

**Fostering Innovations in State Cultural Policy
Project Working Paper
Historic Preservation**

**Prepared by Shelley Mastran
Edited by Lisa Burcham and Constance Beaumont
for the National Trust for Historic Preservation**

Part 1: Readiness of the Historic Preservation Community to Identify, Share, and Replicate State Level Policy Innovations

Structures and Mechanisms to Identify and Share State Level Policy Innovations

There are a number of structures and mechanisms to identify and share state level policy innovations in historic preservation through the National Trust, statewide partners, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO).

- The **National Trust's State/Local Policy Program** is the locus for identifying and sharing state preservation *policy* innovations at the National Trust. With a small staff of three, the program has the equivalent of 1-1/2 persons dedicated to state policy. The program identifies and shares information about state policies in several ways:
 - through the State and Local Policy Edition of *Preservation Advocate News*, an electronic newsletter sent to some 1,700 preservation advocates and displayed on the National Trust's web site;
 - through periodic special reports. For example, recent reports have covered such topics as state policies affecting historic neighborhood schools and state growth management innovations;
 - through tracking – and disseminating information on – state preservation tax incentives. Our State Policy Analyst maintains an up-to-date, state-by-state listing of all state preservation tax incentives. This listing is on the National Trust's web site and available to anyone. In addition, the Program provides *pro bono* legal assistance to state preservation organizations seeking to enact or develop tax incentive programs;
 - through periodic articles in *Forum*, such as recent articles on state preservation tax incentives and state building codes affecting historic preservation;
 - through occasional books, such as *Smart States, Better Communities: How State Governments Can Help Citizens Preserve Their Communities*;
 - through on-site meetings and/or presentations to state groups – e.g., a recent meeting with Kentucky Governor Patton's Task Force on Smart Growth;
 - through responses to frequent telephone and e-mail requests for information from state preservation organizations;
 - through interviews with the mainstream media and trade press; and
 - through special programs and educational sessions at National Trust meetings and annual conferences.

We also collect copies of state preservation laws and maintain files on them so that we can provide information on such laws when requested to do so. We would like to develop a more complete and interactive National Clearinghouse on State Preservation Policies, but because the State and Local Policy Program has not been core-funded and must raise money for special projects in order to operate, the Clearinghouse is more of a goal than a reality.

- The **National Trust's annual conference** is a major vehicle for sharing information. The conference typically offers educational sessions on state preservation policies and state advocacy efforts. The conference usually draws between 2,200 and 2,600 attendees from around the country. The informal conversations that take place between and among attendees are often as good a forum for exchanging ideas and information as the formal sessions.
- The **National Trust's Statewide & Local Partnerships Program**—its partnership with statewide and local nonprofit preservation organizations—is an important vehicle for information exchange. Through innovative public policy pilot programs, a network-wide listserv, twice annual gatherings of Statewide Partners, the presentation of “Three-Minute Success Stories” at the National Preservation Conference, and the program’s newsletter, *STATEments*, information about innovative statewide collaborations is shared. This clearinghouse function as well as the success of pilot initiatives and coalition-building efforts of numerous Statewides encourages replication. All statewide organizations have their own newsletters, most have websites, and many have an e-mail advocacy network for further dissemination.
- The **National Trust's Preservation Books and Forum** provide information on state-level preservation successes. The Preservation Books series includes several publications that include case studies of state level success stories. In addition, the quarterly Forum Journal and bi-monthly Forum News include case studies and articles concerning state programs and initiatives. Forum Online includes a "Solutions" database that provides hundreds of case studies of preservation successes, many of which are state-level programs.
- The **National Trust Regional Offices** identify emerging state and regional issues, particularly when they have national implications. Through conference calls with the Senior Vice President of the National Trust, the annual prioritizing of regional office issues, and discussions between the regional offices and state and local policy staff at headquarters, innovative and successful statewide stories are shared. The Northeast Leadership Meetings, sponsored by the Northeast Regional Office of the National Trust are gatherings on regular basis of statewide nonprofits, State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), and related organizations in the Northeast.
- The **National Trust Advisors** (two for every state) discuss public policy issues at their annual meeting.

- The **National Trust National Main Street Center** is another vehicle for information exchange: at National Town Meeting, through the Main Street newsletter and other publications, and via the Main Street website and Main Street Network list serve.
- The National Trust's website provides information on statewide successes.
- Relationships between the National Trust and other organizations (e.g., the Smart Growth Network, National Governors Association, National Conference of State Legislatures) provide another vehicle for information exchange.

The strongest and best supported of the National Trust's mechanisms is the Statewide & Local Partnerships Program. This support comes from a number of small, private foundations and individual funders who provide operating support and challenge grants to support capacity building efforts. By hosting regular gatherings and frequent communication between statewide preservation organizations, Statewide & Local Partnerships is able to disseminate information about new models for effective public policy. State and Local Public Policy staff frequently are involved in the Statewide Partners workshops and provide regular technical assistance to statewide and local organizations. As mentioned, funding support from private foundations provides some support for these informational exchanges, but there is currently no funding available for new public policy initiatives.

The **National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO)** has two vehicles for sharing state level information about innovative policy initiatives. One is through presentations at the meetings of the board of directors (three times a year) and the annual meeting in March. For example, recently NCSHPO had a panel of speakers presenting information on heritage area programs, both state and national. The other is through the NCSHPO listserve which links all the SHPOs and many of their staff.

Structures and Mechanisms to Track, Analyze and Replicate State Level Policy Innovations

The mechanisms discussed above for information sharing are informal, flexible, and dynamic. They work fairly well to disseminate information, but they are not adequately funded or staffed to do a comprehensive job of continuously tracking, analyzing, extending, and replicating state level policy innovations. They may *encourage* replication, but additional funding must be raised in any effort to replicate successful statewide strategies. Replication happens only when it's a real priority for a state. When funding for special projects has been available, in-depth analyses of selected issues have been possible. However, the structures and mechanisms for tracking, analyzing, and replicating state level policy innovations are generally anemic.

For example, information about the statewide collaboration of organizations in New Hampshire that raised new money for preservation and conservation has been disseminated through several media, but there has been no training on how to replicate it and no information gathering on whether other states are even trying to replicate such a collaborative. We can identify innovations but have not had the capacity to analyze what works and then to replicate the most successful strategies.

Exceptions to this rather hit-or-miss situation include rehabilitation tax credits and rehabilitation codes, where conscious replication has taken place. There has been real follow-through on tax credits. Unfortunately, however, we have little information on the impact of these credits and the best ways to structure them. And there is no mechanism for analyzing or comparing the value of a dollar's worth of rehabilitation tax credits versus a dollar spent on some other public investment. The National Trust would like to conduct more thorough and systematic tracing of such issues as state transportation policies affecting historic resources, state funding programs for historic preservation, state laws for protecting historic resources, but we do not now have the capacity to do so.

The National Conference of State Historic Preservation Offices (NCSHPO) does some tracking and sharing of information for its own members, but the information it gathers is not generally shared with the rest of the field.

Need for and Interest in Learning from Other States about Policy Innovations

The level of interest in state policy innovations is high. The National Trust's Public Policy Department receives hundreds of calls each year from individuals and organizations requesting assistance in becoming more effective advocates for preservation and information about what other states are doing. For example, recently Kentucky and Wisconsin developed new smart growth initiatives, and the SHPOs came to the Trust for information about these. The National Trust advisors and statewide preservation organizations have also asked for help in becoming more strategic and successful advocates—whether their issues are private property rights, tax credits, or funding for preservation and conservation. The preservation issues vary by region of the country but not the need.

Barriers to State-Level Sharing and Adaptations of Effective Policies

The major barriers to more effective information sharing and replication of policy innovations are money and staff. There is also a need for a longer-term, better coordinated system for sharing information among the National Trust, its advisors, Preservation Action, NCSHPO, the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions, and state and local preservation organizations in developing a common agenda. Oftentimes there are competing or conflicting priorities, as well as philosophical differences about what the preservation community should be involved in. For example, the SHPOs tend to focus on federal issues; the statewide organizations focus on issues within their own states. Consequently, there is often a lack of communication between public and private sectors.

The National Trust has repeatedly identified building a strong advocacy network, tracking information on innovative practices, and replication of “good news” case studies as priorities but has lacked the resources to follow through. Some SHPOs are reluctant to take on new initiatives because they lack the financial and staff resources to sustain them.

Part 2: Descriptive Examples of Successful Policy Innovations

New Hampshire Land And Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP)

In June 2000, the New Hampshire legislature appropriated \$3 million as start-up funding for the first-ever state preservation and conservation funding program. This funding was secured by the lobbying campaign of Citizens for New Hampshire Land and Community Heritage (“Citizens”), a coalition of more than 135 organizations working to increase public and private funding for conservation of natural, cultural, and historic resources.

Catalyst

Throughout the 1990s, the fast pace of growth and threat to historic resources in New Hampshire fueled citizen concern. (New Hampshire is the fastest growing state in New England, with 15,000 acres of open space lost every year; its historic districts and landmarks are in obvious need of assistance.) Yet, although New Hampshire had a land conservation fund, it had no targeted assistance programs for bricks and mortar rehabilitation or historic easement acquisition.

In July 1998, through legislation and the leadership of Representative Martha Fuller Clark and other prominent members of the preservation, conservation, and philanthropic communities, a state commission was formed to look into creating a public-private partnership to provide funding for diverse preservation and conservation efforts. A small group of organizations formed a coalition called Citizens for New Hampshire Land and Community Heritage (“Citizens”) with 15 founding members, including the Audubon Society, the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, and Preservation Alliance of New Hampshire. The commission recommended that the state establish a new fund for both conservation and historic preservation, to provide grants with not less than 50 percent to be matched by the community. The commission recommended a funding level of \$12 million.

Implementation

Within a short period of time, most prominent conservation-oriented groups, statewide business and tourism groups (the Business and Industry Association of New Hampshire and the New Hampshire Travel Council), municipal associations, and others had joined. Eventually more than 135 organizations had signed up with Citizens. Citizens sought to broaden the coalition through various forms of outreach. The New Hampshire Main Street program and State Historic Preservation Office played key roles with the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance in bringing groups on board.

Citizens employed a number of strategies to raise community support across the state. These included circuit riding with a slide show, presentations throughout the state, op-ed pieces, polling and postcard campaigns, and a town meeting campaign. Integral to the campaign was the Internet. Citizens developed a Web page, an e-mailed newsletter, and a database of more than 6,000 supporters who were updated regularly. With every turn of events in the legislature, supporters were notified, asked to take action, and informed in detail how to contact their legislators.

The philanthropic community—both foundations and private individuals—provided support. The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests acted as fiscal agent.

Legislation to fund the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program was introduced in the 2000 legislature. Funding anything new was particularly tough, since New Hampshire was (still is) experiencing an education-funding crisis. Legislation passed in June 2000, and in September, 18 individuals (9 of whom vote) were named by the governor to serve on the authority that reviews and approves grant requests.

Factors Critical to Success

- Hiring a full-time coordinator for Citizens
- Multiple strategies to raise organizational and grassroots support
- Internet-based communication

Outcome

In its first year, LCHIP received more than 100 applications totaling \$19 million in proposed project costs. These were voted on June 1, 2001. The projects will be roughly divided between land conservation and historic preservation.

With Citizens, a preservation and conservation partnership has become solidified, with new collaborations among interest groups. Conservationists are learning about historic preservation, and vice versa. The image of historic preservation has been elevated (preservationists are now part of the statewide lobbying network). Preservation has gotten new media and public-official attention. The Preservation Alliance of New Hampshire has expanded its membership.

Sustainability

In 2001, the New Hampshire House and Senate voted \$6 million for LCHIP's second year and \$9 million for the following year, but final budget negotiations could affect the final appropriation. The program is currently funded in the general administration budget; advocates want more and more permanent funding to help communities protect what is irreplaceable about New Hampshire.

Lessons Learned

- Build strong coalitions.
- Use technology to keep communications quick and timely every day; notify everyone electronically through a list serve.
- Get to know your legislators ahead of time.
- Get in front of your legislators; brief new legislators on preservation issues; train them.

Contacts

Alice deSouza, New Hampshire Preservation Alliance, (603) 224-2261;
CWLALD@mediaone.net

Jennifer Goodman, New Hampshire Preservation Alliance, (603) 224-2261;
jg@nhpreservation.org

Brian Hart, Citizens for New Hampshire Land and Community Heritage, (603) 230-9729;
citizens@spnhf.org

Pennsylvania Public Policy Pilot – Restructuring the Movement

Through a public policy partnership initiative funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and a number of Pennsylvania foundations, 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania, other statewide and local preservation organizations, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation helped secure the passage of several preservation-friendly laws. Chief among the legislative victories were changing the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code so that municipalities could plan together through cooperative agreements and so that local plans would have to incorporate heritage and natural resources; passing the Downtown Location bill encouraging state agencies to locate downtown; revising the Department of Education's construction reimbursement policies to be more favorable to historic schools; and "Growing Greener," a reshuffling of state budget money toward acid mine drainage cleanup, brownfields, planning, streams, parks, and similar priorities.

Catalyst

In the mid-1990s there was widespread concern about sprawl in Pennsylvania. A number of organizations were working on aspects of the issue, but there was no overarching strategy to combat sprawl. Each organization had its own sub-agenda; each group addressed a small part of the issue and, therefore, had little impact.

In 1995, Preservation Pennsylvania and other groups organized a two-day symposium, attended by representatives of some 120 organizations to discuss issues of sprawl and develop an action plan. The major outcome was agreement that an alliance—an umbrella entity—was needed.

Meanwhile, the National Trust sent a request for proposals (RFP) to statewide preservation organizations to engage in collaborative projects to strengthen the preservation movement. Preservation Pennsylvania was interested in strengthening its public policy role and, with the Trust, requested funding from the Mellon Foundation to support a Public Policy Pilot Project.

Implementation

Preservation Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Environmental Council, and the National Trust raised additional funds from other foundations. The money went primarily for hardware and software to build an Internet-based advocacy network, as well as to conduct a study on the costs of sprawl in Pennsylvania.

Out of this collaboration, 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania was formed. It was incorporated as a 501(c)(3) in 1999. Initially it had 60 member organizations—heritage, environmental, business, government—interested in sprawl issues. All the organizations' members are linked through a computerized e-mail system. Today there are 200 endorsing organizations representing some 310,000 members. The organization has a lobbying arm, 10,000 Friends/Advocates for Pennsylvania, a 501(c)(4). It is a bottoms-up collaborative with ten task forces covering issue areas which define the legislative agenda for 10,000 Friends.

Factors Critical to Success

- The cathartic symposium with many entities brought together
- Having no preconceptions about the outcome of the symposium
- Being armed with good data (*The Cost of Sprawl in Pennsylvania*, published January 2000, was undertaken to have facts with which to make convincing arguments.)
- Bringing in the National Trust in the formative period of 10,000 Friends; this provided an added impetus to go to funders to get support quickly.

Outcome

Strategic lobbying occurred as a result of the e-mail network. All 200 organizations are on board for the issues: they represent a powerful challenge to the money and connections of the development industry. All the organizations together are working on historic preservation tax incentives and easement bills.

10,000 Friends and its member organizations now have easy access to, influence with, and credibility with the legislature. Key bills have passed, particularly Municipalities Planning Code revisions (2000 June); the Downtown Location bill (May 2000); and changing the Department of Education's reimbursement guidelines to make it easier to rehab historic schools (2000).

There is now a true collaboration across the state on sprawl issues and a widespread understanding of the parameters of sprawl.

Sustainability

10,000 Friends is an established 501(c)(3), and there is an organizational lobbying arm, in 10,000 Friends' Advocacy Network, a 501(c)(4).

Lessons Learned

- Convene all interested parties in an open way, getting agreement up front on issues and direction.
- Solidify and legitimize organizational roles through a Memorandum of Agreement. (An MOA among National Trust, Pennsylvania Environmental Council, and Preservation Pennsylvania was signed defining relationship, agreed to fundraising relationship.)

Contacts

Caroline Boyce, 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania, (717) 234-6070; carolineboyce@aol.com

Texas Courthouse Preservation Grants

In 1999 the Texas legislature appropriated \$50 million to save the state's endangered historic courthouses. The legislature (which meets every two years) provided these funds in the form of partial matching grants from the Texas Historical Commission (THC). An additional \$50 million has recently been appropriated for the next two years.

Catalyst

Texas has 254 counties, and 225 of them have historic courthouses, most in disrepair. The Texas Historical Commission had been concerned about the rehabilitation of these buildings since the mid-1970s. The fire that almost destroyed the Hillsboro County courthouse in 1993 served as something of a catalyst, because Hillsboro tapped into almost \$4 million in ISTEAs for restoration. Other courthouses followed suit, and by the third round of ISTEAs funding at least 30 courthouse proposals had been submitted.

In 1994, the Texas Historical Commission received ISTEAs to develop a program to document and assess the condition of 55 of the oldest and most threatened landmark courthouses and build a data base of information on all the courthouses. This initiative was known as the Texas Courthouse Alliance.

Meanwhile, Preservation Texas started campaigning for the protection of county courthouses. In 1996 Preservation Texas nominated the state's courthouses to the National Trust for Historic Preservation's list of America's 11-Most Endangered Historic Places. Although the courthouses did not make the 11-Most list the first time, they were included in the announcement of June 1998. Meanwhile, Governor George W. Bush proposed the Texas Courthouse Preservation Initiative and in June 1998 asked for \$100 million to save the courthouses.

How was Governor Bush persuaded of the importance of courthouse restoration? Several strategies brought key political support and this, in turn, raised the visibility of the issue. THC commissioners are gubernatorial appointees, and a number of them were persuasive with Bush. The county judges were also key, some of whom had been denied ISTEAs funding in the third round of applications. Preservation Texas played a strong advocacy role. On Legislative Day in 1997 the organization focused the luncheon speech on courthouses. The executive director of the statewide made numerous slide presentations to meetings of the county judge associations and asked them to sign a form letter to the lieutenant governor about the courthouse crisis.

Preservation Texas and the National Trust's Southwest Office lobbied to get the funding. Theirs was largely a grassroots campaign, whereby counties with endangered courthouses and both members' organizations were encouraged to contact their legislators about the importance of the

funding. A year later, the legislature provided \$50 million through the Texas Historical Commission.

Implementation

Counties are required to have a master plan before they can get the bricks-and-mortar money from THC, which approves their master plan. In order to expedite the planning process, the National Trust's Southwest Office obtained an initial \$25,000 from the Meadows Foundation for courthouse planning grants; another \$25,000 has recently been awarded. These "Smart Start" 50-50 matching grants were \$2,500 each to get the rehabilitation planning process started. Today those grants have doubled in size.

Preservation Texas and THC have built a grassroots network of support to sustain the grants. They developed a traveling exhibit of 14 panels showing the development of the county system in Texas and the design and construction of the courthouses. Training workshops for county officials and preservation architects were held. Preservation Texas has organized a courthouse lobbying team of representatives of 70 counties to obtain continued funding.

Factors Critical to Success

- Complementary roles of three historic preservation players in the state
- Listing in the National Trust's 11-Most Endangered Historic Places
- Political ties to the governor

Outcomes

In the first biennium, 115 counties submitted master plans to THC, and 93 received approval to apply for bricks and mortar grants. Forty-four projects received full or partial grants totaling nearly \$50 million. The National Trust provided Smart Start grants to 15 counties in the first round (2000) and expects to fund 8-10 more in 2001 with grants of up to \$5,000.

There has been a change in counties' attitudes toward historic courthouses, and much more awareness of their importance.

Sustainability

The \$50 million appropriation that the Texas legislature has twice provided will have to be repeatedly sold on its own merits and compete with other legislative priorities, but for now continued funding seems fairly well assured.

Lessons Learned

- Have an involved and committed state agency.
- Get broad national publicity.
- Form a strong partnership among the players.

Contacts

Daniel Carey, National Trust for Historic Preservation, (817) 332-4398; daniel_carey@nthp.org

Elizabeth Ann Gates, Preservation Texas, (512) 472-0102; PreservTex@aol.com

Stanley Graves, Texas Historical Commission, (512) 463-6094; stan.graves@thc.state.tx.us

Jane Jenkins, Downtown Boulder BID, (303) 449-3774; jane@dbi.org

Libby Willis, Historic Fort Worth, (817) 336-2344; libbyW1@swbell.net

Vermont Housing & Conservation Trust Fund

In 1987 the Vermont legislature funded a new program for farmland preservation, open space conservation, historic preservation, and affordable housing. Through monies from the real estate transfer tax and state bonds, grants and loans are provided to nonprofits and municipalities for preservation, conservation, and affordable housing projects.

Catalyst

During late 1980s, Vermont experienced a rush of land speculation, increasing development pressure, and rising costs of land and housing. Multiple interest groups across the state were lobbying separately for a small pot of money. Meanwhile, the conservation community had for some time been looking at the possibility of establishing a fund similar to one on Nantucket that used a portion of the real estate transfer tax to support land conservation efforts. In 1986 Vermont's conservation and historic preservation communities began discussing the issue and agreed to hire a lobbyist to further the process.

Then Governor Madeline Kunin and her administration were supportive but also wanted to support the development of affordable housing. That was the catalyst that encouraged the formation of a broad and unusual coalition, including the Vermont Land Trust, Vermont Natural Resources Council, the Nature Conservancy, the Preservation Trust of Vermont, Vermont Legal Aid, the Burlington Community Land Trust, as well as farming interests and affordable housing advocates. Together they worked on the draft legislation that established the Housing and Conservation Fund.

Implementation

The Vermont Housing and Conservation Board has nine members including five governor-appointed citizens and four state officials responsible for agriculture, natural resources, housing and community development. The Board receives applications and makes decisions. Grants, loans, and loan guarantees are provided for the purchase of development rights, options on land, easements, fee-simple purchase of land or buildings, rehabilitation of historic properties, and the

rehabilitation or construction of low-income housing. Funds can also go for feasibility studies and pre-development work.

The Vermont Housing and Conservation Coalition, composed primarily of land trusts, the Preservation Trust of Vermont, and affordable housing organizations, meets every month, and during legislative sessions the key activist members meet once a week. Each year the coalition raises between \$20,000 and \$25,000 to hire a lobbying firm to secure continued funding for the Trust Fund.

Factors Critical to Success

- An agenda of broad goals, with affordable housing and farmland protection taking precedence
- Testimony and support from all interest groups
- Support from the top: Governor Madeleine Kunin encouraged the broad-based coalition.

Outcome

Since its beginning, the Vermont Housing and Conservation Trust Fund has provided approximately \$140 million in grants and loans. More than 327,000 acres of land—89,100 acres of which are farmland—have been protected. More than 6,300 units of perpetual affordable housing have been funded, many of them in historic buildings.

Sustainability

The Trust Fund has been sustained year after year and is very much an ongoing effort.

Lessons Learned

- Have a broad, unusual coalition. In the late 1980s the idea that land conservation and historic preservation had an interest in affordable housing was unthinkable, but the coalition has proven to be very powerful.
- Have a collection of programmatic goals.
- Work in a small state. In a small state like Vermont, where there are lots of connections among people and organizations at many different levels, it may be easier to develop collaborative efforts.

Contacts

Paul Bruhn, Preservation Trust of Vermont, (802) 658-6647; paul@ptvermont.org

Gus Selig, Vermont Housing and Conservation Trust Fund, (802) 828-3251

Washington Heritage Caucus

Formed in 1990, the Washington Heritage Caucus is a loose bi-partisan organization of state legislators and other elected officials, state heritage, cultural and lands agencies and nonprofit organizations that supports the protection of the state's historic and cultural legacy. Some of the diverse partners include the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, the Olympia Heritage Commission, the Squaxin Island Tribe, the Steilacoom Historical Society, the Maritime Heritage Foundation, Historic Seattle, King County Landmarks, Seattle Landmarks Commission, the Steamer Virginia V Foundation, the Arts Alliance of Washington, the Northwest Railway Museum, and others. The Caucus has been successful in securing legislation to fund a number of capital heritage projects and support for heritage initiatives across the state.

Catalyst

The Caucus grew out of the state's Centennial celebration in 1989. Members of the Centennial Commission, including the governor's wife, the Secretary of State, the head of the House Appropriations Committee (currently the governor of Washington State), and the majority leader of the Senate, worked together to fund the celebration. Afterward, the State Historical Society proposed a new State History Museum in Tacoma, and the legislative effort to accomplish this goal established the structure of the Caucus. At that time the key leadership in the House and Senate were all from the Tacoma area, so there was strong political support. In addition, the governor's wife went on the board of the Historical Society.

Implementation

The Caucus is staffed by the State Historical Society. Leadership is shared between a member of the House and a member of the Senate representing different parties. It is open to any elected official, staff person, or organization. Typically 7-10 legislators or their staff, the Secretary of State or staff, and 12-15 agency or organizational staff attend.

During legislative session the group meets weekly at 7:00 a.m. for an hour. It reviews bills and budgets that affect heritage, and recommends strategies for success. The Caucus is a place to find bill sponsors, float proposals, and learn about what other agencies and groups are doing.

Factors Critical to Success

- Bipartisanship
- An informal atmosphere and fluid membership
- A regular meeting time and place
- Good staff preparation
- Thorough follow-up on the issues discussed between meetings
- Good capital projects to work toward

Outcomes

Several capital projects have been funded through the efforts of the Caucus. These include the State History Museum in Tacoma (\$39 million); the completion of the original plan for the State Capitol (\$4.6 million), expansion of the Cheney-Cowles Museum in Spokane (\$2.1 million);

renovation of historic buildings in state parks (\$5 million), and creation and funding of Capital Projects Fund for Washington's Heritage, providing more than \$4 million to heritage projects throughout the state.

The Caucus has been successful in obtaining budget support for the State Historic Preservation Office, State Historical Society, Office of Tourism, Heritage Corridors of Washington State Department of Transportation, State Archives, the State Oral History Project, and State Arts Commission. It was instrumental in fighting off efforts to eliminate the Arts Commission.

Sustainability

The Caucus has been sustained for more than 10 years. Because there are always issues and threats to heritage, it should be indefinitely sustainable. Every legislative session is different, and new legislators need to be educated and invited to participate, and that is an ongoing process.

The success of the Heritage Caucus has given birth to a separate Arts Caucus modeled on the same structure.

Lessons Learned

- Remain bipartisan. Having the Caucus co-chaired by a member of the House and Senate from different parties works well.
- Keep the Caucus informal and efficiently run.
- Staff it well. Each week, staff prepare a summary of all the bills affecting heritage, their sponsors, and their status.
- Recruit and educate new legislators through receptions and e-mail reminders.
- Develop letterhead to legitimize the Caucus.

Contacts

Mary Thompson, Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, (206) 624-7880;
marythompson1@home.com

Florida Historic Preservation And Special Category Grants

At the initiation of the Florida Division of Historical Resources and a grassroots lobbying campaign, the Florida legislature in 1984 approved a program of grants to local and state agencies and nonprofit organizations for the identification, excavation, protection, rehabilitation, and knowledge of historic properties. These grants are funded through the Corporation Trust Fund (with approximately \$2 million/year) and an annual appropriation from the Historic Preservation Fund (approximately \$200,000/year). The maximum grant in this category is \$40,000.

In 1985 Special Category grants were funded for the first time. These are annual appropriations to local nonprofit organizations, municipalities, school boards, and state agencies and for specific

projects—including the restoration of historic structures, archeological excavations, and museum exhibits—that are identified in advance of the appropriation. Typical grants range from \$50,000 to \$250,000. Special Category grants require a minimum matching contribution of \$50,000 in cash, in-kind or donated services, or donated materials. In most cases, local funds match the grant appropriation by 2 to 1. With the Special Category Grants, Florida has the largest grants program in the country for historic preservation.

The Catalyst

For years the staff of the Florida Division of Historical Resources had experienced frustration as their repeated requests for historic preservation funding were turned down. In 1984, widespread grassroots lobbying gave their efforts a boost when the legislature passed funding for historic preservation grants. The lobbying for these smaller grants paved the way for larger efforts.

The Division of Historical Resources, under the leadership of former director George Percy, decided that the way to obtain larger funding for preservation was to propose specific projects that individual legislators could support. Legislators, after all, are primarily concerned with local projects and local successes: why not a historic preservation project? With specific local preservation projects in mind, legislators could pursue targeted appropriations. Percy's idea was championed by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation; together its president, Frank Perkins, and Percy visited legislators and persuaded them that the private sector was supportive of preservation projects across the state and that it would be in their best interests to fund them. The Special Category grants were an immediate success, with \$1.3 million in funding for targeted preservation projects obtained in the first year (1985-86).

Implementation

Each spring local organizations and local and state agencies nominate potential projects to the Florida Division of Historical Resources. The state's Historic Preservation Advisory Council, whose 11 members are appointed by the Secretary of State, evaluates the nominations each September and makes recommendations to the Secretary. Approved projects become part of the budget request to the legislature. They are included in a "Pink Book" describing the projects. This is a lobbying tool, so proponents can show legislators where the money would be going. Lobbying is done by local advocates for the projects and the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation. Preservation Day, sponsored by the Florida Trust and the Division of Historical Resources, is a big lobbying push for the Special Category Grants. Once legislators buy into the projects, they approach the Appropriations Committee for the funding.

Factors Critical to Success

- Leadership with vision and perseverance (George Percy)
- A forward-thinking State Historic Preservation Office
- Strong partnership between the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation and the SHPO
- Lobbying by the Florida Trust and grassroots organizations for individual projects; getting legislators in support of projects that would benefit their districts.

Outcome

Florida has provided steady funding every year since the beginning (1985-86) for Historic Preservation and Special Category grants. In 2000, \$17,095,880 in Special Category Grants and \$2 million in Historic Preservation Grants were awarded.

Sustainability

Although the Historic Preservation and Special Category grants are not a dedicated funding source and require annual requests, they energize people to advocate for the projects and verbalize the importance of historic preservation.

Lessons Learned

- Have decentralized lobbying. Lobbying is more successful when individuals pursue their own projects with their own legislators.
- Form a partnership among the State Historic Preservation Office, the statewide preservation organization, and local communities. Lobbying for preservation funds requires real public-private cooperation.
- Have an Advisory Council made up of local citizens to review and recommend projects to ensure legislators' buy-in.

Contacts

Fred Gaske, Florida Bureau of Historic Preservation, (850) 488-1480
FGaske@mail.dos.state.fl.us

Heather Mitchell, Florida Trust for Historic Preservation, (561)460-6013;
heather@floridatrust.org

George Percy, former SHPO, (850) 488-5607

Missouri Historic Tax Credit Program

In September 1997, a special session of the Missouri General Assembly passed a 25 percent residential and commercial rehabilitation tax credit for historic structures (on top of the 20 percent federal credit for commercial structures) as part of a larger economic development package. It became effective January 1, 1998.

Catalyst

Jerry Schlichter, a local trial attorney and concerned citizen of St. Louis who despaired over the numerous vacant or underutilized buildings, and Carolyn Toft, executive director of Landmarks Association of St. Louis, discussed the possibility returning the federal tax credits to their pre-

reform status. Carolyn thought it more likely that they could obtain state tax credits. Carolyn brought Nellie Longworth (Preservation Action) to St. Louis to discuss tax credit programs in other states at an unprecedented joint meeting of the board of directors of Landmarks Association and the board of directors of the Downtown St. Louis Partnership. (These organizations typically never worked together.) A small group of people—Carolyn, Jerry, Barbara Geisman (member of the Landmarks board), and Kim Kimbrough (then president of the Downtown Partnership)—began drafting legislation, gathering data, and assembling a larger coalition. Among those attending the initial meeting was Dick Fleming, a friend of Nellie's and president of the Regional Commerce & Growth Association, a key organization that would subsequently join the coalition.

Implementation

The four leaders worked together on various aspects of the effort. Carolyn worked to bring local and statewide preservation and environmental interests on board. Barbara did hundreds of hours of research on where the tax credits could be applied statewide. Kim brought economic development interests across the state on board: the Main Street and downtown business development community, Chambers of Commerce, and retail organizations. Jerry drafted the legislation and spent hours lobbying in Jefferson City. All four made scores of presentations around the state. A data base of phone and fax numbers was created, with information about who knew whom politically and which district in the House and Senate each person resided in. A phone bank was established in the office of Downtown St. Louis. Volunteers bombarded data base members with calls to draft letters on their letterhead and make appropriate phone and fax contacts. They drafted sample editorials and sent them to most of the smaller newspaper across the state along with a basic fact sheet.

Eventually, a broad coalition of groups was pulled together to rally behind the tax credit legislation. In addition to Landmarks Association of St. Louis and Downtown St. Louis Partnership, the coalition included Missouri Main Street, Missouri Parks Association, Missouri Alliance for Historic Preservation, the Coalition for the Environment, the Historic Kansas City Foundation, and numerous civic and business organizations and municipalities across the state.

Factors Critical to Success

- Highly motivated leaders (Carolyn, Jerry and others)
- Ability to move fast without layers of meetings and approvals
- Access to professionals who worked pro bono (particularly Jerry, who wrote the legislation, provided political direction, and spent hours lobbying in Jefferson City.)
- Political connections. (Jerry was well-connected politically.)
- Belief that it could happen
- Lack of concern with who got the credit
- Broad-based coalition of support

Outcome

Since 1998, more than \$200 million have been spent on rehabilitation project costs, with \$53 million in state tax credits. A study by Rutgers University finds that for every \$1.00 provided in tax credits, \$4.00 is added to the economy in terms of jobs, materials, supplies, etc., through the multiplier effect.

The tax credits have been applied largely in St. Louis, but also in Kansas City, St. Joseph, Jefferson City, Springfield, and smaller communities. In St. Louis credits have been a huge boon to downtown and other neighborhoods; projects range from small-scale residential to medium-size office to multi-million dollar condo and hotel deals and have been instrumental in rehabilitating many of the city's multi-story former manufacturing buildings.

Sustainability

Efforts have been made to cap the tax credits and limit their transferability, but advocates have been successful in defeating these efforts. Every year, as there is more and more success, the constituency for tax credits grows.

Lessons Learned

- Have knowledgeable, indefatigable, and undiscouraged leadership. Landmarks Association's executive director credits their success to the late Governor Mel Carnahan and attorney Jerry Schlichter.
- Partner, partner, partner. No one organization should try to "carry the water" by itself.
- Don't listen when people say you can't do it.

Contacts

Barbara Geisman, Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, (314) 622-3201

Nat Griffin, Downtown Saint Louis Partnership, (314) 436-6500; ngriffin@dtslp.org

Kim Kimbrough, Association for Portland Progress, (503) 224-8684

Carolyn Toft, Landmarks Association of St. Louis, (314) 421-6474;
landmark@stlouis.missouri.org

pew-final-rept-2.doc