However, the costs and problems associated with less-than-fee influenced the "rational" to remain with the known and developed measure of full-acquisition. Often there was ambiguity as to what land was incorporated into the less-than-fee acquisition and what restrictions had been placed upon that land. This problem was often exemplified with the change of ownership. The costs saved from less-than-fee acquisition were often lost on legal battles and costs of enforcement for the acquisition rights (Foresta, 1984).

The perceived advantages and disadvantages of less-than-fee can play a significant role in future application of this method of land acquisition. The factor which appears to contribute to the greatest complications stems from
limited public knowledge and understanding of the terms incorporated into less-than-fee measures. Increased public involvement and participation in the planning process may lead to the potential for greater affectiveness and positive outcomes of this land acquisition measure.

**Summary**

During this time period, 1950 - 1975, many changes were made in terms of the planning and preservation process within the National Park Service. Legislation - NEPA and the Historic Preservation Act, were a primary influence. Planning procedures involved a more detailed and comprehensive process with a significant focus on environmental impacts and public participation in the process. Preservation measures also became more defined, primarily still focusing on specific structures instead of a holistic approach. Land acquisition measures swayed even further from outright full-acquisition to increased implementation of alternative methods such as less-than-fee and greenline parks. Preservation efforts moved beyond simply protection of historic resources from impacting development to protection of these historic resources from encroaching or threatening development.
THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 1976 - 1992

This era reflected an increased need to define the role of historic preservation and the measures and procedures undertaken in this process at both the federal, state, and local levels. The role of the National Park Service continued to shift from the application of expertise in historic preservation and planning for federally owned and designated National Parks, to areas outside the National Park Service jurisdiction. Significant events of this era include the establishment and abolition of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, the establishment of significant planning procedures, and amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act. During this time period heritage preservation emerged. For the purposes of this research, the evolution of heritage preservation planning and the role of the National Park Service will be examined more closely in the following section.

Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service

The Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS) was established in 1978, to "serve as the focal point within the federal government for planning, evaluation and coordination of the protection and preservation of the nation's cultural and natural heritage, and for assuring adequate recreational opportunities for all of its people" (Mackintosh, 1986, p. 14). The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was reconstituted as the HCRS with the addition of the transfer of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP) and the National Historic Landmarks Program from the National Park Service.

The HCRS was not successful at accomplishing its purpose due to problems within the administration and organization, and the domination of outdoor recreation interest brought over by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (Mackintosh, 1986). Also, the reorganization of the HCRS may have created
further confusion because many government branches continued with their historic preservation functions as they had been prior to the establishment of HCRS (Hosmer, 1987). In January of 1981, and the end of the Carter administration, the HCRS was abolished, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was added and the OAHP returned to the National Park Service (Mackintosh, 1986).

The status of the agencies incorporated into the HCRS in 1986, were the Interagency Resource Management Division (including the National Register, State Plans and Grants, and Interagency Architectural Services), the HABS/HAER Division (Division of Historic American Buildings Survey and Historic American Engineering Record), and the Preservation Assistance Division.

The HCRS illustrates an attempt to establish a separate division for historic and cultural preservation efforts. This attempt was focused upon the perceived need to interegrate preservation efforts even within federal government offices. Although the HCRS was not successful in achieving its purpose at this time period, the need for a centralized agency focused upon preservation efforts is still evident.

Planning Regulations

Various planning regulations and guidelines were initiated during this era. The General Management Plan is the comprehensive management plan incorporated into the planning process of the National Park Service units. Public participation is an important component and often incorporated early into the process. Cultural resource identification, preservation and management was incorporated into the preservation planning process through the development of comprehensive standards for cultural resource management. Finally, guidelines and standards were developed for the preservation planning process through the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Preservation Planning.
General Management Plans

The National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978, mandated the development of General Management Plans for the preservation and use of each unit within the National Park Service. The General Management Plan was developed to provide specific guidelines for the preservation, use and development as a means to achieve the stated purpose of the park systems. The planning process incorporated into the General Management Plan is detailed in document NPS-2. The basic stages incorporated into this process include the development of the Statement for Management (SFM), followed by the Outline of Planning Requirements (OPM), and then the General Management Plan (GMP).

This planning process includes the rational comprehensive approach and the further inclusion of incremental stages. The first document incorporated into this process is the Statement for Management (SFM). This document is an inventory and analysis of current park management practices and major issues which need to be addressed. The SFM also contains a general statement of management objectives for the individual park system.

The Outline of Planning Requirements (OPR) follows the Statement for Management. The OPR contains a "priority listing of studies and surveys needed to establish the information base for planning and compliance and the plans and design needed for the park" (DeFranceaux, 1987, p. 15). The OPR also serves as a justification for funding to accomplish specific tasks within a 5-year period. The OPR is to be updated yearly by the superintendent of each park. A task directive is then prepared once a task is programmed. This directive specifies details and requirements, i.e. scope, methods, personnel, schedule of work and costs (Melnick, 1984).

The General Management Plan is the major planning document which sets forth the basic policies and philosophies of the parks and provides strategies
for the achievement and identification of management objectives and for resolving any identified issues (DeFranceaux, 1987). The General Management Plan is to include several components. First, the purpose and need for the plan in which basic planning issues, the purpose of the park, management objectives and legislative mandates are detailed. Secondly, management zoning is incorporated in which prescribed land classifications are utilized to determine management and use for designated areas. The third component, a proposal, includes: "interrelated proposals for preservation of resources, land protection, interpretation, visitor use, carrying capacities, park operations and a general indication of location, size, capacity and function of physical developments" (DeFranceaux, 1987, p. 15).

Alternatives to the proposal must be included in which different management approaches to obtain the stated purpose are explored. A "no action" and a "minimum requirements" alternative must be a component of the alternatives section. This reflects back to NEPA requirements of no action alternatives (Randolph, 1987). A Plan implementation schedule and cost estimates are components which must also be included in the GMP (DeFranceaux, 1987).

Additional requirements and associated planning documents may be required for certain situations. These documents are generally for topics discussed in broad terms in the GMP, and more detailed implementation plans are necessary (DeFranceaux, 1987). A development concept plan is incorporated for more comprehensive planning efforts and provides a step between the GMP and comprehensive design (Melnick, 1984). Land protection plans are developed to identify methods for protection of park lands which are not owned or directly administered by the National Park Service. Other types of plans include: resource management plans, interpretive prospectus, wilderness plans, minerals, management, and backcountry management plans (DeFranceaux, 1987).
Public Participation

Public participation is an important component of the planning process. The National Park Service has initiated innovative measures such as workshops and an "Alternatives Workbook". Workshops are incorporated early into the process in order to gain public perceptions of issues and concerns in relation to the park. The Alternatives Workbook obtains information from public participants who want to be a part of the planning process. The workbook provides public input for the formulation of alternatives (Randolph, 1987). Other public participation measures are incorporated into all draft GMP's which incorporate a draft for review and comment from the general public. Typically, public participation has the greatest level of input in the process when there is a high level of interest or controversy surrounding the park system (DeFranceaux, 1987).

Cultural Resource Management

Cultural resource management emerged during this era as a fusion between traditional historic preservation and the expanded responsibilities of resource stewardship. In 1971, Executive Order 11593, "Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment", mandated federal agencies to inventory architectural and historical resources under their jurisdiction. In 1980, a policy guideline for cultural resource management within the National Park Service, NPS-28, was established to develop comprehensive professional standards for all National Park Service cultural resource management responsibilities (Johnson, 1987). These standards incorporate inventories of cultural resources, determination of significance for qualification of preservation, preservation measures and the interpretation of resources (Melnick, 1984).
The establishment of cultural resource management illustrates the move beyond historic preservation and the incorporation of cultural aspects and the influence of these aspects upon the environment. Also illustrated in this trend is the realization that not only the historic structure or artifact is of importance, but also the context or setting is significant in order to truly preserve the cultural influence. An increased realization emerged for the need to recognize, identify and preserve historic and cultural aspects for future generations.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Preservation Planning

The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Preservation Planning of 1983, established guidelines for the preservation planning process to include the establishment of goals and standards for the identification, evaluation and registration of historic properties (NPS, Federal Register, 1983). The establishment of "historic contexts" is incorporated as a basic step within the planning process. The historic context takes into account not only the historic properties, but also the influence of the cultural history on the patterns of development in the investigated area. Detailed recommendations are prescribed for public participation in order to gain increased information on the local perspective of the cultural history (Parker and King, 1990).

These guidelines reflect trends towards a more specific, detailed process for historic preservation. This process is often termed confusing and cumbersome, creating a barrier to what is trying to be accomplished.
Historic Preservation Act Amendments

The 1980 Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act established two primary objectives: first, increased measures for the inclusion of state and local communication in historic preservation planning; and, second, the inclusion of cultural heritage measures in the preservation process. Increased measures in which local historic preservation commissions relate to and participate in the National Historic Preservation Program were established through the increased development of State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO), Certified Local Governments (CLG) and Federal Historic Preservation Officers (FHP). (Parker, 1987).

The State Historic Preservation Officers are state officials who administer at the state level, the National Historic Preservation Program. The main responsibilities of the SHPO include: development of a statewide plan for preservation, the identification of historic properties through the survey and nomination of properties to the National Register, provision of technical assistance to federal, state, and local agencies and the general public, participation in federal undertakings associated with historic properties, and assistance to local governments in the certification process (Parker, 1987).

Certified Local Governments are local governments with historic preservation programs which meet prescribed standards. The certification permits eligibility for special grants-in-aid and technical assistance from the SHPO. At least ten percent of the annual historic preservation fund is distributed to these Certified Local Governments (Parker, 1987).

The Federal Historic Preservation Officers' duties include the coordination of historic preservation activities, the administration of these activities in accordance to the Historic Preservation Act, the identification of historic properties under their jurisdiction, the consideration of planning
actions which may affect these properties, to allow for comment by the Advisory Council on these actions, and the documentation of historic properties which cannot be preserved (Parker, 1987).

The 1992 Amendments to the Historic Preservation Act reflect an even stronger move towards the importance of preservation and the need to develop programs which provide technical assistance. One of the key elements of the 1992 Amendments is the mandate for the development of a preservation professional center in Natchitoches, Louisiana. This center will provide professional expertise similar to that of the Denver Service Center and Harper's Ferry, although in the realm of preservation efforts.

This time period, 1976 - 1992, incorporated further development and refinement of planning and preservation measures. The National Park Service implements the development of General Management Plans for all park systems. This planning process incorporates a rational comprehensive approach, incremental measures and a developed public participation process. The Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act increased measures for participation from the local community with the implementation of State Historic Preservation Officers and Certified Local Governments. The 1992 Amendments reflect the increased importance of the distribution of professional expertise for preservation planning efforts.
CHAPTER FOUR – HERITAGE PRESERVATION PLANNING

Heritage preservation planning has evolved over the past several decades from traditional methods of historic preservation. An examination of the role of the National Park Service and of several state governments in heritage preservation planning will be reviewed in this section. This section will also include the examination of supplementary cases to illuminate an evolution of preservation planning efforts.

HERITAGE PRESERVATION PLANNING AND THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Park Service has been affiliated as either a consultant or lead agency in the development of most Heritage projects. This involvement has been reflected in the NPS, 75th Anniversary Symposium, "Our National Parks: Challenges and Strategies for the 21st Century". In this symposium, the National Park Service identified the need for the development of multi-jurisdictional partnerships for the establishment and protection of natural and cultural resources. Their recommendations to begin the development of these partnerships fall into several categories.

The National Park Service recognizes the need to address the fostering of a new grass roots planning process to identify the places of America's heritage the public wants to save. The establishment of categories for these preserved areas is seen as necessary; one such proposed designation is that of American Heritage Areas (AHA). In the AHA designation, the Park Service would "enter into partnerships with state and local government to conserve specific areas without long-term federal involvement" (NPS, 75th Anniversary Symposium, 1991).
The National Park Service also sees the need for the development of local, regional and national constituencies which would be utilized to identify park resources and help limit adverse impacts of external factors. This is seen as being achieved through better documentation and prioritization of trans-boundary problems and the development of management plans to address these issues. These management plans would include resource management goals which would then be coordinated through regional land use planning efforts (Conservation Foundation, 1985).

STATE HERITAGE PRESERVATION PROGRAMS

Currently five states have developed heritage preservation planning regulations: Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Texas. While the process and terminology differ, they all promote preservation and enhancement of cultural, historical, recreation, natural and economic resources (Kees, 1992).

The Massachusetts Heritage Parks Program was the first program to be established. This Heritage Parks Program was established as a means to conserve and promote cultural and historic resources of declining cities. Economic development, the establishment of community cohesion and awareness of the history of the region are primary objectives of the program (Eugster and Gibson, 1990).

The New York Program, originated in 1977, established a cooperative intergovernmental program termed Urban Cultural Parks. Local leadership and consensus is built into the planning process and the fostering of partnerships. Goals for these urban parks encompass preservation, recreation, education and economic development (Kees, 1992). New York State plays a lessor role in the heritage parks process than does Massachusetts (Eugster and Gibson, 1990).
Two primary roles of the state are funding, some of which is delegated towards the development of a visitor center established as a focal point of each park, and the adoption of management plans at the state level (Kees, 1992).

The Pennsylvania State Heritage Parks Program was established in 1989. The focus of this program is to highlight regions of Pennsylvania which reflect cultural, historical and recreational resources of industrial traditions. Intergovernmental cooperation and regional planning strategies are incorporated into the process. The five primary goals of the Pennsylvania Heritage Parks Program are: economic development, intergovernmental cooperation, cultural conservation, recreation and education (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1990).

The Pennsylvania Heritage Parks Program is basically a three step process. First, a region must conduct a Feasibility Study of the potential development and preservation of the resources in terms of the goals and objectives of the State Heritage Parks Program. Secondly, the Feasibility Study is reviewed by the Department of Community Affairs and the State Heritage Park Interagency Task Force. If the Feasibility Study is approved, it will enable the region to be designated as a Pennsylvania Heritage Park Planning Area and the potential to apply for a Management Action Plan project grant. Federally designated heritage projects automatically qualify for this designation. In the third stage of the process, upon the completion and acceptance of the Management Plan, the region is designated a Pennsylvania State Heritage Park. This designation permits the region to compete for funds for Special Purpose Study projects and Implementation projects. Currently within the State Heritage Parks Program there are two Feasibility Study Project Areas, four State Heritage Park Planning Areas, and two State Heritage Parks.
A CHRONOLOGY OF SELECTED PRESERVATION PLANNING EFFORTS

A brief review of selected regional cultural preservation planning projects with a significant federal presence will provide an illustration of the evolution of heritage preservation planning. The early projects, while not termed as true heritage preservation projects, contain components which have influenced current heritage preservation projects. These supplementary case reviews will provide a context for the review of the two primary cases in this research, The Blue Ridge Parkway and America's Industrial Heritage Project, which will be further examined in Chapter Five.

The Blue Ridge Parkway – 1936

The Blue Ridge Parkway, established in 1936, was developed to provide a scenic, recreational drive connecting Shenandoah National Park to Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The Parkway, located in the states of Virginia and North Carolina, necessitated the need for cooperative measures between federal and state governments in its establishment, primarily the National Park Service, the Bureau of Roads, and the State Department of Highways (Jolley, 1969).

The Blue Ridge Parkway incorporated scenic easements (less-than-fee) and full-fee acquisition in terms of land acquisition and management, moving away from the traditional purely full-acquisition measures undertaken in the development of past park systems (Conservation Foundation, 1985). The Blue Ridge Parkway reflects a regional preservation effort with multi-government cooperative involvement, and the incorporation of acquisition and management techniques beyond full-acquisition (Foresta, 1984). The Blue Ridge Parkway can be viewed as one of the first efforts to move beyond the boundaries of traditional National Park Service efforts and will be utilized as a primary case for a more detailed examination in Chapter Five.
Cape Cod National Seashore – 1961

Cape Cod National Seashore, located in Massachusetts, was established in 1961. Cape Cod was not the first seashore established, nor the first park to incorporate the purchase of private property; however, in Cape Cod, the purpose was not to pursue an eventual elimination of the inholding as had been done in past projects. The developed areas within the park were accepted as permanent features of the park (Foresta, 1984). A congressionally established advisory commission was created in order to establish partnerships between the Department of the Interior, local governments and private land owners. Compatible zoning ordinances were formulated and controlled by this commission, and if followed, the condemnations of inholding by the federal government was prohibited (Conservation Foundation, 1985).

The National Park Service still played the primary role in the acquisition and management of the park area, although now the role of local government and private landowners had become more significant. The methods utilized here became known as the "Cape Cod Formula", reflecting the impact and change from the traditional park acquisition and management methods (Conservation Foundation, 1985; Foresta, 1984).

Ebeys Landing National Historic Reserve – 1978

Ebeys Landing National Historic Reserve, located in Washington State, was authorized in 1978, for the preservation and protection of a rural community representative of 19th century exploration and settlement of the Puget Sound region (NPS, Ebeys Landing, 1984). Ebeys Landing incorporated little full-acquisition measures and pursued a cooperative approach to educate and establish necessary land management techniques (O'Donnell, 1992). Detailed analysis and documentation of the resources and patterns within the reserve
were undertaken. Cooperative efforts and communication between the National Park Service and the local public were utilized to develop land regulatory measures (for example, covenants and easements), and to provide guidance and education as to the importance and the interpretative qualities of the resources (NPS, Ebey's Landing, 1984). Ebey's Landing reflects a shift from the traditional National Park Service role of designation and management of an area through a dominant presence to a less dominant presence and the role of facilitator, advisor, and advocate.

**Lowell National Historic Park - 1978**

The Lowell National Historic Park in Massachusetts was authorized in 1978, as a unit in the National Park system in order to preserve and interpret an early industrial revolution site. Several of the industrial buildings were purchased by the National Park Service, however most of the land remained in private ownership (Foresta, 1984). The interface of historic preservation and economic development was a significant component in the development of the goals and objectives of Lowell. Lowell National Historic Park is also a part of the Massachusetts State Heritage Park Program.

The Lowell project was adamantly promoted and supported by senators and congressmen of the region. This support was a significant influence on the establishment of a congressionally appointed advisory commission. The main function of the commission is guide cooperative measures between federal, state and local agencies and the general public in the establishment and management of Lowell National Historic Park (Foresta, 1984; Eugster and Gibson, 1990). The role of the commission is also to promote and administer funding, develop and implement guidelines and standards, and develop interpretive programs for the historic and cultural resources of the region (Eugster and Gibson, 1990; Lane,

Lowell also reflects the potential interactive role historic preservation and economic development can play through what will become known as *heritage tourism*. The affects of political support, sometimes deemed positive, sometimes negative, and the influence of political backing on the successful mobilization of a project are exemplified in the case of Lowell.

**The Illinois and Michigan National Heritage Corridor – 1984**

The Illinois and Michigan National Heritage Corridor (I & M), established in 1984, was the first designated National Heritage Corridor. The I & M incorporates a regional, multi-jurisdictional, intergovernmental effort to preserve, enhance, and interpret the history, culture, natural, recreational, and economic resources of the corridor (Bolin, 1990). The legislation which established the corridor was drafted by the local public with assistance from Illinois congressional staff. A commission was established through this legislation to coordinate efforts between federal, state and local agencies, business and industry of the region. A private sector organization was formed to bring more focus of an economic development perspective to the project (Bolin, 1990).

The I & M illustrates similar characteristics of the Lowell Project: a congressionally established commission, intergovernmental cooperative measures, strong congressional support, and the inter-related roles of historic preservation and economic development via tourism. The I & M incorporates these efforts on a larger scale, the geographic nature of the corridor in itself demanding multi-jurisdictional efforts. Incorporated into the mission statement of the Corridor are natural, recreational and cultural elements, which take the realm of the goals for development and implementation of a project not only to a larger scale, but to a broader scope.
America's Industrial Heritage Project - 1988

America's Industrial Heritage Project (AIHP), located in Southwest Pennsylvania and encompassing nine counties, began primarily with the 1985, Reconnaissance Survey of Resources, conducted by the National Park Service. In 1988, the Southwest Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission was established to promote the mission of the AIHP project. The goals established for this project incorporate: one, the preservation, enhancement and interpretation of the historical, cultural, and natural resources related to the industrial and transportation industries of this region; and two, the promotion of heritage tourism for these historic resources and for the scenic, natural, and recreational resources within the project area (NPS, AIHP, 1991). The AIHP project places a significant focus on the establishment and development of cooperative partnership and the importance of local support and input into the planning and development of the project (NPS, AIHP, 1991).

The AIHP incorporates similar characteristics of the Illinois and Michigan Corridor: a congressional established commission, multi-jurisdictions and intergovernmental measures, strong congressional support and the goals of the preservation and enhancement of cultural, natural, historic, recreational and economic resources of the region. The AIHP, however, is not a component of the National Park system as are all the other projects which have been incorporated as supplementary case examples in this evolution of heritage preservation planning efforts. Specific areas within the AIHP project area are National Park sites, but as a whole the AIHP has been established and designated as a separate identity. The role of the National Park Service changes dramatically in this case example. The AIHP is the second primary case to be examined in Chapter Five due to the innovative approach taken in its development and administration, and the successful application of the heritage preservation planning process.
CHAPTER FIVE - CASE DESCRIPTION

Chapter five will examine the two primary cases, the Blue Ridge Parkway and America’s Industrial Heritage Project. This examination will include a brief history of the project, factors relating to its establishment, a description of the administrative structure, and components of the planning process. Information gathered from the open-ended interviews, report analysis, survey and literature review will provide the basis for this examination.

THE BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY

The Blue Ridge Parkway was established in the early to mid 1930’s as a National Parkway connecting Shenandoah National Park and the Great Smokies. The purpose of the parkway is not only to link these two national parks, and also provide a recreational motoring highway which will preserve and interpret the natural and cultural resources of the Southern Appalachian Highlands (NPS, BRP, 1989; Jolley, 1969). The Blue Ridge Parkway is located in the states of Virginia and North Carolina, and passes through 29 counties and six congressional districts. Along its 469-mile length, the Parkway encompasses 87,530.56 acres of land (as of 1987) (NPS, BRP, 1989). The Blue Ridge Parkway has been viewed as a pioneer project. At the time of the Parkway establishment, there were few precedents to follow for a project which encompassed the scale and the issues as those undertaken in the Blue Ridge Parkway.

There are five areas of federally owned land adjacent to the Parkway, four National Forests (George Washington, Jefferson, Nantahala, and Pisgah) and The Cherokee Indian Reservation. In terms of state land there two areas with lands adjacent to the parkway lands, Stone Mountain State Park and Thurmond Chatham Wildlife Management Area, both located in North Carolina. There are
three other state parks within close vicinity to the Parkway, Fairy Stone State Park in Virginia, and Mt. Jefferson State Park and Mt. Mitchell State Park in North Carolina. There are approximately 4,000 to 5,000 adjacent parcels of private land (NPS, BRP, 1989).

There are 21 primary sites located along the parkway. These sites have been preserved and established for the local, regional and/or national significance of their natural, historic, and cultural resources. There are eleven areas along the Parkway which have been identified to contain significant natural resources. The cultural resources along the Parkway can be categorized into three broad themes. The most prevalent of these themes is the Southern Appalachian folklife and related artifacts and structures. A second theme is that of transportation – Indian routes, wagon trails, canals, and railroad, which occurred throughout the region’s history. The final theme includes the history and present aspects of the actual planning, development, construction and maintenance incorporated into the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Origins

Parkways had their origin in the early 20's in primarily county and municipal undertakings. Westchester County Parkway in New York, was the primary model from which many other parkways developed, for example, Colonial, George Washington Memorial, Natchez-Trace, Garden State. These projects were all aimed to provide a leisurely motorway in which the preservation of natural and scenic resources could be interpreted and enjoyed by the recreational motorist (Jolley, 1969). A National Parkway, such as the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Natchez-Trace, are federally owned elongated roads which provide recreational enjoyment through the interpretation and preservation of natural,
historical, and cultural resources of a national significance (NPS, BRP, 1939).

Three potential means for establishing the Blue Ridge Parkway were considered. One, the formation of a private non-profit commission which would build a toll road and turn it over to the State governments for management; two, the creation of a public body eligible for federal aid and who could charge toll fees to aid in construction and maintenance costs; or three, the adoption of the project by the federal government. The National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, permitted the selection and implementation of the last option. This act, initiated primarily as an anti-depression, make-work effort, authorized the Public Works Administrator to prepare a comprehensive program for the development and improvement of public roads and parkways (Jolley, 1969).

In the development of the Blue Ridge Parkway, several factors were in place: Shenandoah National Park and the Great Smokies had just been completed and were highly visible; the first CCC camp (Civilian Conservation Corp) had been was located in Shenandoah Valley, Virginia, and the use of make-work projects generated as a result of the Great Depression were well-known and had been implemented in the region. North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee were all extremely interested in the development of the Parkway in the view that it could provide beneficial economic development opportunities through tourism (Jolley, 1969).

The assignment of the Blue Ridge Parkway project to the National Park Service proved significant in the outcome of the parkway. The standards of the parkway had to meet the high quality standards of the National Park Service rather than minimal standards of ordinary highways. Also, both the National Park Service and the Public Works Program were under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, which allowed for easier coordination between the various agencies (Jolley, 1987).
The three major influences on the designation of the parkway boundaries included political factors, the opportunity to take advantage of scenic resources, and the desire to implement a route which would incorporate low impact design in order to better preserve the natural and cultural resources. In terms of this last component, the outcomes of the Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park played a role the importance of low impact design. In the development of Shenandoah National Park, the homeowners were evacuated and structures were removed; therefore, much of the cultural influence on the land was also removed. The identity and context of the landscape was severely altered. The lessons learned from this issue, and concerns for potential negative environmental impacts of parkway development, were a primary influence on the final roadway placement of the Parkway. The roadway was located to minimize displacement of homeowners, and placed so that it would be visually unobtrusive while still providing ample scenic vistas. The roadway was also located so that cut and fill would be minimal; where it occurred the cut or fill would be used for beneficial purposes, for example, a roadway overlook (Jolley, 1987).

There were major disputes concerning the designation and location of the Parkway. These disputes stemmed primarily from political realms and the desire of the three states to obtain as large a section of the parkway route as possible. The primary dispute was whether the parkway route should pass through sections of Tennessee or North Carolina as it reached the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The debate was very involved and long-lasting, however the outcome was that the parkway would pass through North Carolina. The primary reasons were stated to be that the North Carolina route was more scenic, the route would provide an alternative access to the Smokies (the other well-established entrance was in Gatlinburg, Tennessee), and the substantial amount of the Pisgah National Forest along the North Carolina route eliminated some of
the right-of-way land acquisition problems (Jolley, 1969). Table 5-1 provides a summary of the key components related to the origins of the Blue Ridge Parkway and incorporates statements regarding potential advantages and disadvantages of these approaches.

**Land Acquisition and Management**

The Parkway is coined "a model for cooperative land-use planning between the States and the Federal Government" in the 1989, Statement for Management (NPS, BRP, 1989, p. 5). The Parkway provides a means to establish regional identity and a common rallying point in which to understand the land as a community instead of as a commodity. In this capacity it can provide the opportunity for regional cooperative management of Parkway resources.

In planning for the development of the parkway, it was agreed that the states would purchase, or through other means, procure the land which was needed for the development of the parkway. The measures taken are reflected in the current ownership of parkway and adjacent lands. As of 1987, of the total Parkway acreage, 87.2% is under total fee with NPS, .1% is under total fee USFS, 2.3% less-than-fee, 9.7% non-federal, and .7% other public ownership (NPS, BRP, 1989).

There were several land acquisition methods, right-of-way (full-fee acquisition) and scenic easement (less-than-fee acquisition), incorporated into parkway management. A right of way was obtained of one hundred acres per mile in fee simple acquisition. This means that the land was obtained by process of outright purchase or condemnation, and legal title belongs to the Parkway. Fifty acres of scenic easement control were added to the hundred acres per mile. In this case, the use of the land is directed by the Blue Ridge Parkway, but the land still belongs to the original owner. An average
width for a right of way strip was set at one thousand feet and allowed to be no less than two hundred feet along the parkway length. The use of right-of-way had been used frequently in the past and was well understood; however, scenic easements and the restrictions associated with this less-than-fee acquisition method were not well understood. At the time of parkway designation, private landowners were anxious to grant these rights to the Blue Ridge Parkway in order to obtain parkway frontage (Jolley, 1969). As time progressed, the scenic easement rights created difficulties due to disputes over the rights of the landowners, particularly as the ownership of the land changed hands.

The Agricultural Land Use program of the parkway permits lands to be leased to adjacent landowners to for agricultural purposes. This program not only provided the scenic benefits, but also, through provision of materials and education in sound agricultural practices has enhanced the agricultural practices of some of the adjacent park lands (Jolley, 1987). Table 5–2 provides a summary of the key components related to the land acquisition and management of the Blue Ridge Parkway and incorporates statements regarding potential advantages and disadvantages of these approaches.

**Administration**

The Blue Ridge Parkway is administered under the traditional National Park Service system. The main headquarters for the Parkway are located in Asheville, North Carolina, and a regional office in Roanoke, was created for the development of the Roanoke River Parkway extension. The administrative structure follows that of most parks: the Secretary of the Interior, Washington Offices, Regional Offices, Superintendent of the Park, park personnel. The Denver Service Center provides technical expertise in the realms of planning, design and construction. Harper's Ferry Center provides technical assistance in
terms of interpretive programming (Foresta, 1984).

A variety of agencies were involved in the development of the Blue Ridge Parkway. Federal agencies included: National Park Service (offices in Washington, Roanoke and Richmond), the Bureau of Public Roads (Washington office and two field offices), the Forest Service (three divisions), the Cherokee Indian Agency, the Veteran Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Public Works Administration, and the Civilian Public Service Administration. In terms of state agencies, the Highway Departments of Virginia and North Carolina, were primary agencies incorporated into the development of the Parkway, in addition to the involvement of various state officials and representatives and local and civic groups (Jolley, 1969). Table 5–3 summarizes administrative components and also includes a discussion of potential advantages and disadvantages of these approaches.

**Planning Process and Objectives**

The Denver Service Center is utilized for most aspects of the planning process, and design aspects have been directed primarily through the landscape architect for the Parkway. There are three major divisions of the Denver Service Center (DSC) in terms of planning and design technical services: Eastern Branch, Central Branch and Western Branch. The traditional planning and development process incorporated into the services provided by the DSC branches fall into three divisions: planning, design and implementation. These divisions are fairly segmented with little continuity of study team members between the planning, design and implementation phases of a particular project.

The Blue Ridge Parkway is currently in the process of developing a General Management Plan. The General Management Plan will provide direction, goals and objectives for further development and management of the Parkway.
The Parkway Land Use Maps (PLUM) are the primary document which guide maintenance and development of the parkway. The PLUM maps were developed through Reconnaissance Surveys undertaken by landscape architects working for the Parkway. These documents consist of information concerning land acquisition, deeds, special use permits, field surveys, and contract construction drawings. These maps are a valuable source of information in the planning, development and maintenance of the parkway, however many of these documents are currently outdated (Jolley, 1987).

Several major issues were identified in the 1989, Statement for Management and were defined as key factors which needed to be addressed. These issues include:

**Resource oriented**
- lack of baseline data for natural and cultural resources
- external threats – air pollution, hazardous wastes, water pollution

**Land use**
- changes in traditional land uses – conflicts between use of lands adjacent to parkway
- access from public and private roads – can contribute to incompatible land use
- declining interest in Agricultural Leasing Program

**Visitor related**
- increased visitation – affects of increased visitation on resources
- aging and inadequate facilities – deterioration of facilities and resources
- inadequate visitor services

**Public participation**
- public involvement – increased public awareness and interest has led to need to provide greater opportunities for involvement

A review of the long-term and short-term management objectives stated in the 1989, Statement for Management will illuminate key issues perceived in the planning and management of the Blue Ridge Parkway.
Long-term objectives include:

**Resource protection and identification**
- the protection of scenic and natural resources in cooperation with other agencies, organizations and private landowners
- develop cultural and natural resource database
- prioritize the natural, cultural, visual and recreational resources in terms of significance to assist in resource preservation
- identify, protect, preserve and maintain these resources
- establish information on the historic resources of the parkway
- identify and inventory potential threats to park resources and develop process to monitor and control these threats
- create innovative means to establish ecologic ethic to promote protection of parkway resources

**Land use**
- cooperation with federal, state and local agencies, private organizations and general public to ensure compatible land-use of adjacent land
- continue the Agricultural Leasing program and develop incentives to increase interest and motivate participation
- secure adequate land-base through acquisition, boundary adjustment or other means

**Park use**
- encourage year-round uses in a manner that minimizes adverse affects on park resources
- increase interpretive measures and visitor contact facilities
- provide and maintain park facilities of a high quality
- promote public awareness of parkway attributes
- establish handi-capped accessibility in current and proposed facilities
- initiate cyclic maintenance program to repair or replace deteriorating infrastructure
- study trends which could reduce reliance on private automobiles and still maintain the leisure qualities of the parkway

**Short-term Objectives include:**
- develop Comprehensive Plan for parkway access in cooperation with local, and state governments
- complete General Management Plan
- initiate Interpretive Prospectus
- initiate programming and secure funding for Cultural Landscape Plan
- establish mechanism to assure development meets quality standards of Parkway

There are several primary areas which reflect the focus of the planning and management goals and objectives of the Blue Ridge Parkway. The identification and protection of resources have been a continuous objective.
throughout the lifespan of the Parkway. This appears to be a continual process, particularly when the project is of the scale and scope of the Parkway. The adjacent land-use problems and adverse affects of increased visitation are a primary focus in terms of resource management. Cooperative measures are stated as objectives for both the protection of scenic and natural resources and in the establishment and maintenance of compatible land-use adjacent to the Parkway. The establishment of an "ecologic ethic" and increased interpretation of the parkway resources are measures defined to promote the protection of resources. Maintenance and development of visitor facilities is another focus within the objectives of the Parkway. Finally, increased public involvement in order to promote public interest and awareness in terms of the resources and attributes of the Parkway, are a significant component of the defined objectives. Table 5-4 summarizes key components relating to the planning process of the Blue Ridge Parkway and includes a discussion of potential advantages and disadvantages of these components.

**Summary**

The Blue Ridge Parkway, initially developed as a recreational motorway connecting the Shenandoah and Great Smokies, has become a model of regional, cooperative land-use practices between the state and federal governments. The Blue Ridge Parkway incorporates recreation, preservation and economic development into its goals and objectives. The Parkway developed as a make-work project during the depression years, has provided economic benefits, not only through the provision of jobs during the construction years, but also through the resultant increased tourism to the region. The Parkway serves as an example of the National Park Service in the role of lead agency for the establishment and management of a regional preservation project.
The Blue Ridge Parkway illustrates one of the first movements beyond traditional preservation planning efforts. The focus of the project extended beyond the preservation and management of a specific site or area and incorporated intergovernmental relations in the establishment of the Parkway. The parkway efforts also included economic aspects, such as tourism promotion, as a means to establish economic stability of the region. The Blue Ridge Parkway could be termed an early heritage preservation project when viewing the components of inter-governmental cooperation in a regional effort for the preservation and interpretation of natural and cultural resources.
## ORIGINS - BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY

### TABLE 5-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY COMPONENTS</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL NPS EFFORTS</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of project</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Parkway: motoring highway for recreation purposes; tough economic times; follows parkway development of the times; government ownership and management of large scale, regional projects</td>
<td>Strong public support of government projects</td>
<td>No environmental regulations or historic preservation regulations when first constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date when project was established</td>
<td>1936 authorization and begin construction</td>
<td>Long term record for quality planning and design</td>
<td>Adjustment necessary to current times, regulations and trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key agencies, groups and individuals</td>
<td>National Park Service, Senate representatives from Virginia, and North Carolina; Bureau of Public Roads, States of Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee</td>
<td>Federal control</td>
<td>Limited local support and input; Federal &quot;red tape&quot; time consuming; sometimes difficult to achieve desired results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of mission statement</td>
<td>Establishment of motor parkway between Shenandoah and Great Smokies; parkway for recreational, scenic and interpretive use; economic purpose to provide jobs and promote tourism to areas along parkway</td>
<td>Highly used, established parkway; scenic and quality project; positive effects of tourism</td>
<td>Necessary development of interpretive goals; adjustment to increased or different needs; negative effects of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation for establishment</td>
<td>Act to provide administration and maintenance of the BRP - June 30, 1936; Act to amend- June 8, 1940; Act to transfer land - May 13, 1952, and June 30, 1961</td>
<td>Acquisition of land by legislative measures</td>
<td>Revisions necessary to adjust to current times and problems; ie. boundaries - disputes about adjacent land-use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Acquisition and Management - Blue Ridge Parkway

**Table 5-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Traditional NPS Efforts</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Parkway</td>
<td><em>Established parkway; large area, defined boundaries in terms of “park lands”</em></td>
<td><em>Location due to certain political aspects, may not be best route; government domain in acquiring land is difficult in current times</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope/scale of project area</td>
<td>469 mile highway connecting Shenandoah National Park in Virginia, and The Great Smokies in North Carolina, passes through 29 counties, and encompasses 87,530 acres of land.</td>
<td><em>Clearly defined boundaries in terms of parkway land; visual boundaries are not so clearly defined</em></td>
<td><em>Negative impacts of adjacent land areas are difficult to remedy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method for designation of project boundary</td>
<td>Political; scenic, low impact design</td>
<td><em>Full-price acquisition and ownership leads to easier management; less-than-fee low cost alternative</em></td>
<td><em>Full-price high cost; less-than-fee problems with adherence to land regulations and restrictions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method for acquisition of land area</td>
<td>Full-price acquisition; less-than-fee via scenic easements</td>
<td><em>Control of lands by one agency</em></td>
<td><em>Problems of adjacent land use; possible need for future acquisition</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of land areas</td>
<td>National Park Service acquisition of lands</td>
<td><em>Management by one agency</em></td>
<td><em>High cost for upkeep and development must be absorbed by one agency</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of land areas</td>
<td>National Park Service, Blue Ridge Parkway personnel; Agriculture Leasing Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY COMPONENTS</td>
<td>TRADITIONAL NPS EFFORTS</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Parkway</td>
<td>Tried and true administrative structure for quality work</td>
<td>Limiting constraints; do not always respond to current, important issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of administrative agency(s)</td>
<td>Federal-National Park Service; initially cooperated with the National Forest Service in terms of nearby National Forests; administration downt</td>
<td>Limited number for approval</td>
<td>As the individual in the position of Superintendent or Regional Director changes, goals and objectives may change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current administrative agency</td>
<td>National Park Service - Superintendent of BRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of current administrative agency</td>
<td>Secretary of the Interior; NPS Washington Office, Regional Offices, Superintendent of individual parks</td>
<td>Established agency; good reputation</td>
<td>Difficult to conform to new realms; change is often a slow process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY COMPONENTS</td>
<td>TRADITIONAL NPS EFFORTS</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Parkway</td>
<td>Depth of professional input in specific area</td>
<td>Limited interdisciplinary studies; problem with project continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of study teams - professions and interaction</td>
<td>Professions grouped together, i.e., planners for GMP, landscape architects and architects for design; limited integrated teams</td>
<td>One controlling person; limited approval or consensus necessary</td>
<td>Problem with project continuity as key people change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency, group or individuals who mandate type and timing of studies</td>
<td>Superintendent of park with approval from regional office</td>
<td>Follows set structure; some adjustments for site</td>
<td>Difficult to adjust procedure for unique applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of studies undertaken</td>
<td>Reconnaissance Study, HAER/HABS Studies, Master Plan, General Management Plan, design documents, construction documents</td>
<td>Public input generated as a result of NEPA process</td>
<td>Limited public input; very controlled; moderate priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type and method of public participation</td>
<td>Public meetings, media, workshops, public review of documents</td>
<td>Limited number of reviews for approval; less time-consuming; developed public review process</td>
<td>Potential for biasness; limited public participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency, group or individuals who review studies</td>
<td>Superintendent; Regional Director; some public review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMERICA'S INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE PROJECT

The America's Industrial Heritage Project (AIHP) located in Southwestern Pennsylvania, is comprised of a nine-county region: Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Fayette, Fulton, Huntingdon, Indiana, Somerset, and Westmoreland counties (NPS, AIHP, 1989). The AIHP project is considered to be exemplary of an innovative and comprehensive approach to historic and cultural preservation and can be viewed as a pioneer of heritage preservation and cooperative partnership efforts.

The purpose of AIHP has two primary components. The first component is to commemorate the significant contributions this region played in the industrial development of the United States through the identification, preservation, interpretation and promotion of the history of the iron and steel, coal, and transportation industries of the Allegheny region, and the influence of the cultural history upon that region. The second component is to incorporate these efforts into a regional tourism promotion program which will promote economic development of the region. The focus of the tourism promotion program is to not only promote the preservation and interpretation of the historic and cultural resources, but also incorporate the natural and recreational resources of the region (NPS, AIHP, 1991). The purpose of the project has evolved to provide a greater emphasis on the interpretation of the cultural history of the region and is reflected in this vision statement of the AIHP Commission:

"Celebrate and conserve the cultural heritage of the region, vigorously promote high-quality visitor experiences, and provide regional economic revitalization and opportunities to maintain the quality of life for residents by telling the story of America's industrial heritage and the people who have lived and are living it." (NPS, AIHP, 1991, p.17)

There are ten federal parks located within the AIHP region, these include two National Historic Sites, four National Recreation Areas, one National
Battlefield, one National Memorial and one National Historic Landmark. There are twenty state recreational parks and four proposed state heritage parks within the nine-county, AIHP region.

The proposed heritage parks include: Mon Valley Heritage Park, National Road Heritage Park Corridor, Lincoln Highway Heritage Park Corridor, and Allegheny Ridge State Heritage Park. Lincoln Highway is in the earliest stage of the process and has been designated a Feasibility Study Project Area. Both Mon Valley and National Road have progressed to the next stage in the Pennsylvania Heritage Parks program and have been designated as a State Heritage Park Planning Area (upon completion and approval of a Feasibility Study). The Allegheny Ridge is the most advanced of these proposed heritage parks within this region and has been designated a State Heritage Park (upon completion and acceptance of a Management Action Plan) (Heritage Forum, 1992).

There are twenty-five natural resource areas within the nine-county region which have been identified to be of significance (NPS, AIHP, 1991).

In terms of cultural and historic resources roughly 80 locations were identified in an AIHP informational brochure. The resources are listed under the categories of historical sites and cultural sites; however, for the purposes of identification for this research the areas were categorized in a different manner. The designation and number of areas included into these categories are as follow: site/location of historical significance (H) - 33; tour with historic focus (HT) - 3; museum with historic focus (HM) - 14; museum with art focus (AM) - 4; site/location with a cultural arts focus (A) - 11; tour with cultural focus (CT) - 5; and festival or seasonal event with cultural focus (F) - 5. It should be noted that the term museum is utilized in the broadest meaning of the term. In terms of national historic significance, there are 13 National Historic Landmark Areas, 6 National Historic Districts, and 3 National Register Sites (NPS, AIHP, 1991).
The identification and designation of the cultural and historic resources is a currently ongoing process in the AIHP project, so these numbers may have already been changed or altered.

**Origins**

In February of 1984, key people from national groups related to tourism toured the AIHP region to review the possibility of tourism promotion in the region. The report which was generated from this led to the implementation of a Reconnaissance Study by the National Park Service. The Reconnaissance Survey of Western Pennsylvania Roads and Sites was completed in 1985. The purpose of study was to examine the resources in the Southwestern, Pennsylvania, region to include a discussion of significant historic, natural and scenic resources in order to assess if they are appropriate for designation and recognition under existing federal and state conservation, preservation and recreation programs. Alternative four was selected by Congress in 1986, as the best focus for the project. This alternative entailed a regional approach to preservation and promotion (NPS, 1992).

The National Park Service was requested by Congress to examine the resources of the region in more detail and develop a program in which to implement concepts from the preferred alternative. In 1986, an ad hoc commission was appointed, consisting of 33 representatives from local governments and regional industries and organizations, to provide initial direction for the AIHP project. The commission organized four committees to develop and oversee the planning process - cultural resources, economic development, tourism and marketing, and transportation. The commission developed and completed an Action Plan in 1987. The commission incorporated extensive public participation methods into the development of the Action Plan,

In 1987, legislation was introduced to create the Southwestern Heritage Preservation Commission and was enacted in 1988. The legislation established the Commission to implement the Action Plan and direct the AIHP project. At this time the role of the NPS changed from that of guiding the development of the project to that of providing technical expertise (NPS, 1992).

A significant component of the AIHP project is the incorporation of cooperative planning, development, and management through the development of cooperative partnerships. The Commission acts as a facilitator and coordinator to these the partnerships. The Commission has a ten-year life span in terms of the legislation for its establishment. Three options were proposed in the Comprehensive Management Plan for the future of the Commission: one, renewal of the legislation and continuance in the same capacity (this was the situation which occurred with the Lowell Historic Preservation Commission); two, establishment of a private, non-profit corporation which would assume the role of the Commission; and three, for each of the partners in the partnership to obtain adequate funding to maintain the project on a continuing basis (NPS, 1992). Table 5-5 summarizes key components relating to the origins of AIHP and incorporates a summary of potential advantages and disadvantages of these components.

Land Acquisition and Management

A wide variety of land management and acquisition measures are incorporated into the AIHP region. It differs significantly from the BRP in that it is not a federally owned and managed region. There is a variety of land ownership and management within the region, ranging from National Park sites, lands owned and managed by the state, county owned and managed lands, areas
owned and managed by non-profit organizations and privately owned and managed lands. Examples include: federal – Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site; state – Ohiopyle State Park; county – Jacob’s Creek, organization – Altoona Railroaders Memorial Museum, and private – Spring’s Museum (NPS, AIHP, 1991). Table 5-6 summarizes land acquisition and management measures and discusses potential advantages and disadvantages of these measures.

Administration

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission consists of 21 members comprised of one representative from each of the nine counties, one representative from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, one representative from the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs, four representatives from the Southern Alleghenies Planning and Development Commission, two representative with knowledge and experience in the field of historic preservation, and the Director of the National Park Service (ex officio) or appointed delegate. The commission has a current staff consisting of an Executive Director, a Program Manager, a Projects Manager, a Public Affairs Marketing Manager, a Management Analyst, an Executive Secretary and Clerical support. The staff to the Commission are crucial for the successful development of the AIHP project and the numbers and positions will be expanded as the project continues to develop (NPS, 1992).

Each county has a County Heritage Committee which forms a crucial linkage between the nine counties and the Commission. These committees serve a variety of functions and two of the most critical of these functions are the dispersal of information to the public within the region and the development of individual county heritage plans. Four technical advisory groups (TAG) have been developed to provide assistance and guidance to the Commission. These
groups consist of the Economic Development TAG, Interpretation and Historic Preservation TAG, Marketing and Tourism TAG and Transportation TAG. These groups can be comprised of any number of interested citizens within the region, however each TAG has only nine voting members who are the representatives for each County Heritage Committee (NPS, 1992).

There are a number of agencies and organizations incorporated into the partnership. At the federal level the National Park Service provides technical expertise in terms of research, planning, design and construction support as requested. The NPS will also continue to administer the National Park units within the region and provide basic interpretive skills training to state and local agencies. Other federal agencies have been encouraged to become involved in the partnership efforts, these include the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Highways Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Environmental Protection Agency (NPS, 1992).

At the state level, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a developed State Heritage Parks Program as described previously. Through the State Heritage Park Interagency Task Force, representatives of six departments are incorporated into the partnership. These departments include: the state departments of Community Affairs, Commerce/Economic Development Partnership, Environmental Resources, Education and Transportation, the Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission, the Pennsylvania Heritage Affairs Commission, and the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts. Other members of this partnership include local municipalities, community organizations, agencies and groups, private businesses and organizations and the general public (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1990). Table 5-7 summarizes administrative components of AIHP and discusses potential advantages and disadvantages.
Planning Process and Objectives

The planning process incorporated into the AIHP project closely follows that of the National Park Service in terms of the various stages:

- Reconnaissance of Resources/Feasibility Study
- Inventory, i.e. Historic Resources Documents
- Study of Alternatives
- Management Action Plan
- Design Development
- Implementation

The AIHP project contracts with the Denver Service Center (DSC) and private consultants for elements of the planning and design process. A focused branch has been developed at the Denver Service Center — the Southwestern Pennsylvania Partnership Branch, to provide the technical expertise of the National Park Service, primarily for the larger scale projects. The Southwestern Pennsylvania branch differs from the other DSC Branches in terms of the focus on an interdisciplinary team approach to the planning, design and implementation process.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Commission reviews all studies and documents and provides a crucial critique in terms of the overall picture. Public involvement is crucial to the planning process. There is an emphasis to develop informed policy and a willingness to make even highly controversial decisions if necessary (Cooley, 1992).

Goals and objectives for the commission and the partners have been defined in the Comprehensive Management Plan. These goals and objectives are taken from the Management Plan and are as follows:

Goal: Establish leadership and management capability for future project success.

Objectives:  
- define tasks, roles, and responsibilities of partners
- establish and implement policies and procedures
- establish a strategy for post-commission activities
- establish an information and assistance network
Goal: Instill a cultural conservation ethic as well as a preservation consciousness in the regional leaders and residents

Objectives:
- identify tangible and intangible resources in region
- provide for public participation in conserving and interpreting heritage
- implement/develop educational initiatives
- develop educational initiatives
- integrate preservation considerations into land use and community planning and development
- enhance preservation values of community leaders and those providing services

Goal: Maintain and protect the diversity of the area's resources that are determined to be significant to the success of the project

Objectives:
- inventory, evaluate, and establish a protection program
- determine resources that are significant to the project success and provide a protection and use program
- promote a balance of recreational and other elements with cultural treatment of resources

Goal: Provide a high-quality visitor experience

Objectives:
- develop a comprehensive interpretive plan based on America's industrial heritage
- establish criteria for a high-quality services and accommodations for regional visitors
- promote and provide high-quality services and accommodations for regional visitors
- provide improved transportation systems to and within the region (including tour routes)

Goal: Attract more visitors into the region

Objectives:
- coordinate facilities and programs
- market available opportunities (cultural, natural, recreational and scenic resources)
- provide information about area resources to the public
- link interpretation to tourism promotion

Goal: Sustain regional economic growth and diversity

Objectives:
- identify and enhance opportunities for public and private sector development related to the region's cultural and industrial heritage
- incorporate the project initiatives into overall economic development planning
Goal: Evaluate short- and long-term accomplishments of the partnership

Objectives:  
- establish evaluation criteria and processes  
- implement and monitor that process short-term and long-term  
- modify the project, as appropriate, based on findings

Several goals and objectives focus on the planning, development and management of the AIHP project. The establishment and coordination of cooperative partnerships is a primary goal stated throughout all aspects of the AIHP project. The need to establish and implement a structure for project development and evaluation is a primary goal at this stage of the project. These measures are seen necessary in order to provide a high quality visitor experience. The identification, preservation and interpretation of resources are a significant focus of the goals and objectives. Public involvement, through interpretation, education and participation in the planning and development of the project, is a major emphasis in obtaining these goals and objectives. Finally, increased visitation to the project region and the establishment and sustenance of regional economic development are important components of the AIHP project. Table 5-8 summarizes components of the planning process.

Summary

The AIHP project is one the most developed and successful examples of regional cooperative preservation efforts. This heritage preservation project has incorporated a variety of partnerships into the development, implementation and management of a nine-county region in southwestern, Pennsylvania. The National Park Service has taken on a new role in this type of project, that of changing from the lead agency to the provision of technical assistance and advocacy for a project with federal, state and local presence. The AIHP project can be considered a model for future cooperative heritage preservation projects.
### ORIGINS - AMERICA'S INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE PROJECT

#### TABLE 5-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>KEY COMPONENTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>PARTNERSHIP EFFORTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advantages</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disadvantages</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td>America's Industrial Heritage Project</td>
<td>Combine heritage preservation, economic development (tourism), and recreation; tough economic times; nationwide movement for the identification of America's roots/history, government ownership of large land areas past</td>
<td>Historic preservation more established; new project, easier to try new processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview of project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid to late 1980's, Initial study: 1985 Reconnaissance Study by the National Park Service</td>
<td>Establishment process currently underway; current regulations and trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date when project was established</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission, local groups, Congress representatives, NPS, state, counties</td>
<td>Both local and regional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key agencies, groups and individuals in the mobilization of project establishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>To commemorate the significant contributions of coal, steel, iron and transportation industries in America's industrial growth, and the ethnic, labor and social history tied to this; tourism promotion to include scenic, natural and recreation areas</td>
<td>Current trend for identification of historic sites in America; positive economic gains from tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of mission statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislation for establishment</strong></td>
<td>Public Law 100-698 Nov. 19, 1988; establishment of AHP Commission, funding and heritage route designation</td>
<td>Enables funding sources; easier for partnership development; enables wider input and government, state and local support</td>
<td>Opposition created; becomes &quot;special case&quot;; conflicts between NPS traditional role and new consultant role; no complete control via NPS ownership and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY COMPONENTS</td>
<td>PARTNERSHIP EFFORTS</td>
<td>ADVANTAGES</td>
<td>DISADVANTAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td>America's Industrial Heritage Project</td>
<td>Comprehensive scope; broad variety of resources</td>
<td>Large area, difficulty in defining areas of importance and the delineation of spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope/scale of project area</td>
<td>Nine county region in southwest, Pennsylvania - Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Fayette, Fulton, Huntingdon, Indiana, Somerset and Westmoreland counties</td>
<td>Broad scope with specific nodes; greater draw for tourism; enables potential for funding</td>
<td>Political designation is somewhat arbitrary in terms of significant resources; creates need for a clearer definition of key nodes and project land areas boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method for designation of project boundary</td>
<td>Political - county boundaries</td>
<td>Need for land acquisition is limited; cost of land acquisition is distributed among many agencies</td>
<td>Variety of management agencies - more difficult to coordinate land-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method for acquisition of land area</td>
<td>Most areas to remain in current ownership; includes federal, state, local and private ownership</td>
<td>Do not have to acquire all lands; expense is distributed between partners</td>
<td>Complexity with multiple ownership; limited control over private lands; must get people to &quot;buy&quot; into project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of land areas</td>
<td>Public - federal, state, county; private</td>
<td>Multiple agency management is not such a financial drain as one agency management</td>
<td>Variety of management methods; difficult to maintain standards; problem of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of land areas</td>
<td>National Park Service, other federal agencies, state, local government, private, non-profit groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ADMINISTRATION - AMERICA'S INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE PROJECT

#### TABLE 5-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY COMPONENTS</th>
<th>PARTNERSHIP EFFORTS</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>America's Industrial Heritage Project</td>
<td>Greater base of support and funding</td>
<td>Coordination between partnerships can be a difficult and time consuming process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of administrative agency(s)</td>
<td>Partnerships - federal, state, local, public, private; strong grass roots base</td>
<td>Enables interdisciplinary team and a variety of viewpoints; continuity of project administration</td>
<td>Coordination and consensus may be difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current administrative agency</td>
<td>AIHP Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of current administrative agency</td>
<td>21 members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas needing representation may change as area develops; appointment procedure may need revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY COMPONENTS</td>
<td>PARTNERSHIP EFFORTS</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>America's Industrial Heritage Project</td>
<td>Variety of viewpoints;</td>
<td>Depth of specific input in a professional area to a lesser degree; i.e., one planner vs. planning team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of study teams - professions and interaction</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary, integrated teams</td>
<td>continuity in project</td>
<td>Consensus of group may be difficult; variety of viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency, group or individuals who mandates type and timing of studies</td>
<td>AIHP Commission</td>
<td>One administrative group which provides guidance to partners</td>
<td>Variation of studies undertaken between sites may create problems; limited development of a consistent process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of studies undertaken</td>
<td>Reconnaissance study, Feasibility Study, Inventory of Historic Resources (HABS/HAER), Study of Alternatives, Management Action Plan, design documents, implementation documents</td>
<td>Follows National Park Service format for the studies; modification can be made to fit specific purposes</td>
<td>Time consuming and expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type and method of public participation</td>
<td>Workshops, newsletters, local news and media, public meetings, participation in local groups by AIHP staff, one-on-one</td>
<td>Establishment of strong public ties to project; local support, cooperation and assistance</td>
<td>Time consuming: different review criteria may cause conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency, group or individuals who review studies</td>
<td>Commission, State Task Force, local public</td>
<td>Multiple reviews lead to greater assurance of quality projects</td>
<td>Time consuming: different review criteria may cause conflicts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER SIX - SURVEY RESULTS

The survey was administered to obtain information or attitudes of professionals currently involved in the preservation planning process. Individuals surveyed were: one, professionals involved in the planning process for the primary cases, the Blue Ridge Parkway (BRP) and America's Industrial Heritage Project (AIHP); and two, individuals who are involved in heritage preservation planning. The main purpose of the survey is to collect data and generate information for the case study comparison. A secondary purpose was to obtain information from individuals who are key players in current heritage preservation planning efforts concerning current planning processes in this realm.

There are two primary areas of focus incorporated into the survey. The first focus entails the identification of components of the planning process which are important for a successful preservation project and their perceived use and significance. (A successful project is being defined as projects which meet their stated goals and objectives.) The second focus of the survey is to obtain attitudes of professionals in terms of successful methods for information collection and distribution in the planning process.

A comparison is conducted of the data generated from the survey to illuminate the similarities and differences between the primary case studies (BRP and AIHP) concerning the main issues and components of the planning process. A secondly analysis will be conducted of the combined groups - BRP, AIHP, and heritage groups. The analysis and findings of the survey results will illuminate the trends and issues related to the preservation planning process as perceived by professionals in the field.
PROCESS

The survey was administered to professionals involved in the planning and design process of the primary cases, and individuals involved in heritage preservation planning. The individuals were selected due to their knowledge and participation in the planning process. Information generated from the open-ended interviews, and through the review of related literature and documents led to the selection of the individuals surveyed. The survey was administered to a total of 40 individuals, 12 - BRP, 14 - AIHP, and 14 - heritage. A total of 33 completed surveys was returned, 10 - BRP, 13 - AIHP and 10 - heritage, for a total response rate of 82%. The BRP group and the AIHP group were the two primary groups utilized for this analysis. The heritage group was combined with the AIHP and BRP groups to make up a Combined group for analysis. This Combined group was established in order to see if there were any significant trends or issues reflected comprehensively within all the individuals surveyed.

ANALYSIS

Elementary quantitative analysis was conducted through the use of univariate analysis: distribution (percentages), central tendency (mean), and dispersion (range); and bivariate analysis: subgroup comparisons between dependent and independent variables (Babbie, 1992). In the initial analysis, distribution (percentages) was utilized for the questions which generated nominal and ratio data (questions # 1-3, and 11 on the survey; located in Appendix C). For questions which incorporated Likert Scale responses, central tendency was employed and the interval data generated were analyzed for the mean value. The dispersion of the responses was analyzed according to the range (distance separating the lowest from the highest value), and are included
for reference purposes in the appendix of survey data results (Appendix E).
The results for this initial analysis will be detailed for each question included in
the survey. A comparative analysis was then conducted between several related
questions in order to examine any potential associations.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Generally there was a great deal of similarity between all groups
signifying similar tactics in terms of preservation planning efforts regardless of
the age of the project. The information obtained dealt primarily with public
participation measures and their associated importance.

For all groups, the Management Plan was the type of study in which the
respondents were most often involved. This type of study was also rated by all
groups as the most significant study in the development of a successful project.
The Reconnaissance Study was rated the least significant of all the studies for
the development of a successful project, and was also least used by the
respondents.

In terms of factors important for the success of a project, all factors were
rated high in importance. These factors included: coordination of efforts,
development of public support, acquisition of funding, development of political
support and collection of information/data to substantiate importance and
relevancy of project. The two highest rated factors for the AIHP group were
the coordination of efforts and political support, for the BRP group – acquisition
of funding and public support, and for the COMB group – acquisition of funding
and coordination of efforts. The factors were rated low in difficulty to obtain by
all the groups. Of these factors, acquisition of funding was rated the most
difficult to obtain for all groups. The coordination of efforts was also rated as
difficult to obtain in the AIHP group.
For questions concerning public participation, six participation methods were included: workshops, public review of documents, survey/questionnaire, news/media, presentation to local groups, and one-on-one interaction. Responses to these questions reflected that workshops and on-on-one interaction were used most often, determined most successful in obtaining public input and in communication of information to the public. The use of news and media was also rated high as a method for communicating information. The method rated least successful in obtaining public input and least used was survey/questionnaire.

Responses to the open-ended question focused on primarily three topics. One, the need for coordination and cooperation of efforts. Two, the importance of public involvement and participation in the process. Finally, the need to properly identify the "theme" or "sense of place" of resources which are being preserved.

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

The analysis of the data generated from the responses to the individual questions will be summarized in the following section. This analysis will include a summary of the data and a brief conclusion of the significant results. Percentages or mean averages were used to allow for comparison between the different sized groups.

Following the analysis of the individual questions, three cross comparisons have been conducted. These comparisons examine data from several questions to ascertain if there are any additional associations.
Individual Question Results

Question Number One: What is your profession?

Figure 6-1: Professions of the respondents

The categories included in the survey for this question included not only several specific professions but also administration as a category and an open (other) response. The responses showed a diverse range of profession involved in preservation planning efforts of both the primary cases and in heritage projects. The largest category was Administration for all three groups, with Planners ranking second. It was significant to find that no Economic Analysts were incorporated into any of the groups. This was surprising due to the economic development focus of all projects, particularly the AIHP and heritage projects. This may be due to the fact that often economic studies are sub-contracted to consultants with expertise in this realm.
Question Number 2: Length of time in current position:

![Bar chart showing length of time in current position for AIHP, BRP, and combined groups.]

Figure 6-2: Respondent's length of time in current position

The responses appear to reflect the length of time in the profession rather than the length of time in the current position. The majority of the respondents were in their current position for ten years or more. The responses for the BRP group were anticipated to be longer due to the length of time the Blue Ridge Parkway has been in existence, and the likelihood that the majority of the professionals working in relation to that project have been in place for more than ten years. Many of the individuals who are in the AIHP group and in the heritage group, while relatively new in their current position, have been in their profession for a longer length of time. The fact that all groups had similar traits in terms of length of time in the profession eliminates the potential that the length of time in the profession influenced the planning techniques undertaken within any of the groups.
Question Number 3: What type of study are you most often involved in?

![Bar chart showing types of studies](image)

*Figure 6-3: Types of studies in which the respondents were most often involved*

The AIHP and COMB group listed multiple studies, while the BRP only listed one study per respondent. This may reflect the traditional approach of the BRP group for professionals to be involved in a particular type of study, and the heritage approach of the AIHP group to be involved in a variety of study types. The Management Plan was expected to be the most utilized study for all groups due to its importance in the planning process in developing a procedural framework for each project. The Management Plan surprisingly showed a greater use in the AIHP group. It was anticipated that the BRP group would show a greater use due to the fact the General Management Plan is currently being developed.
Question Number 4: How important are the following factors in the overall success of a project?

Table 6.1 – Mean Average of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Coordination of efforts</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Development of public support</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Acquisition of funding</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Development of political support</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Collection of information/data to substantiate importance and relevancy of project</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 - not important; 2 - somewhat important; 3 - important; 4 - very important; 5 - extremely important

The responses were all rated towards the high end of the scale, (extremely important) which reflects the significance of all factors in the development of a successful project. It was anticipated that public support would be more important for the AIHP group due to the partnership approach of the AIHP and the focus on public involvement. The results indicate that public involvement for the BRP group (mean 4.7) was as important or more so than the AIHP group (mean 4.0). This may reflect the trend towards increased needs for public involvement in the National Park Service. The importance of acquisition of funding was higher in the BRP group than in the AIHP group. This was surprising due to the newness of AIHP and the subsequent higher level of development and associated costs currently ongoing. The AIHP has been very successful in obtaining funds for its mission, which may account for this result.
Question Number 5: How difficult is each of the following items to obtain in a successful project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2 – Mean Average of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Coordination of efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Development of public support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Acquisition of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Development of political support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Collection of information/data to substantiate importance and relevancy of project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 – not difficult; 2 - somewhat difficult; 3 - difficult; 4 - very difficult; 5 - extremely difficult

Acquisition of funding was rated the most difficult to obtain of all the responses listed. The coordination of efforts was rated to be more difficult in the AIHP than the BRP group. This response was expected due to the partnership approach of the AIHP and subsequent greater number of "players" involved in the project. The development of both public and political support were rated very similarly for both groups. These responses were expected to reflect a higher level of difficulty for the AIHP group due to the fact that the project is still being established, causing these factors to be more critical at this stage. The response dealing with the "collection of information to substantiate the relevancy of the project" reflected responses much less difficult than expected. These responses were anticipated to be rated more difficult due to the time-consuming nature and incorporation of a variety of sources and methods.
Question Number 6: How significant are the following types of studies in developing a successful project?

Table 6.3 - Mean Average of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Reconnaissance Study</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Feasibility Study</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Historic Resource Inventory</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Study of Alternatives</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Management Plan</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Design Documents</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 - not important; 2 - somewhat important; 3 - important; 4 - very important; 5 - extremely important

The significance of the studies in developing a successful project were, as a whole, rated highly important. The Management Plan, rated most important, was anticipated to be the most significant due to the planning framework a Management Plan often provides to the development of a project. The Reconnaissance Study was rated very low in importance for the BRP group. This may be attributed to the fact that the Parkway is well established and the need for this type of study is practically non-existent. It was anticipated that the Reconnaissance Study would be rated more important in the AIHP group than the responses reflected. This expectation was based upon the important role a Reconnaissance Study plays in the development of the AIHP project. The fact that the AIHP is established and the study has been completed may account for these results.
Question Number 7: To what extent are each of the following causes apt to result in a lack of continuity between planning intent and design implementation?

Table 6.4 - Mean Average of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Change in administration</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Change in study team members</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lack of communication between study teams who have worked on different phases of the project</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Change in available funding</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other Responses: (listed in Appendix E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 - not likely; 2 - somewhat likely; 3 - likely; 4 - very likely; 5 - extremely likely

The change in study team members was rated more likely to result in lack of continuity within the BRP group than the AIHP group, as anticipated. The traditional structure of the Denver Service Center (DSC) is more segmented with separate divisions, than the integrated structure implemented in the Southwestern Pennsylvania Branch of the DSC. In the BRP group (DSC), the study team members change between the various stages of the project (planning, design and implementation). The Southwestern Pennsylvania Branch (AIHP group) try to maintain a level of continuity in the study team members as the various stages of the project progress. The responses for the AIHP group indicated that lack of communication between study team members was likely to create lack of continuity in a project. While there appears to be continuity in regards to study team members for the AIHP group, communication still appears to cause complications in accomplishing a consistency between planning intent and design implementation.
Question Number 8: How important are each of the following sources in gathering information for the development of a Management Plan?

Table 6.5 - Mean Average of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Legislative documents</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Archival/historic documents</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ethnographic interviews</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Public meetings</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Maps (ex. topographic, utility)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Local government officials</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 - not important; 2 - somewhat important; 3 - important; 4 - very important; 5 - extremely important

Public meetings were rated most important for all groups. These responses support the importance of public participation in the planning process. The high level of importance placed upon public participation in heritage preservation projects is most likely a result of the project's objectives to develop and maintain local public support for the project. Public participation has been an important component of Park Service planning and this emphasis appears to be reflected in the responses of the BRP group. The use of ethnographic interviews was significantly higher in the AIHP group, most likely due to the greater emphasis on local history in the AIHP project. The ethnographic interviews serve as a means to acquire knowledge of local history, and serve as a means to develop connections between the local public and the preservation project. This connection is an important component of the AIHP project and is not an objective of the BRP project.
Question Number 9: How often are each of the following methods utilized to incorporate public participation into the planning process?

Table 6.6 – Mean Average of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Workshops</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Public review of documents</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Survey/questionnaire</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. News/media</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Presentations to local groups</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. One-on-one interaction</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 – not often; 2 – somewhat often; 3 – often; 4 – very often; 5 – extremely often

The survey and questionnaire were rated least used by all groups, and the use of news and media were rated of the highest use. Presentations and workshops were anticipated to be the method often used to incorporate public participation rather than the high use of news and media. The use of public participation methods was rated very similar between both the AIHP and the BRP group. The use of public participation methods was anticipated to be higher in the AIHP group than the BRP group because, even though public involvement is a significant component in NPS planning, there is an increased emphasis on public participation in current heritage preservation planning efforts. One-on-one interaction was rated as expected for the AIHP group, because of the emphasis on this component in the AIHP planning process.
Question Number 10: How successful are the following methods in communicating to the public the information necessary to maintain public support for the project?

Table 6.7 – Mean Average of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Workshops</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Public review of documents</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Survey/questionnaire</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. News/media</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Presentations to local groups</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. One-on-one interaction</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 = not successful; 2 = somewhat successful; 3 = successful; 4 = very successful; 5 = extremely successful

The use of surveys and questionnaires as a means to communicate information are not very effective and this is reflected in the low rating of success. The effectiveness of public review of documents was much lower than expected. Public review of documents is a primary component of the Environmental Impact Statement process and was anticipated to be categorized as a successful method due to the amount of use and refined process as a result of that use. It was surprising to find that one-on-one interaction was rated the most successful of all the methods. It was anticipated that the time-consuming aspects of one-on-one interaction would cause the response to this questions to be a lower success rating than presentations to local groups and workshops. Perhaps the benefits of personal attention outweigh the drawbacks of extra time consumption.
Question Number 11: Which of the following public participation methods are you most often involved in?

![Bar chart showing public participation methods]

*Figure 6-4: Public participation methods in which the respondents were most often involved*

Workshops were the public participation method in which the respondents were most often involved. The low involvement in the news and media category was anticipated, however with respect to the responses to the previous two questions and the high success rating and high use of news and media to incorporate public participation, this response seems incongruous. Perhaps the responses reflect the number of individuals needed for the various public participation methods, or that the respondents (planners and management) are not routinely involved in press releases. For example, the number of individuals needed to orchestrate news and media are fewer than the number utilized in public participation workshops. Here again the use of public review of documents was rated significantly lower than the other methods.
Question Number 12: How significant are the following methods for gathering public input for the development of a Management Plan?

Table 6.8 – Mean Average of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Workshops</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Public review of documents</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Survey/questionnaire</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. News/media</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Presentations to local groups</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. One-on-one interaction</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 - not important; 2 - somewhat important; 3 - important; 4 - very important; 5 - extremely important

Workshops and One-on-One interaction were the highest for both groups. This was anticipated for the workshops due to the fact that they are often incorporated into the planning process, however one-on-one was not anticipated to be so high, again due to the time-consuming manner of this method. The review of public documents was rated higher here than they were rated in the success for communicating information to the public. This may suggest that this method is better suited for gathering public input than for dispersing information.
Please feel free to include any additional comments you may have regarding current trends and issues in cultural/historic preservation.

Six respondents provided comments for this final open-ended question. The responses focused upon three primary areas – cooperative measures, public participation and definition of preservation. Often all three categories were incorporated into each response. Following are a few excerpts from these responses. A complete summary of the responses are provided in Appendix E.

**Cooperative Measures**

"In the mid-late 90's (and beyond), preservation of important historic, natural cultural and scenic resources will increasingly involve non-public lands. Public agencies will play an increasingly important role in being advocates for the protection of (wise use of) these resources. Coordination with local citizens and local/state officials will be even more critical, as will the cultivation and sustaining of meaningful public/private partnerships, involving private non-profit community groups, land trusts, historical groups, etc."

"Trend is toward preservation for preservation's sake. We should be certain that what we preserve is truly significant and not simply 'old'."

"The following elements must be present

- emphasis on common ground/coalition building
- clarity of purpose/public understanding
- shared leadership/responsibility (both success and failures)
- plan ahead/momentum is very important do not allow it to fade
- seek successful projects, however small, for visibility and momentum
- define that "sense of place" we all want to protect"
Preservation

"Knowing and understanding the stories and themes is paramount. Resources must be viewed as significant based upon their ability to contribute to the telling and understanding the important stories, not their association with, or listing on, the National Register of Historic Places which was created for an entirely different purpose."

Public Participation

"Development of a clear management plan understood and accepted by the public insures a good management plan. Workshops are most effective for most regions doing this now."

"There are many questions about public input. Determining and carrying out the public involvement strategy is critical to any project success. You can't generalize about best methods."

Cooperative measures, or coordination of efforts, in these regional preservation projects is a reoccurring theme, not only in the responses to this question, but also throughout the survey. Elements of public participation and involvement are a significant method utilized to promote and coordinate these cooperative measures. In terms of preservation, it is not literally the definition of preservation which is sought, but the means to identify and preserve the "sense of place" or the "theme" surrounding and incorporated into the historic and cultural resources of the project region.
Comparison One

The first comparison will look at relationships in data generated from questions concerning the type and use of project studies. The data from question 3 consists of the use of the particular study types, and the data from question 6 consists of the perceived significance of the studies (see Appendix E).

Table 6.9 - Type and Use of Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Study</th>
<th>AIHP Use</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
<th>BRP Use</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
<th>COMB Use</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnaissance</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Altern.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist. Res. Invent.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Documents</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 - not important; 2 - somewhat important; 3 - important; 4 - very important; 5 - extremely important

The Reconnaissance Study in both the use and significance was rated low in all three groups. This factor is surprising due to the important role that Reconnaissance Studies played in the development of both the AIHP and the BRP project. The Historic Resource Study was rated low in use although it was rated fairly high in significance. The use of the Historic Resource Inventory was rated much higher in the BRP group than in the AIHP group. The use of this study was anticipated to be of higher use in the AIHP group due to the greater emphasis on historic preservation. The rating of this response may be influenced by the
comparative newness of the AIHP project and the relatively limited number of historic studies which have already been undertaken. (Terminology may also have influenced the responses. The historic studies are more often referred to as Historic Resource Studies rather than Historic Resource Inventories. An Inventory and a Study may be viewed quite differently.) In terms of the significance of the Historic Resource Inventory both groups rated the study very important. The Management Plan was rated highest in use and significance of all the studies as has been reflected in responses throughout the survey. The significance of Design Documents was rated important, however the use of this type of study was rated low. This was the only category in which there was an incongruity between significance and use of a of study. Perhaps this reflects the limited use of design documents in the planning phases and establishment phases of the projects.

Comparison Two

The second comparison will look at relationships concerning specific aspects of a project. The importance of aspects of planning efforts for each project in terms of the development of a successful project will be compared to the difficulty to obtain these aspects in a successful project. Data from question 4 consists of the importance of these aspects, and data from question 5 consists of the difficulty in obtaining these aspects (Appendix E contains the results of the individual questions).
Table 6.10 – Importance and Difficulty of Planning Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coord. of efforts</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political support</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect. of info.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: 1 = not important; 2 = somewhat important; 3 = important; 4 = very important; 5 = extremely important

All of the aspects were rated high in importance and the difficulty to obtain these aspects were rated within the middle range. Collection of information to establish the relevancy of the project was rated least difficult to obtain for all groups. For the BRP group, funding was rated most important and most difficult to obtain. In the AIHP group, funding was rated of lesser importance, but rated more difficult to obtain. Coordination of efforts was rated most important and most difficult to obtain in the AIHP group. Both political and public support were rated of high importance for both groups and fairly low in difficulty to obtain. This reflects the strong initial public support that Responses for the importance of political support were higher in the AIHP group, and importance of public support was higher in the BRP group. The reverse emphasis was anticipated due to the administrative structure of the BRP project and the focus on public participation in the AIHP project.
Comparison Three

The third comparison will look at relationships concerning the use of public participation methods. Three variables will be compared: the percentage in which the respondents utilized the public participation methods (data from question 11), how often the methods are utilized to incorporate public participation into the planning process (data from question 9), and the success of the methods to communicate information (data from question 10).

Table 6.11 - Public Participation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>AIHP Part.</th>
<th>Sup.</th>
<th>BRP Part.</th>
<th>Sup.</th>
<th>COMB Part.</th>
<th>Sup.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4.0a</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rev.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News/media</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where a: 1 - not often; 2 - somewhat often; 3 - often; 4 - very often; 5 - extremely often
Where b: 1 - no successful; 2 - somewhat successful; 3 - successful; 4 - very successful; 5 - extremely successful

For both groups, workshops and one-on-one were rated the highest percentage of involvement and the most successful methods to communicate information. News and media were rated the highest in terms of methods utilized to incorporate public participation into the planning process, and were rated successful in terms of communicating information, particularly in the AIHP group. This comparison illustrates a great deal of similarity in the responses of the AIHP and the BRP group. This may reinforce the notion that both a regional project established over 60 years ago and a currently established project respond to current planning and public participation issues in similar manners.
CHAPTER SEVEN - CASE COMPARISON AND CONCLUSIONS

This final chapter will discuss the results of the primary case comparison and general conclusions. The case analysis will include the examination of key components and the evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of these components. General conclusions will then be discussed, focusing on an evaluation concerning components of traditional preservation projects and of heritage preservation projects, the changes which have evolved, and potential reasons why these changes have occurred. Finally, the role these conclusions can play in future preservation efforts will be discussed and questions for further exploration will be posed.

CASE COMPARISON

In the comparative analyses of the two primary cases, the key components established in the case descriptions were utilized as the topics of comparison. These key components included elements which are significant in the establishment and the development of the projects: origins, land acquisition and management, administration, and components of the planning process. Similarities and differences of these components are summarized in table 7-1.

Origins

This section will compare the significant issues which were encountered in the establishment of the primary cases. The primary goals incorporated into the establishment of both projects have basic similarities which has led to similar issues and concerns encountered in the projects. A review of these issues can provide an insight into how these issues were faced, both in the past and in present day circumstances.
The Blue Ridge Parkway and America's Industrial Heritage Project were both established during periods of unstable economic times. The Blue Ridge Parkway has a primary focus towards recreation, while AIHP has a focus towards preservation and interpretation of historic or heritage resources. Both cases incorporate recreation, economic development, preservation and interpretation of historic, cultural and natural resources, all within a regional scale project.

The Parkway began as a make-work project during the depression era and provided work for many unemployed professionals. A secondary economic benefit sought in the development of the Parkway was the potential increase of tourism and the related economic gains of that industry. The AIHP project has a significant focus on the preservation and interpretation of the heritage of the region, and incorporates economic development through tourism and related industries into the preservation strategies. Both projects strive to take advantage of the benefits of tourism and service related industries. The AIHP is being established during a time in which there is a strong movement towards the identification, preservation and interpretation of the history and culture of America. The increased emergence of heritage projects reflects both the cognizance of this trend, and the associated possibilities to utilize this trend for economic development through the tourism industry. This trend also reflects the movement to a post-industrial society and a more service oriented economy.

Projects which incorporate a tourism focus should consider both the positive and negative impacts of tourism on the resources and culture of the region. The tourism industry does not always provide a stable economic base, and can often fluctuate with changes in the economy. Tourism has brought economic benefits to the Parkway, however negative impacts of tourism, for example, overuse of visitor facilities or impacts on natural resources, have also been subsequent affects of introducing tourism into a region.
The Blue Ridge Parkway was developed during a time in which there was strong public support for large scale government owned and managed projects, and where development was a key component of such projects. Strong local support was not as crucial at the time of the Parkway development, as it is during current times and in the development of the AIHP. There has been a decline in acquisition through federal domain and ownership of large land areas preserved for the benefit of the public. The ability to acquire large land areas is extremely limited due to high land costs, and limited numbers of large intact parcels of land area. The stretched management and maintenance capabilities of the federal agencies has led to the diminished, and potentially obsolete, process of newly established federally owned and managed public lands.

Environmental regulations and historic preservation processes were not as developed at the time of parkway establishment as during current times. The goals and objectives of the Parkway, the desire to produce a quality project, and the accessibility of a substantial base of experienced professionals, directed the project, to some extent, to be environmentally conscious. These factors led the placement of the Parkway to reflect a consciousness of the effects upon the resources in terms of where and how the route was determined. The designation of the boundaries for both projects had a strong political foundation. The designation of the routing of the Parkway was influenced by political factors relating to the state governments of Tennessee, Virginia and North Carolina. The routing of the Parkway was also influenced by the desire to provide a variety of scenic and visual experiences and to do so with little impact upon the resources of the region. The Parkway established a clear, contained boundary in terms of land area incorporated into the park, which is beneficial in terms of the management and maintenance of the land area. However, the Parkway relies on scenic vistas outside the physical boundaries, and with this type of boundary
delineation the negative impacts of adjacent land-use are not easily controlled.

The AIHP boundaries are primarily determined by the counties incorporated into the project. There are various sub-boundaries within the region which are being developed, for example, the state heritage parks. The establishment of such a broad region allows for the incorporation of a wide range of resources. This diversity of resources can be very beneficial in developing a tourism draw; however, the coordination of efforts and the management of the resources becomes even more difficult and challenging.

Both the Blue Ridge Parkway and America’s Industrial Heritage Project incorporate economic development through tourism in the project’s goals and objectives. The Parkway has a greater focus upon recreation and natural resources, while AIHP has a greater focus upon historic and cultural preservation. While both are regional in scope, the BRP encompasses a linear configuration and the AIHP a group configuration. Both projects have faced issues in which management of resources must extend beyond the politically designated boundaries. The multi-jurisdictional partnership approach can provide increased opportunities to respond to regional resource preservation issues through the cooperative regional approach.

**Land Acquisition and Management**

This section will compare the primary issues relating to land acquisition and management. A review of the land acquisition methods and management techniques will provide a summary of the main techniques utilized for both projects. This review will also highlight and compare the significant advantages and disadvantages relating to land management issues.

The land area for the Blue Ridge Parkway was primarily acquired through full-fee and less-than-fee acquisition. The full-fee acquisition, though costly,
allows for management of the designated land area and resources through one agency, in this case the National Park Service. The planning, development, implementation and management of the land area is determined primarily through this one agency. Potential advantages of full-fee acquisition are limited conflicts between multi-agencies in terms of the use and management of the resources.

Less-than-fee acquisition and the use of scenic easements in the development of the parkway allowed for a lower cost alternative to full-fee acquisition, while providing a means of protection to the parkways resources. The disadvantages of less-than-fee stemmed from the limited understanding and knowledge by the land owners in terms of the restrictions of the regulations. The Agricultural Leasing Program also provided an alternative to full-fee acquisition and provided a means to establish the desired land use of adjacent properties. For the land areas incorporating both the Agricultural Leasing Program and the use of scenic easements, as the land areas have changed in ownership, the new owners often are reluctant to adhere to the established regulations and limitations placed upon the land.

In the AIHP project, the cost of the land acquisition is distributed among the variety of partnerships and agencies incorporated into the project. Often the land area remains in the current ownership with the owner cooperating and supporting of the partnership mission. The coordination of land use and management can be much more difficult than in the single agency structure because of the variety and numbers of agencies involved. It is important that all agencies "buy into" the project, and accept and adopt the goals established for the project region. Quality control, or the establishment and maintenance of quality projects, can be more difficult to establish and maintain in a project with numerous agencies and partners. The commission and key individuals
representing the partnerships play an important role in developing and maintaining the desired level of quality for the project.

The issue of increasing land costs have played a significant role in the land acquisition practices of regional projects. Even at the time of the Parkway establishment alternatives were being sought to full fee acquisition. The partnership and multi-jurisdictional approach is an alternative being applied in current projects such as the AIHP. This approach, however, as in the less-than-fee acquisition approach, requires a great deal of public support and understanding of the project's goals, objectives and management strategies, particularly in regards to land designation and use.

**Administration**

This section will review the primary similarities and differences between the administrative structures of the Blue Ridge Parkway and America's Industrial Heritage Project. The partnership approach of the AIHP is significantly different than the traditional National Park Service administration incorporated into the BRP project. A review of the main issues can provide a summary of the key advantages and disadvantages associated with the new partnership approach in comparison to the traditional approach to administration.

In the Blue Ridge Parkway, the National Park Service is the lead agency in the administrative structure, and the main focus of the administration is at the federal level. The involvement of state governments have also been a significant component of the Parkway, including the development and establishment of the Parkway.

The administrative structure of the Blue Ridge Parkway follows that typical to most of the units within the National Park System. As discussed in the
case descriptions, the administrative structure follows: the Secretary of the
Interior, the main office in Washington, regional offices (in this case the Blue Ridge Parkway is under the Southeast Regional office) and the Superintendent
of the Parkway. The Superintendent has a significant and key position in
determining the goals, objectives and management of the Parkway.

The disadvantages of the typical Park Service structure involves the
"Bureaucratic Red Tape" and sometimes limited constraints and flexibility,
especially needed in the fast changing resources of today's environment. Also,
as the Superintendent of the Park changes, the direction and focus of the goals
and objectives often change according to the perceived primary issues of the
new Superintendent. The advantages of this administrative structure is that it
has been in existence for quite some time and the establishment and management
process has been well developed and structured. Another advantage is that the
number of individuals needed for the approval of aspects of the project (for
example, type of studies to be undertaken, goals and objectives), is more limited
than in the partnership structure.

The AIHP administrative structure is based upon the establishment and
maintenance of cooperative partnerships. These partnerships range from
federal, state, and local governments, private and non-profit agencies and
groups, and representatives of the local public. A cooperative partnership
approach enables a greater base of support and funding than the traditional
single agency administration. The partnership approach provides a base for
cooperative exchange of information and coordination in the use and management
of resources.

The disadvantages of such a cooperative effort can stem from the
difficulty to communicate effectively between the partnership members. Also,
there can be difficulty in reaching a consensus or the willingness to implement
components in which only a majority consensus has reached and not a total consensus. Even the relative newness of the approach and inherent glitches in developing a new framework for administrative procedures can cause complications which must be resolved.

In the AIHP administrative structure, all government levels are incorporated along with a strong level of local public involvement. The National Park Service began as the lead agency in the establishment of the AIHP until the establishment of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission. At this time the NPS took on the role of advocate and provider of valuable technical assistance to the project. The change in the role of the NPS from key administrator to one of the partners in the partnership can reflect a move towards multi-jurisdictional efforts. This trend appears to be shifting from complete government owned and managed public land areas to regional land areas managed by multi-jurisdictional partnerships.

**Planning Process**

This section will review the significant issues associated with the planning process of both projects. The focus of the planning process and the structure of the planning team are the two primary issues reviewed.

The Blue Ridge Parkway was established during a period when the focus of such projects was primarily development oriented. The planning approach encompasses a development focus and a fairly segmented process. In this process each component (for example, historic resource) was developed with a limited relationship back to the overall parkway development scheme. The overall parkway development came into play in the planning, design and implementation of the parkway route, the primary purpose of the parkway.

The structure of the planning team was less interdisciplinary than in the
current heritage approach, and continuity between components of a particular site development, for example, planning to design, was limited. The environmental regulations have led to a significant public participation component in the planning process.

The AIHP project is more preservation oriented and incorporates a degree of new development into the overall scheme. This approach incorporates revitalization aspects along with controlled growth development. The planning approach also incorporates a high degree of coordination between the preservation and development of resources. An inter-relational viewpoint is a significant component of the project, for example, viewing the various resources, the development projects and how they affect and contribute to the whole region and the goals of the project. This approach is the basis of the cooperative partnership and is essential for such a partnership to succeed.

The planning team incorporates an interdisciplinary structure, striving to achieve continuity between the planning, design and implementation phases, in the development of the particular sites throughout the project. Public involvement is a key component throughout the planning process. The public support and input is critical not only in the development of the project area, but particularly in the sustainability and long term success of such a project.

In the both projects, privately owned lands within and adjacent to the region have significant affects on the resources of the region. The role of the local public, and a high level of public involvement, can play a major influence in this respect. If the local public feel the project is important and they accept the purpose, goals and objectives of the project, they are more likely, and willing, to adopt the land use and management objectives developed for the region.
### PRIMARY CASE COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT COMPONENTS

**Table 7-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>AIHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal/Mission</strong></td>
<td>Similarities: Identify and preserve resources; economic development through tourism</td>
<td>Differences: Focus on recreation and natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope/Scale</strong></td>
<td>Similarities: Regional scale</td>
<td>Differences: Linear configuration - 29 counties (partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Similarities: Natural, historical, cultural, recreational, economic</td>
<td>Differences: Focus on natural, recreational, visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative</strong></td>
<td>Similarities: National Park Service involvement</td>
<td>Differences: Single agency - National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agencies in</strong></td>
<td>Similarities: Multi-jurisdiction</td>
<td>Differences: Federal and state; some local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
<td>Similarities: Politically and legislatively designated boundaries of project area</td>
<td>Differences: Full-fee and less-than-fee land acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>Similarities: Identification, plan, design, implementation</td>
<td>Differences: Planning approach limited inter-disciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>Similarities: Public participation incorporated into development process</td>
<td>Differences: Limited local support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRADITIONAL PRESERVATION AND HERITAGE PRESERVATION

This section will discuss general conclusions resulting from the historical analysis of cultural preservation planning, the survey results and the case study analysis. The discussion of these conclusions will revolve around the description and analysis of traditional cultural preservation efforts and heritage preservation efforts. While the AlHP project represents heritage preservation efforts, the BRP project represents preservation efforts later in the continuum than the traditional preservation efforts. As stated previously, the Parkway efforts were one of the first regional efforts to move beyond the site specific protectionist measures of traditional historic preservation.

The components of each process differ in their structure and focus, although both contain similar aspects – administration, establishment process, goals and resources. The components of the traditional preservation project incorporate a single agency which guides the particular project. Often the focus is upon preservation and protection of the historic, and sometimes cultural, resources within the project boundaries. Other resources (natural, recreational and economic) are included in the project scheme; however, with a lesser focus. The goals incorporated into the traditional preservation project revolve around the identification and preservation of the resources, interpretation of the resources and the development of new facilities to accomplish the interpretive goals, for example, visitor and interpretive centers. The establishment process is fairly linear and incorporates the identification of resources, planning, design and implementation. Public participation has been incorporated into this process and has been developed to be a larger component succeeding implementation of environmental regulations. Figure 7-1 illustrates the components of a traditional project.
Components of Traditional Preservation Project
(Figure 7-1)

In the heritage process the administrative component is comprised of a partnership structure and often includes a commission and strong public support and involvement. (Figure 7-2 illustrates components of a heritage preservation project.) The resources incorporated into the project are similar to the traditional project; however, the relationship of the resources within the project region are incorporated in a more holistic manner. The focus is often on the historic and cultural resources, but the natural, recreational and economic
resources and their affect on the cultural resources, are also important. As in the traditional efforts, the project goals incorporate the identification, preservation and interpretation of resources. The goals also incorporate the establishment of cooperative partnerships, development of regional identity and incorporation of economic development into the project scheme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Process</th>
<th>Heritage Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale /scope of preservation focus</strong></td>
<td>Site specific; internal, protectionist focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative structure</strong></td>
<td>Primarily single agency; usually federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of the National Park Service</strong></td>
<td>Usually lead agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning approach</strong></td>
<td>Development oriented; compartmentalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning process</strong></td>
<td>Identification of resources, planning, design, implementation; segmented; limited interdisciplinary team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public involvement</strong></td>
<td>Limited; public review of documents, publications, workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-2. Significant differences between the traditional and heritage process

The establishment process is similar in its components to the establishment process of the traditional project, but there is a greater focus on the inter-relationships of the resources and project components. Also, the establishment of a cooperative partnership in the administrative structure is crucial in the development and success of the heritage project.

The categories in which the primary differences occur between a traditional project and a heritage project include the scope and scale of the preservation focus, the administrative structure, the role of the National Park Service in this structure, the planning approach and focus of the planning process. Table 7-2 summarizes these components and how they differ between the traditional and the heritage process.
The scope of preservation efforts has changed from the site-specific efforts of traditional historic preservation to the more regional perspective of heritage efforts. With this change the focus has evolved from the traditional internalized and protectionist focus to the more comprehensive and holistic approach of the heritage process. The comprehensive approach of the heritage efforts was one factor which led for the need to establish a cooperative partnership administrative structure rather than the traditional administrative structure of a single agency. Other factors which contributed to the partnership approach were the high cost of outright land acquisition and the related need to incorporate a variety of owners and public participants into the project in order for the project to be successfully established.

The change in the administrative structure for these regional cultural preservation efforts is also reflected in the role change of the National Park Service. The NPS in the past was predominantly the lead agency in large scale cultural preservation efforts. In the heritage efforts, the role of the NPS has shifted from lead agency to one of the partners incorporated into the cooperative partnership administration.

The cultural preservation planning approach has also become more comprehensive in nature and has shifted from a development and protectionist orientation of the traditional efforts to a preservation and more inter-related orientation. The planning process of the traditional approach reflects a more segmented or compartmentalized approach. The compartmentalized approach includes a more internal focus towards a particular component or resource of the project, with the focus being directed primarily from the lead agency. Figure 7-3 illustrates this approach.
In the heritage process the planning approach incorporates a more inter-relational focus and the components or resources are viewed in a broader, more comprehensive manner. Primary considerations are the affects the resources have upon each other and the role they play in terms of the contribution to the overall project. Figure 7-4 illustrates the planning approach for the heritage process.
A variety of factors can be attributed to have initiated the change, or evolution, from the traditional historic preservation approach to the heritage preservation approach. The primary factors for this change include: changes in legislation, awareness of the inter-relatedness of resources, public awareness and involvement concerning environmental and planning issues, changes in the economy and types of industries. These factors and resulting changes are summarized in table 7-3.

Changes in legislation, primarily the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the Historic Preservation Act, have created a more defined and regulated process for historic and cultural preservation planning efforts. NEPA has been a significant influence on the incorporation of increased public participation into the planning process. The increased public involvement and media coverage of environmental and preservation issues has led to greater public involvement and awareness of the cultural preservation process.

There is an overall increased awareness of the inter-relationship of resources, primarily stemming from media coverage of negative environmental impacts upon these resources. This awareness had led to the development of cooperative measures to manage and protect valuable resources, and a change in the cultural preservation planning process from a linear process to a circular or relational process.

The change to a post-industrial and service oriented society has led to an increased market for tourism related industries. The recent trends and interest in the cultural heritage of America have emerged as a focus for current tourism related industries within the United States. Tourism and related industries are being sought as a means to provide a more stable economic base for regions of the country which are in economic distress. All of these factors combined have provided incentives for change in the cultural preservation planning process.
### Factors Affecting Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Affecting Changes</th>
<th>Resulting Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in legislation (NEPA, Historic Preservation Act)</td>
<td>Increased regulations and defined process, increased public participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased public knowledge and awareness of wide range of issues via news, media, etc.</td>
<td>Increased public involvement and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased environmental awareness and inter-relationship of resources</td>
<td>Development of cooperative measures for management of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Divided We Fall Syndrome&quot;</td>
<td>Work together to achieve common goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness of potential negative influences of external factors on resource</td>
<td>Change from internal focus to external and inter-relational focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness that planning process is not linear or compartmentalized</td>
<td>Planning process developing as circular and inter-relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness and interest in the cultural heritage of America</td>
<td>Incorporation of cultural and heritage aspects into the preservation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to post-industrial, service oriented society</td>
<td>Increased focus on service industries (tourism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable economy</td>
<td>Strive for innovative ways to develop economic stability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-3.

### Potential Applications

A brief discussion of potential applications of the research findings will be covered in this section. Three topics will be included in this discussion: the potential of cooperative partnership management for regional land areas, the affects of changes in the planning process for cultural preservation, and the changes in the role of the landscape architect and planner.

In terms of the cooperative partnership approach, there are greater potentials for integrated resource management on a regional scale basis, than in the traditional, single agency approach. The partnership approach applied in heritage preservation projects could serve as a model for implementing such an approach in regional planning efforts, for example, regarding the protection and planning of natural resources. The partnership approach can respond to the
management of regional or multi-jurisdictional resources more effectively than the limited capabilities of the single agency approach. The increased awareness of the inter-relationship of resources and the broad scope of environmental impacts has provided an incentive and enabled a common rallying point in which these partnerships and multi-agencies can converge.

The planning approach, particularly in these regional cultural preservation efforts, has become more interdisciplinary and circular. The process for these planning efforts needs to be further defined through the review of successful and unsuccessful projects which encounter common issues, and through the potential establishment of a procedural framework for these preservation efforts.

The increased role of public participation is important for the success of the regional cultural preservation efforts. Through the education and involvement of the local public, a strong basis and community tie to the project is developed. The involvement of the public has become increasing prevalent in the planning process, and further measures to incorporate the public into the development of the project is crucial. Increased public involvement and awareness will also lead to a greater awareness of resources at the local level, and how the management of these resources affect the region as a whole.

The role of landscape architect and planner have changed dramatically, from the voice and direction of the "professional" in the traditional preservation approach, to the role of coordinator and facilitator in the heritage preservation approach. The changes in the roles of the landscape architect and planner have resulted from many of the factors discussed in the evolution of the cultural preservation planning process: more demanding regulations as a result of changing legislation, increased public awareness and involvement, or the increased awareness of the inter-relatedness of resources.
In the traditional approach, focus was placed upon the individual site and the components within the site boundaries. The elements which had to be considered in the planning or design of the project were confined and often left to the discretion of the professional. In the more recent heritage approach, the roles have become more complex, and incorporate a comprehensive focus with a vast array issues which must be considered in the establishment and management of a project. Today the landscape architect and planner must provide a broad scope of expertise in order to facilitate and incorporate the many factors which influence the planning and design of our valuable resources.

**FUTURE QUESTIONS**

Through the pursuance of research and knowledge, answers, insights and explanations are sought. Often throughout this process, further questions are discovered. This final section poses several basic questions encountered as a result of this research, and for which further exploration or research should be undertaken.

What is the potential of applying the partnership approach to projects which incorporate a different primary focus rather than heritage preservation?

Can a systematic structure or framework be developed to incorporate the cooperative partnership approach effectively and efficiently?

Can the role of interdisciplinary planning continue to be refined and incorporated into the planning process effectively?

In terms of the coordination of efforts, which profession, if any, should take the lead role and in what manner?

Can tourism be established as a means for economic development and stabilization of local communities, and what are the extent of the residual impacts of tourism upon the character of these communities?
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APPENDIX A: CHRONOLOGY OF SIGNIFICANT EVENTS AND KEY LEGISLATION

1906 Antiquities Act established
Enables the President by proclamation the authority to set aside any federally owned land with prehistoric, historic, or scientific value as a national monument.

1916 National Park Service Act established
Creates the National Park Service and the National Park System

1917 National Park Service
Mather and Albright appointed as Director and Assistant Director respectfully; jurisdiction is assumed by the National Park Service over the existing National Parks and Monuments

1926 Great Smokey National Park established
Shenandoah National Park established

1933 Transfer of Military Historic Areas
Military historic sites, primarily Civil War sites, are transferred from the War and Agriculture Departments to the National Park Service

Civilian Conservation Corps established
Provides manpower for construction purposes within many parks

1935 Historic Sites Act established
A national policy to reserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States; established the National Historic Landmarks Survey

Less-than-Fee Acquisition
Use of land management measures such as scenic easements, instead of strictly full-acquisition measures

1936 Parks, Parkway and Recreation Act established
National Park Service is authorized to seek the cooperation and assistance of Federal Department Agencies having jurisdictions of land belonging to the United States, for the determination of land suitable for recreation purposes
1936 **Blue Ridge Parkway established**
Act to provide administration and maintenance to the Blue Ridge Parkway

1961 **Cape Cod National Seashore authorized**
Incorporated private inholding, zoning ordinances, and a congressionally authorized advisory commission

1964 **Land and Water Conservation Fund established**
Fund established to acquire recreation land from private owners, by condemnation or at prevailing market prices if necessary

1966 **National Historic Preservation Act established**
Established the legal and administration context within which local historic preservation commissions relate to and participate in the National Historic Preservation program

**Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established**
Established as a mandate of the National Historic Preservation Act; council responsible for advising the President and Congress on Historic Preservation matters, and review and comment on agency actions which affect historic properties

**National Register of Historic Places established**
Established as a mandate of the National Historic Preservation Act; a listing of properties nominated and accepted as having historic, architectural, archeological, engineering or cultural significance at the federal, state, or local level

**Greenline Parks**
Designated region in which cooperative intergovernmental (federal, state, and local) comprehensive planning is initiated in areas of national significance to include the preservation of open space, protection of significant natural and recreational features, while keeping existing residential communities and economic activities intact

1967 **Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation established**
Established in order to consolidate the National Park Service’s top level historians, archaeologists, and historic architects; initially the primary divisions were history, archeology and historic architecture

1968 **National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems legislation established**
Includes three categories of rivers: wild, scenic, and recreation; which are managed under plans approved by the Secretary of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture; federal ownership not mandated
1968 National Wild and Scenic Trail Act legislation established
Encourages federal, state and local agencies to work together to
establish scenic trails, preserving the natural setting and
establishing protection from incompatible residential or commercial
development; federal ownership not mandated

1970 Denver Service Center and Harper's Ferry Center established
Established centers for professional and technical expertise to all
parks within the National Park Service

1972 1972 Plan established
Comprehensive plan developed to identify gaps within the
representation of historic and ecological themes within the National
Park System

National Register Branch becomes a separate division

1973 Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation consolidated
Consolidation of programs basically external to the National Park
Service, consisting of the National Register Division, Grants
Division, Historic Architecture Surveys Division, and Interagency
Services for Archeology

1976 National Historic Preservation Act amendment
Amendment which constitutes the Advisory Council of Historic
Preservation as an independent agency

1978 Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service established
The focal point within the federal government for planning,
evaluation and coordination of the nation's cultural and
natural heritage, and for assuring adequate recreation
opportunities for all its people.

National Parks and Recreation Act established
Directed the preparation and revision of General Management Plans
for the preservation and use of each unit in the National Park
System

Ebey's Landing authorized
Incorporated few full-acquisition measures, utilized cooperative
measures between the National Park Service and the local public

Lowell National Historic Park authorized
Incorporated few full-acquisition measures, established a
congressionally appointed advisory commission; combined historic
preservation and economic development into mission statement
1979 National Environmental Policy Act amendments
Contents of the Environmental Impact Statement changed to be more like planning document and to include an early "scoping" process.

1980 National Historic Preservation Act amendments

State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO)
Established as a mandate of the amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act; state officials who administer the National Historic Preservation program at the state level.

Federal Preservation Officers (FPO)
Established as a mandate of the amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act; federal officers who have been designated in federal agencies to nominate federal properties and fulfill other responsibilities under the Act.

Certified Local Government (CLG)
Established as a mandate of the amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act; certification of local governments whose historic preservation programs meet prescribed standards, making them eligible for special grants and technical assistance from SHPO to assist in carrying out the Historic Preservation Act at the local level.

1981 Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service abolished
With the end of the Carter administration the HCRS is abolished and its functions and staff are transferred to the National Park Service.

1983 Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning
Development of specific guidelines and standards for preservation planning.

1984 Illinois and Michigan National Heritage Corridor established
Incorporated the establishment of a congressionally appointed advisory commission, and the inclusion of historical, cultural, recreational, and economic factors into the mission statement.

1985 Reconnaissance Study of Southwest Pennsylvania region

1988 America's Industrial Heritage Project Commission established

1992 National Historic Preservation Act amendments
APPENDIX B: RESULTS OF OPEN-ENDED INTERVIEWS

The interviews were scheduled in advance and were conducted at the informant’s place of work. An open-ended methodology was selected due to the diverse focus and topics which were discussed. An open-ended framework allowed for complete latitude to discuss topics which arose and which were considered pertinent to the focus of the research. The interviews were to remain anonymous in case of any complications which could arise if the respondent’s identity was given. The content of the interviews was not sensitive, however, it was felt that anonymity should be maintained.

A data base was developed in order to conduct a systematic analysis of the content of the interviews. Due to the open-ended nature not all categories of the data-base were covered in each individual interview. The information generated from these interviews was extremely beneficial for the development of the direction of the research, for the description and analysis of the individual cases, and for the development of the survey.

CONTENT OF ANALYSIS
1. Date and Location of Interview
2. Name of informant (not included in Appendix)
3. Agency
4. Position (generalized in Appendix)
5. Recommended Contacts
6. Background of Project / Agency
7. Components of Process
8. Example Cases for Illustration Purposes
9. Key Issues
Date and Location of Interview: August 4, 1992; Lakewood, Colorado

Agency: National Park Service, Denver Service Center

Position: Historian

Recommended Contacts:
- Denny Galvin - obtain NPS-2
- Betty Janes - perspective on MP and Environmental Plans; development into GMP
- Ann Van Ruizen - BRP planning
- Keith Dunbar - guided AiHP Commission; educate and guide group public meetings
- Carlton Abbott - design and beginning origins of BRP

Components of Process:
- Old - coordination outside not very substantial
- New - organization outside Park Service; ethic and economic development; instill ethic into community; NPS and local community

YOC - Year of Construction
GMP - General Management Plan; conceptual
DCP - Development Concept Plan - more detailed, i.e. site design, interpretive plan, etc. not very specific (more bubble type)
Class C taken out of means what similar construction costs are from other areas
IP - Interpretive Prospectus

Construction - 1 year guarantee by DSC, fulfilled by contractor; on site supervision by DSC

Process followed by NPS sites within southwestern, PA; highly disciplined process; slightly modified for outside

AIHP - general resource study; data analysis, plan and implementation

Public meetings - constant, small one on one meetings; 300 in one year, public contact with Randy; Combination with various other larger group and public meetings

DSC responsible, funding through the commission; careful about interdisciplinary; newness not completely experimental; adjustment to new role of planning and Landscape Architects sometimes difficult

Strong community tie, not successful if just tourist based; local groups in Ad Hoc; full representation

Allow for resource studies prior to appropriations

Administration (Bush et. all) does not like Commission approach, nor government help within local communities

NPS Mid-Atlantic region from hostile to now moderately supportive in regards to AIHP project
Date and Location of Interview: August 3, 1992; Lakewood, Colorado

Agency: National Park Service, Denver Service Center and Western PA Partnerships Branch

Position: Historian, Planner

Background of Project / Agency:

1985 initial Reconnaissance of Southwestern Pennsylvania area – AIHP result of the study

Identification of Cambria Iron Works as one of the significant resources

Development of alternatives – took alternative number 4

Cambria – resource study – inventory of resources; determine significance, integrity, story

Prepare National Register nomination/ National Historic Landmark acceptance

1988 – Lower Works at Cambria – look at Iron Company, fit into themes and photo documentation

Legislation developed for National Historic Park; introduced through Congressman Murtha

Supported by both Congressman Murtha and Bethlehem Steel

East Broad Railroad study of Alternatives – already a National Historic Landmark, history of was already undertaken; 1989 – HABS/HAER documentation

Fort Necessity – GMP developed; was in the Park System since 1931; new development vs. in place

Study of alternatives is not always undertaken
Date and Location of Interview: August 3, 1992; Lakewood, Colorado

Agency: National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Western Pennsylvania Partnerships Branch

Position: Planner, Historian

Recommended Contacts:
- Sharon Brown, NPS/DSC Historian

Background of Agency / Project:

Johnstown Flood Museum, Altoona Railroad Museum, and Windber Bureau (created Coal Heritage Fund) – All prior to the development of AIHP Commission; not overseen by commission but, established process to move in right direction

Legislation for Commission and definition of stories – creative ways to project and manage resources

DSC – Eastern Team, Western Pennsylvania Branch, Central Team; split into planning, design and construction

Components of Process:
- Past: piecemeal approach, focus on single resource
  - focus on resource
  - fluctuation by individuals; focus depends on superintendent and regional office
  - some flexibility and opportunity for creativeness
  - past GMP - development oriented, now more conceptual

PA partnerships more project oriented office, planning from different perspective and philosophy

Better as strategic plan basis; design of specific areas

Still some emphasis on development, political influence; focus on economic development and tourism; common thread; different alternatives

Encourage to fund programmatic rather than development

Example Cases for Illustration Purposes:
- Steamtown – break from process; special resource study; new area study; legislation up until that day is was passed called for feasibility study
- New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail – Southern NJ; Study of alternatives; legislation conflicting, established strong Congressional support; range of alternatives, define stories, and resources to tell stories look at ability to contribute
- Florida Timequan – cooperative multi-agency; Mississippi River Corridor; Jimmy Carter Plains Georgia

Key Issues: Days of total ownership by government agency are gone
Date and Location of Interview: June 30, 1992; Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania

Agency: Southwest Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission

Position: Administration

Recommended Contacts:
Ervin Zube - University of Arizona; evolution of Heritage Areas
John Albright - Denver Service Center; history of design in NPS
Denny Galvin - NPS, Washington; Associate Director of Planning and Development
Jim Pepper - Blackstone River Corridor
Keith Dunbar - NPS, Seattle; Chief of Planning in Northwest Regional Office; previous Director of AIHP
Fred Babb - NPS, DSC, SW PA Branch
Mike Bureman - NPS, DSC, SW PA Branch; comprehensive management plan for AIHP Commission
Dennis Frenchman; Mary Means, John Milner and Assoc. - Consultants
James Abrams - ethnographer for AIHP

Background of Agency / Project: AIHP history

1984 - February - tour of heads of National groups related to tourism led to report, initial study

NPS report generated Action Plan; citizen's task force and government, public meetings; Targeted key areas for development; quality is key

3 1/2 years of planning prior to any appropriations

Development of research program for nine county region by county - ethnographic, architectural and cultural site inventory

Components of Process:

Following NPS process; State of PA has similar process
- Reconnaissance of Resources/Feasibility Study
- Inventory ie. Historic Resources Documents
- Study of Alternatives
- Management Action Plan
- Design Development
- Implementation

Public involvement is key

Contract with Denver Service Center, focused branch at DSC - Southwestern PA Branch

Commission reviews overall picture, site visits by Denver people; AIHP people to Denver; local people to Denver, design review
Altoona railroader's museum – management entirely at local level

Horseshoe Curve – both Denver and Pittsburgh consultants for planning and design; Kittanning depot as model for building design

Public Involvement
  economic value of involvement – dollar impact of visitors to the area; helps to tie public involvement into project qualitative judgment – active public involvement
Informal policy – controversial decisions are necessary

Presentation is key to participation; open-ended sessions; modification of program to respond to problems

Tie into project by public is important; Randy was an active member of 35 community organizations to become familiarized with community and to establish better ties within the community

**Key Issues:**

Opportunity and confidence to seize opportunities is key to success

Don't satisfy everybody, can't accommodate everybody – establish true consensus
Date and Location of Interview: July 14, 1992; Roanoke, Virginia

Agency: National Park Service

Position: Landscape Architect

Recommended Contacts:
- Ann Van Huizen – Denver Service Center, GMP development for the BRP
- John Albright – History of National Park Service and Design
- Jim Ryan – Director of Planning and Resources, BRP
- Edie Ramey – Technical Information Center at the Denver Service Center

Background of Project / Agency:

Purpose of Blue Ridge Parkway was to develop a scenic and recreational drive which connected the Shenandoah National Park to the Great Smokies.

Master Plan includes development of park and is continually updated.

General Management Plan is now utilized – includes interpretive aspects.

BRP developed by sections; contracts by section.

Grading of the parkway balanced cut and fill; requirement of low impact flattening hillslopes and development of roadside overlooks was used to compensate cut and fill.

Quality was/is an important component in any construction; any rehabilitation incorporates rebuilding not just the addition of another layer.

Utilized general bidding process; usually contract within the area; developed quarry within 10 - 15 miles for bridge materials; usually granite stone.

Bureau of Public Roads, Landscape Architects in NPS collaboration with regional offices; participated in all Reconnaissance studies.

Field Reconnaissance studies – terrain and landscape; generalized maps; state acquired lands and private lands donated.

Components of Process:

Planning process change from development project to management project; protection of resources is a continual process.

GMP in process of being developed; includes the development of alternative strategies for planning and management; a range of choices.

Change in NPS process resulting from NEPA; created greater public involvement.
Date and Location of Interview: June 29, 1992; Richmond, Virginia

Agency: Virginia Department of Historic Resources

Position: Administration

Recommended Contacts:
- Porter - Landscape Architecture Department at UVA (design of BRP)
- Bob Page - Landscape Architect; Washington Office NPS (historic architecture)
- Al Hess, Art Alan - cultural resource management
- Ian Firth - biotic resources (BRP)
- Kellers - Alliance for Preservation of Historic Places, Charlottesville, VA
- Ralph Dimeter - Superintendent of Olmsted, linear parks
- Nora Mitchell - cultural landscapes
- Robert Melnick - historic and cultural landscapes

Example Cases for Illustration Purposes:

Ebey's Landing - late 1970's; one of the first examples of a role change of the National Park Service

Lowell, Massachusetts - partnership role became more defined

Country music center in Galax - ethnic attitudes towards landscape

Key Issues: changing attitudes in cultural historic landscape preservation; from dominant management to establishment of partnerships; look at process of example cases and their focus, goals, and objectives
Date and Location of Interview: August 4, 1992; Lakewood, Colorado

Agency: National Park Service; Denver Service Center, Western Pennsylvania Partnerships Branch

Position: Administration

Background of Project / Agency:

AIHP: large capital projects - primarily DSC
mid - range projects - primarily private consultants

Interactive approach - Commission with branch; two studio - interactive team throughout whole project

Fiscal or no year money allows for more continual projects

Integrated approach incorporate themes and linkages to those themes; look at visitor experience

Conduct public meetings and meet with site people

Positive reputation of the Park Service and also incorporate private firms

DSC somewhat fragmented by branches - planning, design and implementation
(−) change of players leads to low continuity in project

(+ more depth of input per field area, i.e. more planners than one on interdisciplinary team

BRP manicured; not so much cultural preservation as recreation

Key Issues: learning through experience - restoration and linking of events to understand whole picture in place where it happened is extremely important
Date and Location of Interview: July 1, 1992; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Agency: Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs; Pennsylvania Heritage Parks Program

Position: Administration

Recommended contacts:
- Alan Sachs and Alan Chase - DCA Regional Directors
- Joe Dibello – NPS, Mid-Atlantic Region
- Debbie Darten - NPS, Mid-Atlantic office
- Project Coordinators for PA Heritage Parks
- Mary Means - consultant for Heritage Parks

Background of Project / Agency:

Role of State:
- No mandates, recommendations only – state role as facilitator
- Provide technical assistance, guide process of public participation; intergovernmental cooperation
- Meet five goals of program; facilitate planning process (primarily through regional coordinators Sachs and Chase)
- Task force – incremental review of management action plan; different agencies assist in area of expertise as needed; often in field, i.e. Historic Museum, Heritage Affairs
- Contract entered into with historic museum; direct contracting agent Heritage Affairs Commission – ethnic/cultural focus; already in existence before Heritage Park program
- Potential to incorporate more federal agencies than just the NPS – Corps of Eng.; EPA
- No legislative or regulatory support for mandates; want to achieve, stay away from as long as possible to maintain flexibility of program; at least two more years
- Regional grants program (RIRA) – 3.5 million appropriated grants to local government for parks and recreational activities; rail trail and greenways included; use system for implementation, although Heritage Areas are more flexible; Can acquire land, value assessed, little more flexibility
- Dept. of Recreation rails to trails funding through recreation grants; 15 million in grants requests; county to local development of rails to trails Inventory at state level of rails trails
- Rails to Trails projects; canal system; greenways in recreation program; incorporate existing greenways with historic components, more numbers of rails to trails than other states
Process - past vs. present
Problems; popularity; many inquiries about program, small local groups; see need to develop separate component

Reorganization of existing staff for implementation is seen as necessary to handle this approach aspect

Heritage greenways - historically significance centered around greenway treatment as a separate category, funding for study only; protection of natural and historic resources to be the focus; no marketing of tourism

Development of guidelines is more defined; increased paperwork phase; especially once legislation is incorporated

Development of guidelines and requirements seem to be necessary; education packet development for public

Address reassignment of internal people; joint staff people to update staff people on previous process

Components of Process:

Feasibility study - funding $40 - $50,000 (State $30, local $10)

Reconnaissance study - prior to feasibility; answers question of necessity; analysis of resources only

Local group presents feasibility study and then this is reviewed by state

Promote use of consultant firms - feasibility study often with individual firm

Internal DCA (Dept. of Community Affairs) review - local management capability to carry out, process and physical ingredients; i.e. task force, steering committee, cooperative action

Distributed to other state agencies, task force, education, etc. for review; more comprehensive, less specific than management plan; little to no field work

Management Action Plan
Process important to the development team and structure; cooperative intergovernmental partnerships; same review process by task agency; consultant team approach; firm as lead agency, areas of expertise

Implementation stage - Special Purpose Studies are developed as necessary; i.e. marketing strategy; special focus to fill in "holes" of management plan; policies from other state agencies primarily

Requirements - construction documents submitted and reviewed; bricks and mortar projects; technical assistants
Public meetings – case by case; facilitate more influence by DCA; consultant to help with public participation

People buy into; NPS presence is positive; public perception

Quality projects– examples; Denver Service Center for larger projects

Example Cases for Illustration Purposes:
Boundary definition – Delaware/Lehigh – support of county wide; develop defined network; set of issues, split commissioners; push towards decision making by DCA

Lumbar Region – leadership low; problems with leadership, still working on feasibility

National Parks in East are primarily heritage/historic related; focus on preservation, tourism, economic development, ethic culture; western parks address natural beauty and natural resource preservation

Massachusetts and New York models– framework, control of people; change in federal role; grass roots; development of framework for guidance

Potential case study – Lumbar Region; DCA approached region to do feasibility study; no strong group of leaders; Lycoming County – center of Lumbar historically; other regions submitted on their own; challenge to obtain steering group, failing in Lumbar Region

Oil Region – strong local support; keep in check; no federal presence; county and government; in process of management action plan; development of RFP

Schukyill – division within agency task force; feasibility and inventory found strong history in 7 out of 8 themes; Main theme will focus on river nucleus, river of revolutions; physical (first scenic because of need to clean up river) and historically revolutionary; Theme to permit flexibility

Lackawanna– challenge to process – no authorization but have appropriations, ie. Steamtown

Key Issues:
Comparison of AIHP to NPS office; work together with state and locals on projects; some tension and turf resentment of bypassing traditional management processes and structure

Problems in working with NPS – resulting differences between groups; establishment of who does what in process; is addressed in meetings

AIHP reflected process at national level; tradition NPS process is incorporated at AIHP in addition to partnership approach

Mid-Atlantic office of NPS is perceived as key office in national strategy for future endeavors
Date and Location of Interview: August 4, 1992; Lakewood, Colorado

Agency: National Park Service, Denver Service Center

Position: Planner

Recommended Contacts:
- Buxton Beatty – Appalachian Consortium
- Jean Speer – VPI, Appalachian Studies
- Stan Abbott – design principles of parkway
- Warren Brown – for revised version of NPS-2

Background of Agency / Project:
GMP – development currently in process; support of surrounding community
and cooperation with local government and community is important

No parkway interpretive plan to date – trying to accomplish main themes; include
interpretive plan within GMP

1976 Master Plan; 1989 Statement for Management; existing conditions,
justification – set program goals; every several years updated

Components of Process:

Funding – from Washington to region to park; justification for need for funding
from region to Washington to Congress

More partnerships being developed; informational facilities

HRS – cultural resources; document significance, assess overall; National
Register form application; Visitor focused cultural resources

Development of continuity; planning to design; document rationale behind
decisions
APPENDIX C: SURVEY

PRESERVATION PLANNING SURVEY

Respondent Number:

Please check here if you would like a summary of the survey results

Clarification of several terms used in the survey is necessary. "Projects" are defined as specific areas within the regional park or project area which are currently or have recently been developed. Please answer these questions viewing the projects collectively.

"Studies" are defined as particular planning or design documents incorporated in the establishment and development of a project. Examples would include feasibility study, management plan, or design documents. Please refer only to the projects and studies you have undertaken in your current agency.

1. Profession: ___Administration; ___Architect;
   ___Economic Analyst; ___Historian; ___Landscape Architect;
   ___Planner; ___Other (please list) ______________________

2. Length of time in current position: ___0 - 5 yrs; ___6 - 10 yrs;
   ___11 - 15 yrs; ___16+ yrs

3. What type of study are you most often involved in?
   (Please check one answer)
   ___Feasibility Study
   ___Reconnaissance Study
   ___Study of Alternatives
   ___Management Plan
   ___Historic Resource Inventory
   ___Design Documents
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4. Successful projects are those which meet the stated objectives of the project while accomplishing the preservation, protection, and interpretation of resources.

How important are the following factors in the overall success of a project?

Please use the following scale:
1 - not important
2 - somewhat important
3 - important
4 - very important
5 - extremely important

A. Coordination of efforts
B. Development of public support
C. Acquisition of funding
D. Development of political support
E. Collection of information/data to substantiate importance and relevancy of project

5. How difficult is each of the following items to obtain in a successful project?

Please use the following scale:
1 - not difficult
2 - somewhat difficult
3 - difficult
4 - very difficult
5 - extremely difficult

A. Coordination of efforts
B. Development of public support
C. Acquisition of funding
D. Development of political support
E. Collection of information/data to substantiate importance and relevancy of project
6. How significant are the following types of studies in developing a successful project?

Please use the following scale:
1 - not important
2 - somewhat important
3 - important
4 - very important
5 - extremely important

A. Reconnaissance Study 1 2 3 4 5
B. Feasibility Study 1 2 3 4 5
C. Historic Resource Inventory 1 2 3 4 5
D. Study of Alternatives 1 2 3 4 5
E. Management Plan 1 2 3 4 5
F. Design Documents 1 2 3 4 5

7. To what extent are each of the following causes apt to result in a lack of continuity between planning intent and design implementation?

Please use the following scale:
1 - not likely
2 - somewhat likely
3 - likely
4 - very likely
5 - extremely likely

A. Change in administration 1 2 3 4 5
B. Change in study team members 1 2 3 4 5
C. Lack of communication between study teams who have worked on different phases of the project 1 2 3 4 5
D. Change in available funding 1 2 3 4 5
E. Other (please list)__________ 1 2 3 4 5
8. How important are each of the following sources in gathering information for the development of a Management Plan?

Please use the following scale:
1 - not important
2 - somewhat important
3 - important
4 - very important
5 - extremely important

A. Legislative documents
B. Archival/historic documents
C. Ethnographic interviews
D. Public meetings
E. Maps (ex. topographic, utility)
F. Local government officials

9. How often are each of the following methods utilized to incorporate public participation into the planning process?

Please use the following scale:
1 - not often
2 - somewhat often
3 - often
4 - very often
5 - extremely often

A. Workshops
B. Public review of documents
C. Survey/questionnaire
D. News/media
E. Presentations to local groups (ex. Kiwannis Club)
F. One-on-one interaction
10. How successful are the following methods in communicating to the public the information necessary to maintain public support for the project?

Please use the following scale:
1 - not successful
2 - somewhat successful
3 - successful
4 - very successful
5 - extremely successful

A. Workshops

B. Public review of documents

C. Survey/questionnaire

D. News/media

E. Presentations to local groups
   (ex. Kiwanis Club)

F. One-on-one interaction

11. Which of the following public participation methods are you most often involved in? (please check one answer)

___ Workshops
___ Public review of documents
___ Survey/Questionnaire
___ News/media
___ Presentations to local groups
___ One-on-one interaction
12. How significant are the following methods for gathering public input for the development of a Management Plan?

Please use the following scale:
1 - not important
2 - somewhat important
3 - important
4 - very important
5 - extremely important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Public review of documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Survey/questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. News/media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Presentations to local groups (ex. Kiwannis Club)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. One on one interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please feel free to include any additional comments you may have regarding current trends and issues in cultural/historic preservation.
## APPENDIX D: SURVEY CODEBOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>QUESTION NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CODES/VALUES</th>
<th>FORMAT RECODES</th>
<th>MISSING VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFTIME</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Length of time in profession</td>
<td>1. 0 - 4 years 2. 5 - 9 years 3. 10 - 14 years 4. 15 - 19 years 5. 20 - 24 years 6. 25 + years</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORD</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Importance of coordination of efforts in success of project</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBSUP</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Importance of public support in success of project</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFUND</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Importance of acquisition of funding in success of project</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLSUP</td>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Importance of development of public support in success of project</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLINFO</td>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Importance of collection of information and data to architectural preparation of report</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>9 - No Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECON</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Significance of reconnaissance study</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEASBL</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Significance of feasibility study</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTINV</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Significance of historic resource inventory</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDALT</td>
<td>6D</td>
<td>Significance of study of alternatives</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMPTPLAN</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td>Significance of management plan</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Significance of design documents</td>
<td>1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>9 - No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGAI</th>
<th>7A</th>
<th>Likelihood of change in administration to result in lack of accountability in central government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDMEM</td>
<td>7R</td>
<td>Likelihood of change in study team members to result in lack of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOMBE</td>
<td>7C</td>
<td>Likelihood of change in leadership to result in lack of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPUNO</td>
<td>7D</td>
<td>Likelihood of change in funding to result in lack of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>7E</td>
<td>Likelihood of change in personnel to result in lack of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGDOC</td>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Importance of legal documents in the development of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTDOC</td>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Importance of historic documents in the development of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNO</td>
<td>8C</td>
<td>Importance of ethnographic interviews in the development of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBMEET</td>
<td>8D</td>
<td>Importance of public meetings in the development of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPS</td>
<td>8E</td>
<td>Importance of maps in the development of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV-PROP</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Importance of local government officials in the development of accountability in central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIFUNSP</td>
<td>8A</td>
<td>How often are workshops utilized to incorporate public participation in the mission narrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBREV</td>
<td>8B</td>
<td>How often are public reviews of documents utilized to incorporate public participation in the mission narrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY</td>
<td>8C</td>
<td>How often are surveys and questionnaires utilized to incorporate public participation in the mission narrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA</td>
<td>9D</td>
<td>How often are news and media utilized to incorporate public participation in the mission narrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>9E</td>
<td>How often are presentations to local groups utilized to incorporate public participation in the mission narrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>9F</td>
<td>How often is one on one interaction utilized to incorporate public participation in the mission narrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKSHOP</td>
<td>TGA</td>
<td>How successful are workshops in communication of information to involve public support for the report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW</td>
<td>TGB</td>
<td>How successful are public review of documents in communication of information to involve public support for the report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY</td>
<td>TGC</td>
<td>How successful are surveys and questionnaires in communication of information to involve public support for the report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSMED</td>
<td>TGD</td>
<td>How successful are news and media in communication of information to involve public support for the report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>TGE</td>
<td>How successful are presentations to local groups in communication of information to involve public support for the report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONEON</td>
<td>TGF</td>
<td>How successful is one-on-one interaction in communication of information to involve public support for the report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTMETH</td>
<td>TGG</td>
<td>Which public participation methods have been involved in the report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOPRSP</td>
<td>TGA</td>
<td>Significance of workshops in the development of a comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REV</td>
<td>TGB</td>
<td>Significance of public review of documents in the development of a comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURV</td>
<td>TGC</td>
<td>Significance of surveys and questionnaires in the development of a comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWS</td>
<td>TGD</td>
<td>Significance of news and media in the development of a comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSGRP</td>
<td>TGE</td>
<td>Significance of presentations to local groups in the development of a comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREINT</td>
<td>TGF</td>
<td>Significance of one-on-one interaction in the development of a comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:**

1. Not successful
2. Somewhat successful
3. Successful
4. Very successful
5. Extremely successful

1. 11
2. 11
3. 11
4. 11
5. 11
6. 11
7. 11
8. 11
9. 11
10. 11
11. 11
12. 11
13. 11
14. 11
15. 11
16. 11
17. 11
18. 11
19. 11
20. 11
21. 11
22. 11
23. 11
24. 11
25. 11
26. 11
27. 11
28. 11
29. 11
30. 11
31. 11
32. 11
33. 11
34. 11
35. 11
36. 11
37. 11
38. 11
39. 11
40. 11
41. 11
42. 11
43. 11
44. 11
45. 11
46. 11
47. 11
48. 11
49. 11
50. 11
51. 11
52. 11
53. 11
54. 11
55. 11
56. 11
57. 11
58. 11
59. 11
60. 11
61. 11
62. 11
63. 11
64. 11
65. 11
66. 11
67. 11
68. 11
69. 11
70. 11
71. 11
72. 11
73. 11
74. 11
75. 11
76. 11
77. 11
78. 11
79. 11
80. 11
81. 11
82. 11
83. 11
84. 11
85. 11
86. 11
87. 11
88. 11
89. 11
90. 11
91. 11
92. 11
93. 11
94. 11
95. 11
96. 11
97. 11
98. 11
99. 11
100. 11
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APPENDIX E: RESULTS OF SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS

Question Number 1: Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Percentage Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIHP (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Analyst</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Planner</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklorist</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architect/Planner</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Parks</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologist</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Number 2: Length of time in current position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentage Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 yrs</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 yrs</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 yrs</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 + yrs</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Number 3: What type of study are you most often involved in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnaissance Study</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Alternatives</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Inventory</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Documents</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Number 4: How important are the following factors in the overall success of a project?

Successful projects are those which meet the stated objectives of the project while accomplishing the preservation, protection, and interpretation of resources.

Where:
- 1 = not important
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important
- 5 = extremely important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Average of Responses and (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Coordination of efforts</td>
<td>4.5 (4 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Development of public support</td>
<td>4.0 (2 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Acquisition of funding</td>
<td>3.9 (3 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Development of political support</td>
<td>4.5 (3 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Collection of information/data to substantiate importance and relevancy of project</td>
<td>4.0 (3 - 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question Number 5:** How difficult is each of the following items to obtain in a successful project?

Where:
1 - not difficult
2 - somewhat difficult
3 - difficult
4 - very difficult
5 - extremely difficult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Average of Responses and (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Coordination of efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Development of public support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Acquisition of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Development of political support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Collection of information/data to substantiate importance and relevancy of project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Number 6:** How significant are the following types of studies in developing a successful project?

Where:
1 - not important
2 - somewhat important
3 - important
4 - very important
5 - extremely important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Average of Responses and (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Reconnaissance Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Historic Resource Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Study of Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Design Documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Number 7: To what extent are each of the following causes apt to result in a lack of continuity between planning intent and design implementation?

Where:
1 - not likely
2 - somewhat likely
3 - likely
4 - very likely
5 - extremely likely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Change in administration</td>
<td>3.0 (1 - 5)</td>
<td>3.6 (1 - 5)</td>
<td>3.2 (1 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Change in study team members</td>
<td>2.7 (2 - 5)</td>
<td>3.8 (2 - 5)</td>
<td>3.2 (2 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lack of communication between study teams who have worked on different phases of the project</td>
<td>3.9 (2 - 5)</td>
<td>3.5 (3 - 5)</td>
<td>3.7 (1 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Change in available funding</td>
<td>4.2 (3 - 5)</td>
<td>3.8 (3 - 5)</td>
<td>4.0 (2 - 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Other Responses:

AIHP:  • communication between client and study team  
       • poor match between task force and consultants  
       • lack of communication between all entities involved in the project  
       • lack of public support

BRP:   • ability to make public/private partnerships work  
       • time it takes to implement studies;  
       • lack of clear program  
       • politics  
       • maintaining project momentum

COMB:  • not enough commitment or buy in from local, state and private partners  
       • inability to sustain momentum of project among local supporters between phases  
       • difficulty in acquisition of property
Question Number 8: How important are each of the following sources in gathering information for the development of a Management Plan?

Where:
1 - not important
2 - somewhat important
3 - important
4 - very important
5 - extremely important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean Average of Responses and (Range)</th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Legislative documents</td>
<td>3.8 (1 - 5)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3 (1 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Archival/historic documents</td>
<td>3.8 (2 - 5)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6 (1 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ethnographic interviews</td>
<td>3.2 (2 - 5)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9 (1 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Public meetings</td>
<td>4.5 (3 - 5)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2 (2 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Maps (ex. topographic, utility)</td>
<td>3.7 (1 - 5)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7 (1 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Local government officials</td>
<td>4.0 (3 - 5)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7 (2 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Number 9: How often are each of the following methods utilized to incorporate public participation into the planning process?

Where:
1 - not often
2 - somewhat often
3 - often
4 - very often
5 - extremely often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean Average of Responses and (Range)</th>
<th>AIHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Workshops</td>
<td>4.0 (3 - 5)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0 (1 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Public review of documents</td>
<td>3.9 (2 - 5)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8 (2 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Survey/questionnaire</td>
<td>2.9 (1 - 5)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9 (1 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. News/media</td>
<td>4.2 (3 - 5)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0 (3 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Presentations to local groups</td>
<td>3.9 (2 - 5)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7 (2 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. One-on-one interaction</td>
<td>4.0 (1 - 5)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9 (1 - 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Number 10: How successful are the following methods in communicating to the information necessary to maintain public support for the project?

Where:
1 - not successful
2 - somewhat successful
3 - successful
4 - very successful
5 - extremely successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean Average of Responses and (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Workshops</td>
<td>3.8 (2 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Public review of documents</td>
<td>2.8 (1 - 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Survey/questionnaire</td>
<td>2.5 (1 - 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. News/media</td>
<td>3.9 (2 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Presentations to local groups</td>
<td>3.8 (3 - 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. One-on-one interaction</td>
<td>4.1 (1 - 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Number 11: Which of the following public participation methods are you most often involved in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public review of documents</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey/Questionnaire</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News/media</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to local groups</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one interaction</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Number 12: How significant are the following methods for gathering public input for the development of a Management Plan?

Where:
1 - not important
2 - somewhat important
3 - important
4 - very important
5 - extremely important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ATHP</th>
<th>BRP</th>
<th>COMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Workshops</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Public review of documents</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Survey/questionnaire</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. News/media</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Presentations to local groups</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. One on one interaction</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please feel free to include any additional comments you may have regarding current trends and issues in cultural/historic preservation.

Respondent A6:
Knowing and understanding the stories and themes is paramount. Resources must be viewed as significant based upon their ability to contribute to the telling and understanding the important stories, not their association with, or listing on, the National Register of Historic Places which was created for an entirely different purpose.

Respondent B9:
Development of a clear management plan understood and accepted by the public insures a good management plan. Workshops are most effective for most regions doing this now.
Respondent B15:

There are many questions about public input. Determining and carrying out the public involvement strategy is critical to any project success. You can’t generalize about best methods. One of the biggest weaknesses (I’ve seen) in developing a successful project is the notable lack of expertise in public involvement among designers, L.A. researchers, etc. particularly at the federal level.

Respondent A16:

Planners are best involved at the local/regional level. Projects are less costly and better organized/coordinated if the planner in charge of the project doesn’t have to come from "afar". While public involvement via traditional meetings, etc. is important – better contact involves small group discussions, work groups, one-on-one contact and coordination with "sister" agencies. Large public meetings where a few vocal people can dominate usually don’t serve that valuable a purpose except in formal hearings and introducing a large group to a project. In the mid-late 90’s (and beyond), preservation of important historic, natural cultural and scenic resources will increasingly involve non-public lands. Public agencies will play an increasingly important role in being advocates for the protection of (+ wise use of) these resources. Coordination with local citizens and local/state officials will be even more critical, as will the cultivation and sustaining of meaningful public/private partnerships, involving private non-profit community groups, land trusts, historical groups, etc. Equally important will be tapping into enlightened corporate America for sponsorship and endorsement (without accepting unethical influence) this also helps gain political support as business leaders get behind various efforts.
As the U.S. population continues to grow and diversify, these partnerships will play an increasingly important role in the coordinated protection of resources, landscape character, etc. As preservation emphasis and "battlegrounds" increase in rural America and on our urban fringe, efforts in rails to trails, greenline parks, heritage corridors, cultural landscape protection, historic districts, prime farmland protection, community identity and quality of life, habitat protection and waterways/riparian areas will all provide a generation of involvement for us all.

Respondent B32:

Trend is toward preservation for preservation's sake. We should be certain that what we preserve is truly significant and not simply "old". Otherwise, preservationists might not survive when the pendulum of opinion inevitably swings back in the other direction.

Respondent A33:

The following elements must be present

- emphasis on common ground/coalition building
- clarity of purpose/public understanding
- shared leadership/responsibility (both success and failures)
- plan ahead/momentum is very important do not allow it to fade
- seek successful projects, however small, for visibility and momentum
- define that "sense of place" we all want to protect
APPENDIX F: REPORT ANALYSIS

CONTENT OF ANALYSIS

1. Name: name of report
2. Project: associated project name (BRP or AIHP)
3. Date/ location: date and location of report
4. Administrative agency: administrative agency backing report
5. Study team: study team compiling report
6. Consultants and/or coordinating agencies: consultants and agencies other than the lead agency with primary roles in compiling report
7. Audience for report: main audience for presentation of report
8. Purpose of project: purpose of project stated in report
9. Purpose of report: main purpose of report
10. Goals and objectives of report: main goals and objectives of report
11. Main headings of report: main topics of report
12. Recommendations/findings: brief summary of significant recommendations and/or findings of report
13. Appendices: listing and brief content description of appendixes
14. References: listing of types of references utilized and key sources of information

REPORTS REVIEWED

Blue Ridge Parkway
  • Draft Master Plan (revised 1976)
  • Statement for Management (1989)

America's Industrial Heritage Project
  • Reconnaissance Survey (1985)
  • Action Plan for America's Industrial Heritage Project (1987)
  • Comprehensive Management Plan for the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission (draft 1992)
Name: Draft Master Plan, revised 1976

Project: BRP

Date/Location: Division of Resource Planning and Professions Service, BRP


Study Team:
- John F. DeLay, Landscape Architect, Team Captain, Office of Environmental Planning and Design, Former Eastern Service Center
- Richard W. Russell, Naturalist, Office of Environmental Planning and Design, Former Eastern Service Center
- John F. Weiler, Engineer, Office of Environmental Planning and Design, Former Eastern Service Center
- Kryan D. Thelen, Recreational Planner, Office of Environmental Planning and Design, Former Eastern Service Center
- James C. Killian, Landscape Architect, Office of Environmental Planning and Design, Former Eastern Service Center
- Donald H. Robinson, Interpretive Specialist, Southeast Regional Office
- Granville B. Liles, Superintendent, Blue Ridge Parkway
- Kenneth R. Ashley, Chief Ranger, Blue Ridge Parkway
- John J. Palmer, Chief Naturalist, Blue Ridge Parkway
- Earl W. Batten, Chief of Maintenance, Blue Ridge Parkway
- William O. Hooper, Land Management Specialist, Blue Ridge Parkway
- Robert A. Hope, Landscape Architect, Blue Ridge Parkway
- Robert E. Schreffler, Landscape Architect, Blue Ridge Parkway

Audience: Blue Ridge Parkway Personnel

Purpose of Project: to provide quiet, leisurely motor travel, free from the distractions and dangers of the ordinary high-speed highway, and to give the visitor an insight into the beauty, the natural and human history, and the culture of the Southern Highlands in the area between Shenandoah and the Great Smoky Mountains National Parks. The parkway protects and preserves the natural and historic scene, thereby affording the highest type of recreational and inspirational experience.

Purpose of Report: to provide guidance and direction for the development and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway

Main Headings:
- History of the Blue Ridge Parkway – Overview
  - Resources
    - A. Geology
    - B. Plant/Animal
    - C. History of Region
    - D. Architecture
  - Region
    - A. Description
    - B. Surrounding and Existing Land Use
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C. Access/Circulation
D. Economy
E. Origin of Visitation
F. Description of Terminus Parks
   1. Shenandoah National Park
   2. Great Smoky National Park

Plan
A. Regional Concept
   1. Visitor Use
   2. Information Center
   3. Establishment of Travel Centers
   4. Interpretation
   5. Environmental Education Program
   6. Recreational Activities
B. Local and Regional Planning
C. Resource Management Programs
D. Land Classification
   1. General Outdoor Recreation
   2. Natural Environment
   3. Outdoor Natural Areas
   4. Historical and Cultural Areas
E. Administration
F. Visitor Safety and Protection
G. Design Theme
H. Architectural Theme
I. Walks and Trails
J. Campgrounds
K. Concessions
M. Major Visitor Use Areas
N. Minor Visitor Use Areas
O. Housing
P. Access and Grade Elimination
Q. Blue Ridge Extension

Recommendations/Findings:
Management Objectives developed
A. Central Management with Field Units
B. Close Cooperation with Forest Service
C. Work Closely with States of North Carolina and Virginia
D. Preserve Scenic Views
E. Encourage and Promote Proper Use of Adjoining Lands
F. Architectural Theme to Conform to Highlands
G. Increase Emphasis on Environmental Awareness – need to coordinate matters between states, counties, communities and agencies

Appendices:
A. Management Statement
B. Charts
C. Legislation
E. Study Team
F. General Development Map
Name: Reconnaissance Survey of Western Pennsylvania Roads and Sites

Project: AIHP

Date/Location: September 1985; Southwestern, Pennsylvania

Agency: U. S. Department of the Interior; National Park Service, directed by Congress

Study Team:
Richard V. Giamberdine, Landscape Architect, Denver Service Center (DSC)
Ronald W. Johnson, Cultural Resources Planner, DSC
Keith Dunbar, Community Planner, DSC
Michael J. Spratt, Outdoor Recreation/Transportation Planner (DSC)
Randall Cooley, Superintendent, Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site (ALPO)
Skip Cole, Chief, Interpretation and Resource Management ALPO
Bruce McKeeman, Site Manager, Johnstown Flood National Memorial

Consultants:
Richard Burkert, Director, Johnstown Flood Museum
Don Dreese, Project Coordinator, PA Dept. of Environmental Resources, Division of Scenic Rivers
Ted Holland, Executive Director, Altoona Railroaders' Memorial Museum
Representatives from the Denver Service Center
Representatives from the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site

Audience: Congress

Purpose of Project: To lead towards development of a comprehensive approach to expand the public's awareness of cultural resources to provide present and future populations a better understanding of our nation's transportation and industrial history

Purpose of Study: To conduct a study of the area's historic resources to include a discussion of significant historic, natural and scenic resources in Southwestern, Pennsylvania, in order to assess if they are appropriate for designation and recognition under existing federal and state conservation, preservation and recreation programs

Goals and Objectives:
- identification of areas of national and state significance
- evaluation of significant and feasibility of recognition of possible sites, scenic trails and parkways
- presentation of alternatives to preserve and interpret significant resources in the most effective manner
- preparation of preliminary cost estimates for the development, preservation and interpretation to fulfill congressional mandate
Main Headings:
Summary of Project
Introduction and Purpose and Objectives of Report
Description of Environment
  A. Regional Setting
  B. Study Area
    1. Area features
    2. Geographic setting
    3. Land use
    4. Economic base
Description and Analysis of Major Resources
  A. Natural Resources
    1. General description
    2. Arable land/soils
    3. Forests
    4. Rivers
    5. Minerals
    6. Analysis
  B. Cultural Resources
    1. Description - history
      a. Transportation: key to settlement
         • Canal era
         • Railroad era
      b. Growth of heavy (iron and Steel) industry in Western, PA
    2. Analysis - current status
      a. Transportation
      b. Heavy industry
    3. Thematic representation of transportation and heavy industry
  C. Recreation Resources
    1. Description
    2. Analysis
  D. Settlement Patterns
    1. Description
    2. Analysis
Concepts for the Future
A. Overview of section (section will include the presentation of four alternatives for the identification, evaluation, preservation, interpretation, and development of significant resources associated with the origins and growth of western Pennsylvania)
B. Alternative One: individual site preservation and promotion
  1. Description
  2. Visitor experience
  3. Implementation
    a. Canal features
    b. Railroad structures
    c. Iron and steel industry
C. Alternative Two: individual community development and promotion
   1. Description
   2. Visitor experience
   3. Implementation

D. Alternative Three: the trans-allegheny link/cooperative community approach
   1. Description – three options
      a. Enhance existing
      b. Parkway development
      c. Larger parkway development
   2. Visitor experience
   3. Implementation

E. Alternative Four: regional cooperative development and promotion
   1. Description
   2. Visitor experience
   3. Implementation

F. Funding
   Strategy for Action Common to all Alternatives
   A. Strategy for Action Common to all Alternatives
   B. Suggested structure of the action plan
   C. Estimated costs for completing action plan (by individual alternatives)

Recommendations/findings:
Recommended development of Action Plan, regardless of the alternative selected, for the preservation, enhancement and interpretation of the transportation and iron/steel-making themes

Objectives of the Action Plan
- to identify the historically significant elements of the two themes
- to identify public and private uses for the significant elements
- to outline the development and management responsibilities for the preservation, enhancement and interpretation of these elements
- to identify costs to implement the action plan
- to project capital and operating-cost budgets
- to identify sources of revenue

Foreseen Outcomes of the Action Plan
- lay groundwork for activities for tourist attractions
- lay groundwork for improving visual quality
- provide a greater potential for cultural preservation
- provide a model for how interests and organizations in two communities can work together to develop a preservation plan to address needs of both communities

Appendices:
A. Legislation for appropriations
B. Cultural resources programmatic aspects
C. National register properties
D. Steel and rail industry preservation in other areas
References:
Local History Documents and References

Public Documents
• Historic site survey (local)
• Land-use survey (local)
• PA Recreation Plan
• Economic Significance of Recreation in PA
• PA Trail Guide
• National Register Inventory
• General Management Plan for ALPO
• Historic America (HABS/HAER)
• Census Data
• Marketing Plan for Travel Development in Southern Alleghenies
KAREN HARDY
713 LEE STREET APARTMENT 2
BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24060
(703) 953-3020

EDUCATION:

Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
B.S. Parks and Recreation, 1985
Emphasis: Environmental Education

Virginia Polytechnic and State University, Blacksburg, VA
Masters in Landscape Architecture, Spring 1993

Virginia Polytechnic and State University, Blacksburg, VA
Masters in Urban and Regional Planning
Projected Graduation: Fall 1993

WORK EXPERIENCE:

Fall 1992  Graduate Assistantship
- Spring 1993  Landscape Architecture Department
Blacksburg, Virginia
Advanced Technology

Summer 1992  Research Assistant
Landscape Architecture Department
Blacksburg, Virginia
Research Proposal Development and Editing of
Research Documents

Spring 1992  Graduate Assistantship
Landscape Architecture Department
Blacksburg, Virginia
Intermediate Technology

Fall 1988  Campbell and Ferrara Nurseries, Inc.
- Summer 1990  Alexandria, Virginia
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EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS:
CADD Systems, Word Processing, Spreadsheet Programs,
Statistical Programs, Historic Preservation: National Register
Process, Residential Landscape Design, Horticulture, Regional
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CERTIFICATION AND MEMBERSHIPS:

- Association of Landscape Architects
- American Planning Association
- Virginia Nurserymen Association
- The Honor Society of Sigma Lambda Alpha
- ASLA Certificate of Merit
- National Trust for Historic Preservation

RESEARCH AND ANALYTIC PROJECTS:

- "Coal Camp Culture" - Ethnic Influences on the Built Form of Coal Camps in Southwestern Virginia; Oral History Interviews, Documentation and Ethnographic Analysis

- "Mountain Lake Visual Assessment" - Viewshed Analysis of Highway Corridor Access to Mountain Lake Resort in Giles County, Virginia

- "Pulaski, Virginia" - An Analysis of the Built Form of a Southwestern Virginia Town

- "Appalachia, Virginia" - Potential Planning Scenarios Focused on Natural Resource Protection and Development

- "Davis-Bourne House National Register Nomination" - Individual Structure Nomination in Grayson County, Virginia

- "Blandford Cemetery" - Proposal for Planning Restoration and Design Services for Historic Cemetery in Petersburg, Virginia

- "Tennessee Backroads Heritage Tourism Pilot Area Preservation Plan" - Project Assistant for Historic Resource Preservation Plan for Pilot Area of the National Trust for Historic Preservation Heritage Tourism Initiative

DESIGN PROJECTS:

- Wildlife Rehabilitation Facility
- Hotel/Resort Conference Center