

2005 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan

Oregon State Historic Preservation Office

2005 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan
(updated 7/6/05)

Table of Contents

Introduction.....3
 Purpose.....3
 Integration With Other Plans3
 SHPO Role and Philosophy4

Issues Goals and Objectives.....4
 Issue 1: Partnerships5
 Issue 2: Advocacy.....5
 Issue 3: Economic Development6
 Issue 4: Preservation and Rehabilitation.....6
 Issue 5: Identification and Designation of Resources7
 Issue 6: Communication and Networking.....8
 Issue 7: Funding8
 Issue 8: Education.....9
 Issue 9: Codes and Ordinances.....10

Conclusion and Implementation10

Appendix I: Oregon’s Cultural Resources (Archaeological and Historic Resources)11

Appendix II: Bibliography.....16

Prepared by:
Oregon State Historic Preservation Office
725 Summer Street NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301
(503) 986-0677

2005 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan

Introduction

The Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is the state agency that deals with historic building and archaeological site issues. Every five years SHPO develops a “Historic Preservation Plan” to guide statewide preservation activities for the coming years.

The 2005 Plan is the distillation of ideas and comments collected through a broad outreach effort by SHPO staff over a period of several months. More than 300 Oregonians participated in the series of twenty-five public meetings held around the state, and another 100 submitted their opinions through an online survey. A key component of this effort was a “needs assessment.” This grass-roots level input was invaluable in the creation of the Plan.

In 2010, SHPO will repeat this process to prepare a new Plan. Over the next five years, however, preservationists should continue to refer to this Plan and monitor its relevance and effectiveness.

Purpose

The Historic Preservation Plan serves two primary purposes. First, it is a guide for SHPO activities. Annual work plans for the office and for individual staff members are rooted in the Plan. These Annual Work Plans, which include specific goals and timelines, are the “working” element of the Plan. The annual SHPO office work plan is made available for public comment and input prior to its implementation each year.

Second, the Plan provides a framework for coordinating the goals and activities of preservationists statewide, those individuals and organizations that are not part of SHPO—historic property owners, state and federal agencies, tribes, local governments (including historic preservation commissions), non-profit groups, and so forth. The Plan allows them see how their specific concerns and goals fit into the big picture of preservation issues and activities statewide.

Integration With Other Plans

The Historic Preservation Plan is just one of the planning documents SHPO works with in its role within the Heritage Conservation Division of the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD). The overarching plan for the department is “Target 2014,” which outlines broad goals for the agency to focus on until the year 2014, when the current lottery-based mechanism for generating funds for the agency is scheduled to sunset.

A second companion planning document is the Heritage Plan of the Oregon Heritage Commission, which is also part of the Heritage Conservation Division. The Heritage

Commission addresses history-related programs and organizations typically outside SHPO's primary focus of historic preservation and archaeology. The Historic Preservation Plan was written so that it meshes with these other internal planning documents.

The Plan was also written with an eye on the plans and efforts of a number of external organizations, some of which are directly involved in preservation, and others which are involved only tangentially. The goal is to maximize cooperation, avoid duplication, and ensure there are no gaps in key areas.

SHPO Role and Philosophy

The Oregon SHPO sees its role as the statewide leader for historic preservation, including both historic and archaeological site issues. No other entity has the responsibility or resources to fulfill this broad task.

In this lead role, SHPO administers an array of federal and state preservation programs. While external applicants drive the day-to-day workload for many of these programs, SHPO does have some ability to emphasize one program over another through the allocation of funding and staff resources. The Historic Preservation Plan—coupled with the Annual Work Plans—outlines SHPO's priorities and overall approach.

SHPO does not own or manage any historic or archaeological sites itself, so its primary role is to assist and advise those who do. It is especially committed to working in partnership with the organizations and government entities that are closest to the resources, primarily local governments and land management agencies. Equally important are partnerships with organizations that have shared preservation goals or that routinely come in contact with historic or archaeological sites (ODOT, economic development and tourism agencies, State Lands, etc.).

While supporting partners' preservation goals is a key component of the SHPO philosophy, SHPO may also launch its own initiatives on occasion. From its statewide perspective, SHPO may spot a need or opportunity that it feels uniquely qualified to address. When such initiatives emerge, they are outlined in SHPO's Annual Work Plan.

Issues, Goals and Objectives

Nine key issues emerged from the statewide meetings, constituent comments, and the needs assessment. Each is discussed below, along with a broad goal statement that encapsulates the desired outcome and specific objectives for achieving that goal. This section is the core of the Historic Preservation Plan. More detailed action items for each of these strategies are developed each year to create SHPO's Annual Work Plan.

Issue 1: Partnerships

Given the limited resources available for preservation, it is critical that preservationists forge effective partnerships with one another. It is equally important that they ally themselves with those who may have only a tangential interest in preservation—government agencies, developers, local governments, property owners, etc. SHPO works regularly with both types of partners.

Goal: Create and enhance partnerships that leverage resources for preservation.

Objectives:

- 1.1 Strengthen partnerships between preservation groups and local governments, especially Certified Local Governments, since most decisions that affect historic properties are made at the local level.
- 1.2 Strengthen relationships between preservation groups and tribes to better coordinate cultural resource efforts.
- 1.3 Strengthen affiliations between preservation groups and colleges and universities that have cultural resource programs.
- 1.4 Convene a gathering of federal and state land management agencies to discuss the unique cultural resource issues they face.
- 1.5 Establish or expand partnerships between preservation groups and agencies and entities involved in economic development efforts that involve cultural resources, including those in the tourism industry.
- 1.6 Strengthen relationships between preservation groups and research repositories (libraries, archives, historical societies) and expand the use of their collections for historic preservation purposes.

Issue 2: Advocacy

Advocacy involves taking assertive positions defending and promoting Oregon's heritage resources, especially in the realm of public policy issues. SHPO's role as a preservation advocate is shaped largely by its state agency status. Being part of state government provides SHPO opportunities to assert preservation solutions through the programs it operates and through its role within the state government system. But it comes with limitations as well, since political issues may come into play. Jurisdictional issues may also affect SHPO's ability to insert itself into local government or tribal affairs. Other preservation partners, namely non-profit organizations and local preservation groups, are often in a better position to respond to certain preservation threats. That is why a coordinated advocacy strategy is needed.

Goal: Defend and promote heritage resources by administering strong, professional preservation programs and by employing well-coordinated and well-targeted response strategies and proactive initiatives.

Objectives:

- 2.1 Support efforts of community, non-profit, and tribal advocates.

- 2.2 Develop sound preservation plans that are integrated with the broader planning efforts of the appropriate governmental or tribal organization.
- 2.3 Strengthen communication/networking among preservationists.
- 2.4 Increase funding for threatened resources and emergencies.
- 2.5 Develop a statewide preservation awards program to recognize exemplary projects and efforts.
- 2.6 Enforce existing cultural resource protection statutes.
- 2.7 Form multi-agency working committees as needed to address issues and developments that might affect cultural resources.

Issue 3: Economic Development

Preservation is most successful when it makes financial sense or generates income and jobs. This usually plays out as “downtown” commercial revitalization or as heritage tourism. Partnering with economic development efforts can bring substantial funding to preservation projects, but careful oversight by preservation professionals is sometimes needed to prevent inappropriate compromises to historic integrity.

Goal: Employ historic preservation as an economic development tool while maintaining the long-term integrity of the resources.

Objectives:

- 3.1 Develop authentic cultural heritage tourism efforts in Oregon communities in cooperation with non-preservation partners such as the Oregon Tourism Commission, Governor’s Economic Recovery Team, Oregon Heritage Commission, Oregon Cultural Trust, and other public and private partners.
- 3.2 Include preservation of cultural resources in economic development strategies at all levels of government.
- 3.3 Assess and report on the beneficial economic impacts of heritage tourism and historic preservation activities in Oregon.
- 3.4 Expand preservation-friendly downtown redevelopment programs such as the National Main Street Program.
- 3.5 Ensure that heritage tourism efforts take into account the long-term sustainability of the resources in order to prevent them from being “loved to death.”

Issue 4: Preservation and Rehabilitation

Physical preservation of historic properties is the core purpose of historic preservation. This requires having the appropriate information, guidance, and expertise available to help projects be successful.

Goal: Increase in the number of high-quality preservation projects.

Objectives:

- 4.1 Offer grants and other financial incentives for the conservation, rehabilitation, and stabilization of historic properties.
- 4.2 Balance incentives and regulations to promote proper treatments.
- 4.3 Use physical preservation options (rather than simply documentation) as mitigation for impacts to historic buildings and sites.
- 4.4 Identify technical preservation problems and conduct research for their solutions.
- 4.5 Maintain a library of technical assistance materials and a directory of preservation contractors and consultants, and expand public access to them.
- 4.6 Increase the use of the Oregon Preservation Listserv and preservation websites as tools for sharing technical information.
- 4.7 Provide workshops and training materials on preservation technology to the general public and historic building property owners.
- 4.8 Educate code enforcement officers, building officials, and planners about the specialized needs of historic buildings and the alternatives available for code compliance.
- 4.9 Enhance the “sustainability” aspect of historic preservation.
- 4.10 Provide technical assistance and overall cultural resource advice and assistance to Oregon Parks and Recreation Department to help it fulfill its stewardship responsibilities for historic and archaeological sites.
- 4.11 Assist state and federal agencies with their cultural resource responsibilities, including providing technical assistance when feasible.

Issue 5: Identification and Designation of Resources

Identifying and documenting the state’s historic and archaeological sites is the first step toward their preservation. Designating significant properties to either the National Register and/or local registers is an important follow-up step. SHPO administers the federal National Register program in Oregon, maintains written standards for conducting surveys of both historic and archaeological sites, and, when funding levels allow, provides grants for important survey projects. SHPO also maintains master databases of all known historic and archaeological sites in Oregon.

Goal: Expand the inventory and designation of Oregon’s prehistoric and historic cultural resources for use in planning, education, public information, and protection.

Objectives:

- 5.1 Complete and update comprehensive heritage resource inventories.
- 5.2 Designate significant properties to the National Register and/or local registers.
- 5.3 Streamline and improve the survey process by using new technologies and the most recent scholarship about the resources.
- 5.4 Expand and improve the historic sites database so it is a reliable inventory of all historic properties in the state, and make it accessible to the public via the Internet.

- 5.5 Expand and improve the database of archaeological sites and records, and make it accessible to qualified professionals for planning and scholarly purposes.
- 5.6 Develop and offer training materials and opportunities for those who conduct surveys to ensure statewide consistency and quality.
- 5.7 Incorporate cultural resource data into the data systems of other government entities in order to better integrate preservation into land-use and management processes.

Issue 6: Communication and Networking

It is important that preservationists share information and experiences, both to avoid “reinventing the wheel” and to keep up-to-date on current issues. It is also important that they get to know one another and learn what each has to offer to the preservation community at large. Distance is a major challenge to communication in the state, though technology (primarily the Internet) has helped alleviate that to some extent. Still there is no substitute for face-to-face communication, so it is important that preservationists create opportunities to mingle and network.

Goal: Expand the exchange of historic preservation-related information among Oregon communities and cultural groups.

Objectives:

- 6.1 Use listservs and websites for communicating and sharing information.
- 6.2 Use traditional publications (newsletters, magazines, etc.) where appropriate.
- 6.3 Hold statewide or regional workshops on a regular basis.
- 6.4 Include under-represented groups (cultural, ethnic, geographic) as active participants in the historic preservation network.
- 6.5 Develop, maintain, and disseminate preservation-based information statewide in a coordinated manner.

Issue 7: Funding

Predictably, funding is the top “need” identified in the statewide needs assessment. Increased financial assistance is essential to virtually every aspect of cultural resource work, including surveys, National Register nominations, archaeological excavation and analysis, site stabilization, feasibility studies, public education, training, and so forth. “Funding” includes not only grants and other allocations of money, but also tax incentives and virtually anything else that helps cover costs.

Goal: Strengthen/Expand existing financial incentive programs and develop new incentives and funding sources, both public and private.

Objectives:

- 7.1 Expand state and federal rehabilitation tax incentives.
- 7.2 Create local incentives to inventory, designate, and rehabilitate historic properties.

- 7.3 Publicize fundraising success stories and examples of creative and successful private/public preservation partnerships to inspire and guide others.
- 7.4 Collect and make available contact information for grant and fundraising experts.
- 7.5 Develop a list of funding sources for preservation related programs and projects.
- 7.6 Encourage streamlining and other improvements to preservation grant and incentive programs to minimize administrative costs and paperwork.
- 7.7 Offer preservation expertise to foundations that award grants for preservation if they do not have in-house expertise.
- 7.8 Increase the use of easements (and their tax benefits), where appropriate, for historic properties and archaeological sites.
- 7.9 Secure funding for SHPO's revolving loan fund, which is already authorized.

Issue 8: Education

Public awareness of cultural resource issues is essential to gaining both short- and long-term support for preservation. Professional training for those in cultural resource and related fields is also important in order to assist current practitioners with today's issues and to prepare the next generation for preservation's future challenges.

Goal: Expand the general public's awareness of preservation issues and support specialized preservation education and training.

Objectives:

- 8.1 Develop and use interpretive materials and programs where appropriate: plaques, walking tour brochures, websites, programs and lectures, and so forth.
- 8.2 Provide training opportunities for cultural resource staff within state and federal agencies, tribes, and local governments.
- 8.3 Prepare handout materials that are up-to-date and readily available to the general public and others.
- 8.4 Conduct workshops for cultural resource consultants.
- 8.5 Develop heritage education programs in formats that meet the needs of diverse audiences.
- 8.6 Examine ways to use the media for public education purposes.
- 8.7 Support cultural resource programs at Oregon colleges and universities through scholarships, internships, employment referrals, instruction, recruitment of quality students, sharing information, and so forth.
- 8.8 Develop educational programs for areas of the state where they are most needed.
- 8.9 Incorporate heritage education into continuing education, vocational, and Parks and Recreation programs statewide.

Issue 9: Codes and Ordinances

Federal, state, tribal, and local governments all have regulations that address cultural resource issues, to one degree or another. These include laws and statutes as well as land-use and

building codes. Local regulations are by far the most prevalent, and the most accessible for improvement. Many local ordinances are in need of revision because they are out-of-date and inconsistent with current terms and methods. Strengthening preservation regulations at any level can be difficult, however, especially in an era of increased property-rights awareness and budget cuts. There are also opportunities for the adoption of flexible or “smart” building codes and the streamlining of approval processes.

Goal: Develop and implement codes and ordinances that promote preservation through both regulations and incentives.

Objectives:

- 9.1 Develop training opportunities for local building officials, design professionals, disability advocates, building trades representatives, and developers.
- 9.2 Adopt legislation that provides greater flexibility for historic buildings and structures within state and municipal building codes.
- 9.3 Update state statutes and rules as necessary and as opportunities arise.
- 9.4 Incorporate archaeological site protection into local ordinances.
- 9.5 Develop code accommodation that protects historic and prehistoric resources.
- 9.6 Update and improve preservation ordinances as needed.
- 9.7 When appropriate, improve administrative and enforcement procedures in lieu of wholesale revisions to regulations.
- 9.8 Adopt flexible or “smart” building codes, using existing examples as models.
- 9.9 Coordinate fact finding and information sharing regarding the effects of Measure 37 (passed in November 2004) on cultural resources, and develop strategies as appropriate.

Conclusion and Implementation

This Historic Preservation Plan is intended to help direct a coordinated and effective preservation effort in the State of Oregon. It guides SHPO in its unique, overarching role as the lead preservation agency in the state, but it should also serve as a tool for all of the preservation partners who actually do much of the on-the-ground preservation work at local or regional levels.

A key to implementing this plan is SHPO’s Annual Work Plan. Toward the end of each calendar year, SHPO will develop and circulate for comment its work plan for the coming year. Work plans are rooted in the concepts laid out in this Plan, but they include more specific action items and timelines.

SHPO encourages all of the preservation partners to develop their own annual work plans and, to the extent possible, try to align them with this Plan and with the broader issues and efforts they foresee in the coming year. Full coordination is impossible, given all the variables of funding, politics, “brush-fire” issues, and so forth, but better coordination is certainly attainable.

We owe it to the residents of this state, the next generations, and to the cultural resources themselves to do all we can to be effective stewards of the legacies we have inherited.

Appendix I

Oregon's Cultural Resources (Archaeological and Historic Resources)

Introduction

The following narrative outlines the basic types of cultural resources in Oregon and provides a general assessment of those resources, including the current state of knowledge about them. The purpose of this section is to answer the basic question, “What are we trying to preserve?” Other sections of this plan address the “how,” “when,” and “who” aspects of statewide historic preservation efforts (see *Issues, Goals, and Objectives*).

Overview of Oregon's Cultural Resources

There are two basic categories of cultural resources—archaeological and historic. In general, archaeological resources are at or below ground level, and they are usually remnants rather than intact features. While they are most often prehistoric Indian sites (generally pre-1800 AD), there are also historic-period archaeological resources. Historic resources, on the other hand, are primarily intact aboveground features—typically buildings or structures—that post date European contact.

There are several other important distinctions between archaeological and historic resources. Awareness of these distinctions is important to understanding how statewide preservation efforts address and impact these resources.

- Archaeological resources, due to their below-ground character, are not as easily identified or evaluated as above-ground historic resources. The cost for doing so is also much higher.
- Archaeological resources are most often located in remote areas where they are subject to looting and vandalism, so their precise locations must be kept confidential.
- Conversely, the location and details about historic resources are usually promoted as expressions of community or neighborhood pride, and often as part of heritage tourism and economic development efforts.
- Most archaeological sites are prehistoric Indian sites; therefore they are of special interest to one or more of Oregon's Indian tribes. Coordination with the tribes is an important aspect of any dealings with these types of archaeological sites.
- Given that excavation is essentially a destructive process, the preferred treatment for archaeological resources is to simply leave them alone. Limited testing may be needed to determine the type, extent, and significance of sites, but unless there are compelling reasons to do otherwise, sites should be left largely intact. Additionally, future technologies may offer more effective and sensitive methods for examining these sites.

- Rehabilitation and adaptive use are key elements in historic resource preservation (primarily buildings). There are financial incentives and extensive “how-to” information to encourage and guide rehabilitation efforts.
- Archaeological resources, on the other hand, do not lend themselves to adaptive use and rehabilitation treatments. The most aggressive treatment for archaeological sites is usually stabilization and on-site interpretation, and then only for a very small number of sites that lend themselves to public visitation.
- Historic buildings are usually subject to local zoning, land-use, and building code regulations, so coordination with local planning entities is usually an important part of any preservation effort.

Archaeological Resources

Most of what we know about Oregon’s archaeological sites has come through the process outlined by federal and state “cultural resource compliance” laws and procedures. Here is how it works:

Areas in the path of proposed “ground-disturbing” activities by federal or state agencies are surveyed, discovered sites are documented, and summary reports are written. This information is maintained in a master data set by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and often, as well, by the federal and state agencies themselves. Agencies and other property owners use this ever-expanding collection of data to help them avoid impacts to known significant sites. When avoidance is not possible or feasible, then mitigation is undertaken to try to “compensate” for the loss.

This somewhat random, reactionary process for collecting information about archaeological resources is not especially conducive to comprehensive, scholarly investigation or to thoughtful preservation. Most of the information that is collected is descriptive rather than interpretive or analytical in nature. There is usually neither the time nor the money to follow up on the initial findings with more detailed analysis and interpretation.

Despite the lack of a more proactive and systematic process for documenting archaeological sites, an extensive body of very valuable data has been produced. At the very least, this information will serve as the basis for more in-depth studies by scholars and others in the future. Computers and related technology—databases, geographic information systems (GIS), digital imaging, global positioning systems, and so forth—have greatly improved everyone’s ability to record sites and retrieve data.

In Oregon, approximately 45,000 archaeological sites have been identified over the years, primarily from the 1970s to the present. An archaeological site in Oregon is defined as ten (10) or more **artifacts** (including lithic debitage) within a surface area reasonable to that activity, or a **feature** likely to have been generated by patterned cultural activity. Features include peeled trees, cache pits, hearths, house pits, rock shelters, cairns, and rock art. Examples of prehistoric archaeological sites include (but are not limited to) lithic scatters and quarries, habitation, hunting, and food processing sites, temporary campsites, and burials. Historic archaeological

sites include rural homesteads, industrial sites, shipwrecks, and even in-town sites with remnant artifacts and features related to historic-period uses of the property.

The Oregon SHPO is currently in the midst of an ambitious multi-year effort to “computerize” all of the state’s archaeological records. This involves three primary tasks: (1) compiling databases of core information about all of the individual sites and all of the reports of survey/excavation projects (approximately 19,000 reports); (2) plotting site locations and project boundaries in the GIS (computerized maps); and (3) scanning all of the site forms and reports so electronic images of those documents can be retrieved on the computer. These components—the databases, the GIS, and the scanned images—are all being linked together to maximize the accessibility and usefulness of the information.

Much of this computer work for existing archaeological records will be completed in 2005, due in large part to the financial assistance of a few state and federal agencies with heavy cultural resource responsibilities, namely the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

One of the challenges for SHPO is to keep up the data entry and scanning efforts for the new site forms and reports that continue to be submitted. This is essential to making the centralized data system a reliable cultural resource management tool. Current SHPO budget and staffing levels may not be sufficient to prevent a backlog of data from developing. However, another strategy for avoiding a data backlog is for SHPO to develop and perhaps require the use of electronic data entry forms for all or part of the information currently submitted in hard-copy format only. This would greatly reduce the data entry burden on SHPO and would speed up the integration of the new data into the data system.

Historic Resources

The inventory of historic resources in Oregon has been compiled largely through the survey efforts of cities and counties who wanted or needed to know what historic resources existed within their boundaries. Most of this survey work was done prior to 1995, when the state requirement that cities conduct cultural resource inventories was rescinded.

Currently there are approximately 31,000 historic resources in the SHPO’s master historic sites database. Several thousand more have been inventoried by state or federal agencies as part of their cultural resource compliance efforts, but those hard-copy records still need to be transcribed into the SHPO database (as of May 2005). Tens of thousands more historic resources remain to be inventoried statewide. Expanding the inventory of Oregon’s historic resources is one of SHPO’s priorities over the next several years.

Most of the historic resources that have been inventoried (64 percent) are from the early 20th-century, 1900-1940. Nineteenth-century resources comprise only 22 percent, while post-WWII resources currently represent less than 10 percent of the total. The number of buildings from that latter era is expected to increase dramatically over the next decade or so, as communities begin to address their post-war resources. Scholarship at both the national and state levels for

“resources from the recent past” is needed in order to help preservationists properly classify and evaluate the significance of this vast pool of resources.

There are five basic types of historic resources: buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts. **Buildings** make up the overwhelming majority (83 percent) of Oregon’s known historic resources. They are the resource type most readily associated with historic preservation by the public, and they are the focus of most historic preservation efforts statewide. Houses are by far the most common building type (75 percent). Other building types include commercial, public, institutional, industrial, and agricultural buildings.

In general, industrial and agricultural buildings are more susceptible to abandonment and demolition than the other types because they do not often lend themselves as readily to new uses. Additionally, the cost of structural improvements to help them meet current building codes can often be prohibitive. One exception is warehouses, which have been successfully converted to new uses in Portland and other Oregon cities. Their open spaces and sturdy construction serve a variety of new uses quite well. Factories, mills, and other large-scale industrial facilities, along with most agricultural buildings—barns and other outbuildings—are challenging resources to save if they no longer serve their original purposes. They usually cannot continue in their historic uses because they don’t accommodate the larger new equipment and business standards of their respective industries.

Historic **districts**, in reality, are usually just large groupings of residential and/or commercial buildings. Efforts to preserve the character of historic districts usually include both incentives (tax credits and property tax freeze) and regulations (design guidelines, historic landmark commission review, etc.). There are currently 110 designated historic districts in Oregon. They include some of the best historic resources in the state, and they reflect some of the most successful preservation efforts that have been undertaken. Recent political developments in Oregon may change that. Owner consent and property rights measures threaten to dilute the regulatory options local governments use to protect historic resources. As a result, historic districts could suffer increased losses of integrity in the coming years.

The most common historic **structures** are bridges and linear features, such as canals, railroad grades, trails, and roads. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has done a very good job inventorying and evaluating the highway bridges it oversees, though preservation of many of these structures is not feasible, given their deteriorated condition, increased traffic volumes, and more stringent safety standards. That said, a number of prominent bridges have been successfully upgraded and kept in use using innovative solutions. Notable examples include eleven coastal highway bridges and several bridges over the Willamette River in Portland and neighboring communities.

Linear structures are a challenging type of resource both to document and preserve. There are still no detailed guidelines at the national level for documenting and evaluating resources that stretch for miles, include a minimum of distinguishable historic features, and are under almost constant repair, resurfacing, or upgrading. Some especially vulnerable linear resources are the historic irrigation canals of central and eastern Oregon. Water conservation efforts call for piping these canals in order to prevent evaporation and seepage (water losses can exceed 50

percent over a canal's length). Piping, however, destroys the historic integrity of the canals. Unfortunately, there are not viable alternatives to piping in most instances.

Cultural or historic landscapes have been recognized in recent years as a distinct type of cultural resource. They usually include a combination of natural features and human-shaped elements, and they are usually relatively large in size. They may be formal gardens or parks designed by prominent landscape architects, or they may be informal landscapes shaped by uses and traditions—ranching, mining, farming, and so forth. They might even be large natural areas associated with important religious beliefs or traditions of local cultures (“traditional cultural places”).

Though most of the recent cultural landscape National Register designations have been for urban parks, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area (including the historic highway and related structures) is probably Oregon's best-known cultural landscape. Due to their scale and complexity, cultural landscapes can be difficult to document and protect. They often involve a broad range of resource types (sites, buildings, structures, etc.), numerous property owners, and various levels of governmental oversight.

Appendix II

Bibliography

Archaeological Survey and Reporting Standards. Salem, OR: Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, 2000

Arendt, Randall. *Rural by Design: Maintaining Small Town Character*. Chicago, IL: Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Cassity, Pratt. *Maintaining Community Character: How to Establish a Local Historic District*. Washington, DC: National Trust for Historic Preservation, Information Series, No. 58, 1992.

Catalogue of Historic Preservation Publications: Guidance on the Treatment of Historic Properties. Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1995.

Cox, Rachel S. *Design Review in Historic Districts*. Washington, DC: National Trust for Historic Preservation Publications Office.

Craighead, Paula M. *The Hidden Design in Land Use Ordinances: Assessing the Visual Impact of Dimensions Used for Town Planning in Maine Landscapes*. Portland, ME: University of Southern Maine New England Studies Program, 1991.

Delvac, William F., Susan Esherich and Bridget Hartman. *Affordable Housing through Historic Preservation, A Case Study Guide to Combining the Tax Credits*. Washington, DC: National Park Service, Preservation Assistance Division, 1994.

Delumbra, Madeline. *Economic Effects of Historic Preservation in Oregon. Prepared for the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office*. Vancouver, WA: E. D. Hovee & Company, 1999.

Dennis, Stephen Neal. *Building a Defensible Record*. Washington, DC: National Center for Preservation Law, 1991.

Duerksen, Christopher J. and Richard J. Roddewig. *Takings Law in Plain English*. Washington, DC: American Resources Information Network, 1994.

Eadie, Douglas C. and Richard L. Edwards. "Board Leadership by Design," *Nonprofit World*, volume II, no. 2.

_____. *Taking Command of Change: A Practical Guide for Applying the Strategic Development Process in State Historic Preservation Offices*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division, 1995.

Edwards, Richard L. and John A. Yankey, eds. *Skills for Effective Human Services Management*. Silver Springs, MD: NASW Press, National Association of Social Workers, 1992.

Escherich, Susan M., Stephen J Farneth, AIA, and Bruce D. Judd, FAIA. *Affordable Housing Through Historic Preservation: Tax Credits and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents.

Gagliardi, Neil and Stephen Morris. *Local Historic Preservation Plans: A Selected Annotated Bibliography*. Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, June, 1993.

Griffin, Dennis. "Oral History Standards and Guidelines." Salem: Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, unpublished document, 31 pp.

Handbook for Historic Preservation Planning. Salem OR, Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, 1997.

Henry, Susan L., ed. *Protecting Archaeological Sites on Private Land*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division, 1993.

_____. *Reaching Out, Reaching In: A Guide to Creating Effective Public Participation for State Historic Preservation Programs*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division, 1993.

Heritage Needs Assessment: Preserving Oregon's Heritage. Salem, OR: Oregon Heritage Commission, 1998.

How to Prepare Nominations to the National Register of Historic Places, A Condensed Technical Guide for Oregon Property Owners. Salem, OR: Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, 1996.

Jester, Thomas C. *Preserving the Past and Making It Accessible for People With Disabilities*. Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, October, 1992.

Jester, Thomas C. and Sharon C. Park. *Making Historic Properties Accessible*. Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, Preservation Assistance Division, September, 1993.

Kemp, Evan J., Jr., Robert J. Funk and Douglas C. Eadie. "Change in Chewable Bites: Applying Strategic Management at EEOC," *Public Administration Review*, March/April, 1993, Volume 53, no. 2, 129-132.

Leithe, Joni L. *The Economic Benefits of Preserving Community Character: A Practical Methodology*. Chicago, IL: National Trust for Historic Preservation and The Government Finance Research Center.

Local Preservation Series, various authors. Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Heritage Preservation Series, Branch of State, Tribal and Local Governments.

Morris, Marya. *Innovative Tools for Historic Preservation*. Chicago: Planning Advisory Series, Number 438, American Planning Association and National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1992.

Nelson, Arthur C. "Preserving Prime Farmland in the Face of Urbanization: Lessons From Oregon." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, volume 58, no. 4 (Autumn, 1992): 467-488.

Oregon Heritage Plan. Salem, OR: Oregon Heritage Commission, 1998.

Oregon Model Historic Preservation Ordinance. Salem, OR: Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, 1998

Preserving Your Community's Heritage Through the Certified Local Government Program. Washington, DC: National Park Service and National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, 1995.

Questions and Answers about CLG Grants from SHPOs: An Introductory Guide. Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources.

Report to the Legislative Assembly on the Status of the Special Assessment of Historic Property Program, November 2000. Salem, OR: Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, 2000

Roddewig, Richard J. *Preparing a Historic Preservation Ordinance*. Chicago: Planning Advisory Series, Number 374, American Planning Association and National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1983.

Roddewig, Richard J. and Christopher J. Duerksen. *Responding to the Takings Challenge: A Guide for Officials and Planners*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association, 1989.

Special Assessment of Historic Property Program: A Handbook. Salem, OR: Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, 1996

White, Bradford J. and Richard J. Roddewig. *Preparing a Historic Preservation Plan*. Chicago: American Planning Association and National Trust for Historic Preservation, Planning Advisory Series, Number 450, 1994.

Winter, Noré V. "Defining Neighborhood Design Character and Developing Design Guidelines," in *Guiding History: A Process for Creating Historic District Guidelines*. Boulder, CO: Winter & Company, 1996.

Wright, Sally. *Private Lending Sources for Residential Historic Properties*. Salem OR: State Historic Preservation Office, 1997.