

DRAFT

**Oregon Historic Preservation Plan
2018–2023**

Oregon State Historic Preservation Office

Prepared by:

Oregon State Historic Preservation Office

725 Summer Street NE, Suite C

Salem, Oregon 97301

(503) 986-0690

2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan – DRAFT

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Creating the 2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan.....	5
Purpose of the Plan	6
Integration with Other Plans	6
SHPO Role and Priorities	7
The Role of the Heritage Community.....	9
Issues Goals and Objectives	11
Issue 1: Government Partnerships	12
Issue 2: Heritage Partner Networking and Advocacy.....	14
Issue 3: Public Outreach and Education	16
Issue 4: Professional Preservation Education	18
Issue 5: Digital Information Sharing and Accessibility.....	19
Issue 6: Identification and Designation of Cultural Resources.....	20
Issue 7: Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Protection of Cultural Resources	22
Issue 8: Grants and Funding	24
Issue 9: Economic Development	26
Issue 10: Statutes, Ordinances, Codes, and Processes	27
Implementation and Conclusion	29
Appendix I: Oregon’s Cultural Resources (Archaeological and Historic Resources)	30
Appendix II: Bibliography	37

2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan

Introduction

Oregon’s special places connect us to our past by creating physical continuity over generations and space for public conversations about our values and identity. The ongoing process of recognizing and interpreting these places must be a local one, driven by inclusive public participation. The Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) enables these community-driven projects by creating a favorable environment through statewide leadership and the effective administration of federal and state programs and grants. The SHPO offers its many partners information, technical assistance, funding, and networking and collaboration opportunities to achieve their own preservation goals.

The 2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan distills the ideas and comments collected through a broad outreach effort led by the SHPO staff. Participants spanned Oregon’s heritage community. This included the SHPO’s traditional partners and those involved with museums, archives, cemeteries, and local historical societies, among other heritage organizations, and anyone with an interest in Oregon’s culture and history. The response was clear: Oregonians want resources to carry out their local projects and more diversity in the state inventory and National Register of Historic Places. Participants emphasized the need for better public education about what the heritage community does and why it is important. They also expressed overarching anxiety about the impact of increasing threats and rapid change on Oregon’s special places.

When the SHPO published the 2011–2016 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan, the nation was just coming out of one of the worst economic downturns in recent history. Development pressure on historic properties lessened during this period, especially in urban areas. The years since the Great Recession has brought a period of sustained, if uneven, growth. Oregon’s population grew since 2000 from just over 3.4 million to over 4 million people. Most of the increase came from people moving to the state. Last year, Oregon welcomed over 70,000 new citizens, many of whom are drawn by the state’s beauty and opportunity. Growth brings benefits and, in some cases, jarring change. Infrastructure development and demand for housing, among other factors, put pressure on historic properties, threatening resources as diverse as tribal sites statewide, the Oregon Trail in the northeast, Central Oregon’s irrigation canals, Astoria’s historic waterfront, southern Oregon’s Chinese sites, and Portland’s neighborhoods.

Oregon has experienced this kind of change before. Oregon saw rapid population growth and development after World War II that threatened the state’s agricultural and forest lands, natural spaces, and livability. Led by Republican Governor Tom McCall, Oregonians proactively managed the change through citizen-driven land use planning. The 1973 Oregon Land Conservation and Development Act, Senate Bill 100, introduced the first and only statewide comprehensive land use planning system in the nation. Later adopted under the Act was Goal 5, which addressed over a dozen types of resources, including historic places. Compliance with the revised Goal 5 Rule adopted in April 2017 is optional for local jurisdictions. Communities may not regulate properties or sites listed in the National Register unless they are locally listed, but

may review a proposed demolition or relocation. Still, the core idea of Goal 5 is intact: communities should engage in a public process to identify and protect their important historic resources. The purpose of preservation, Goal 5, and our state's many heritage programs is not to prevent change. Instead, preservation is a tool that manages change by naming those physical pieces of the past that are critical to our story. It is a tool to ensure that these important places serve their communities equitably, productively, sustainably, and economically into the future.

While concrete solutions exist to meet the challenges facing the heritage community, they are not easily accomplished. The heritage community must take responsibility for conveying the value of its work to the public. Including the language we all use in conversation and the tools chosen to get the word out. The effort requires coordination and individual commitment, qualities that are well-represented throughout Oregon's heritage community.

To that end, the SHPO offers these guiding principles for preserving what matters most in our changing state.

Engage the public. Not everyone calls themselves a “preservationist,” but most seek a connection to the past—whether that means swapping family history at a potluck or dedicating a career to preserving historic places. The public knows what is important and meaningful to them. To stay relevant, the heritage community must allow the public to identify what special places, collections, and practices must be saved. This means we experts must let go of academic explanations and exclusive terminology. We must use straight talk that will resonate, not alienate. Popular media can help, too. Experts tend to write back and forth to each other in industry publications. To reach a broad audience, the heritage community needs to use popular media: newspapers, lifestyle magazines, advertising campaigns, and digital media.

Save what matters most. Preservation is a physical connection to the past. Those buildings, sites, documents, or artifacts from years ago can create here-and-now conversations about how we remember and understand our history. But not every old building or artifact has the same significance to the community. In some cases, overriding values or other needs are more important. Communities can build support by focusing on those resources that truly matter to them. The heritage community will build trust and credibility with the public by helping guide these conversations.

Create a future for our special places. The long-term preservation of our special places rests in finding a community use for them. While some may become museums, cultural attractions, or funky breweries, most will be rehabilitated for continued use or otherwise find a new role. Helping property owners, developers, and the public see a future for historic properties beyond a museum or pub means talking about historic buildings as community assets. This approach reframes the conversation from the start. Regardless of their intrinsic value, buildings that do not have a role in the community or in a future reuse or redevelopment proposal will likely be demolished. While needing special protection, archaeological sites too can be preserved for future generations through thoughtful avoidance and stabilization strategies. When appropriate, well-interpreted archaeological sites are important community educational assets.

Span professional disciplines and jurisdictions. Working toward a common goal alongside other disciplines and among all levels of government is critical for success. It does not benefit individual organizations or the resources the heritage community cares for to be territorial and competitive about an aspect of a project. Blurring established professional and jurisdictional boundaries and learning other viewpoints often results in better outcomes than drawing a bold line in the sand.

The heritage community's mission is even more important now. With the public leading the way, professionals across disciplines can assist communities in identifying and managing their special places. Together, we can ensure that our past is preserved, interpreted, and used so that it is culturally and economically relevant into the future. These efforts will result in broad support for heritage organizations and a deepening integration of current preservation processes and programs into statewide transportation strategies, local comprehensive plans, disaster preparedness initiatives, private redevelopment proposals, and broad support for heritage organizations. The public will expect it, foundations will fund it, legislators will understand it, and governors will call for it. Every partner in the heritage community has a role in achieving this goal. Using the framework outlined in the 2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan, we can continue to clarify and align our roles to meet the needs of our changing state.

Creating the 2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan

In summer 2016, the SHPO staff reviewed our progress on the 2011–2016 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan. Staff revised the issue and goal statements to reflect current opportunities and challenges and then used these discussions as a springboard for broad public outreach. Beginning in Fall 2016 through Spring 2017, staff collected ideas and comments from the public and key partners about the direction that Oregon's heritage community should take for the next five years. More than 170 Oregonians participated in a series of six public workshops held in Portland, Eugene, Medford, Astoria, Redmond, and La Grande. An online survey collected the opinions of 348 Oregonians. Staff also hosted workshop sessions with the following key state commissions and work groups with special interest or expertise in cultural or heritage resources:

- State Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation
- Oregon Heritage Commission
- Oregon Cemetery Commission
- Oregon Historic Trails Advisory Commission
- Intergovernmental Cultural Resource Council, a working group of federal and state agencies and tribal governments

A special session was held with local representatives from the Certified Local Government Program (CLG) at the annual SHPO-sponsored training. The insights gained through public outreach are integrated into the comprehensive revision of the 2011–2016 document for this 2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan.

Purpose of the Plan

The Oregon Historic Preservation Plan serves two primary purposes. First, it is a guide for the SHPO's activities. Annual work plans for the office, specific programs, and individual staff members are rooted in the plan. These annual work plans are the "working" element of the plan and include specific goals and timelines. Second, the plan is a framework for coordinating the goals and activities of the heritage community statewide and those individuals and organizations that are not part of the SHPO. This includes historic property owners, state and federal agencies, tribes, regional and local governments, Oregon Main Street Network communities, Certified Local Governments, museums, libraries, archives, historical societies, and the wide variety of building, design, finance, and real-estate professionals. The plan provides a comprehensive view of preservation and heritage issues and activities statewide and invites cooperation toward mutual goals.

Integration with Other Plans

The Oregon Historic Preservation Plan is just one of the documents the SHPO works with in its role within the Heritage Division of the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD). This plan is written so that it meshes with two other key internal agency planning documents.

The first is an overarching plan for OPRD known as "Centennial Horizon," which outlines broad goals for the agency to focus on through the year 2022, the date that marks the centennial of Oregon State Parks. Centennial Horizon highlights three principles relating to the agency's stewardship of natural and cultural resources: saving Oregon's special places, connecting Oregonians to meaningful experiences, and taking the long view toward resource preservation.

These principles support the goals of historic preservation. The plan commits Oregon State Parks to the continued care and active interpretation of historic sites under the agency's stewardship, as well as the selective acquisition of historic places. The SHPO supports the agency's mission in its advisory role under state and federal laws. In turn, OPRD's commitment to cultural resources provides a supportive framework for the SHPO's statewide initiatives to assist our partners in their efforts to identify and designate historic properties and archaeological sites, plan for long-term resource preservation, and make meaningful connections between Oregonians and their history.

A second companion planning document is the Oregon Heritage Commission's 2014–2019 Oregon Heritage Plan. As a part of the Heritage Division, the Commission's initiatives include various grant, technical assistance, and recognition programs that support a range of heritage organizations across the state. The work of the Commission and the SHPO are mutually supportive, with the activities of both encouraging participation in each other's programs and fostering partnerships within Oregon's heritage community. The Oregon Heritage Plan focuses on strengthening the heritage community by providing support for collections management, touting the benefits of heritage tourism, encouraging history education, and providing communication tools for heritage issues. The goals and activities of the Commission broadly

create a supportive environment for the SHPO's efforts across the state by strengthening institutions and organizations and connecting Oregonians to their past.

SHPO Role and Priorities

The Oregon SHPO acts as the statewide leader for historic preservation responsible for creating an environment that enables and encourages local preservation projects. No other entity has the responsibility or resources to fulfill this broad task. In this lead role, the SHPO administers an array of federal and state preservation programs that provide information, technical expertise, and funding to facilitate the work of partner organizations. External applicants may drive the day-to-day workload for many of these programs, but the SHPO can emphasize one program over another through the allocation of funding and staff resources.

Most of the SHPO's programs address at least one of the four components of the National Park Service's approach to historic preservation: identify, evaluate, designate, and treat. The Oregon SHPO believes that education is an important fifth component. Together, these five approaches form the basis of preservation planning and encourage active consideration of what cultural resources are important and how best to preserve and interpret them. This process is crucial. Preservation efforts rely heavily on public institutions and funds, and these resources are limited. Engaging the public in preservation planning is an effective tool to build the necessary support for local programs and projects. To this end, the SHPO's efforts will focus on strengthening our many partners, including those participating in the Certified Local Government and Oregon Main Street Network programs.

The ultimate goal of preservation planning is the long-term protection of a community's significant historic properties and archaeological sites. Each step of the process is a valuable opportunity to engage the heritage community and the general public in meaningful conversation. The following describes the SHPO's approach to preservation planning and its benefits:

Identify. The first step in preservation planning is identifying a community's potential pool of historic properties and archaeological sites eligible for designation. The survey process itself can be a catalyst for community pride and build public support for preservation. Documents and photographs discovered during a survey can later serve as references for rehabilitation and restoration projects.

Surveys can also be used to identify those places that are, or have the potential to be, at risk. Whole groups of properties can be at risk, such as sites located in flood zones, buildings with unreinforced masonry vulnerable to earthquakes, modern-style buildings perceived as being too new to preserve, or barns struggling to find new uses. Noting these properties and sites early informs project planning efforts at all levels of government and buys time to evaluate resources, develop project alternatives, prepare treatment strategies, and plan for advantageous preservation outcomes.

Evaluate. Not all properties identified in a community survey can or should be preserved. The process of evaluating what properties and sites merit recognition must rest in a broad and inclusive understanding of a community's history. Robust public outreach that carefully considers the community's shared values and needs is key to determining which properties and sites are the most important. The process invites conversations about community identity and asks the public to consider the meaning and importance of the past in everyday life.

The evaluation process is also important in long-term project planning. Federal and state agencies have obligations under the National Historic Preservation Act. Most commonly, these include consultation requirements under Section 106 for projects funded or permitted by agencies. Staff regularly make eligibility decisions about cultural resources that affect local communities. Locals can use current information from their own efforts to communicate early on about the historic properties and archaeological sites that matter most to them.

Designate. Local designation and listing a property in the National Register of Historic Places are both tools used to identify the most important cultural resources and ensure their long-term preservation. If community leaders and planners know which sites are important, they are more likely to avoid them during construction, include them in disaster planning, and leverage them as cultural and economic assets. The process of designation can also serve as a community-wide celebration or remembrance of the important persons and events that made a place what it is today.

Treat. When a community designates a historic property it commits to that special place's long-term preservation. Local incentives paired with federal and state tax programs and grants can encourage thoughtful preservation projects and assist owners in maintaining their historic property or site. Well-written local preservation ordinances, design guidelines, and disaster preparedness plans address how best to preserve a property or site's important features that convey its unique physical connection to the community's history.

Educate. The value of historic properties and archaeological sites is in the connection they create between the present and the past as physical representations of a community's values and identity. However, this connection cannot be taken for granted. Robust, proactive education programs that connect history to the everyday present are essential for maintaining public support. It is also important to make the case that the local preservation program, including incentives and appropriate regulation, preserves a community's unique identity, livability, and economic vitality.

There are many reasons to proactively identify, evaluate, designate, and treat historic properties and educate the public through a robust local preservation planning program. Every member of the heritage community plays an important role in this effort.

The Role of the Heritage Community

While the Oregon SHPO sets the tone for statewide preservation efforts and administers the national and state programs, the agency itself does not own or manage historic properties. Instead, the heritage community does much of the on-the-ground preservation work at local or regional levels. The following partners play an important role in carrying out preservation activities across the state:

Federal and state agencies. As stewards and regulators of public property, federal and state agencies have a legal obligation to identify, evaluate, designate, and treat significant historic properties and archaeological sites. Many also administer educational programs. However, limited public resources means that responsible stewardship involves steering resources to those places that have the greatest cultural value. Federal and state agencies can further preservation efforts across Oregon by working with stakeholders to identify the most important properties and sites and then committing to their long-term preservation.

Tribal governments. Oregon's tribal governments are an invaluable partner in the preservation of cultural resources related to the state's first peoples. Growing tribal cultural resource programs encompass many facets of native culture and enrich the lives of tribal members and the community at large. Members of the heritage community must engage with tribes in meaningful conversations. Working collaboratively, they can advance the identification and protection of resources. These partnerships create an understanding of the ongoing role tribes play in Oregon's past and future.

Local governments. City and county governments serve a crucial role in the physical preservation of historic resources. By identifying, evaluating, and designating historic properties, they can protect them under state law and local preservation ordinances. Local programs are also important in cultivating public awareness of preservation issues and building support for preservation through education and incentive programs. Local governments can drive preservation efforts through robust community-driven survey programs resulting in local designation, nomination of properties to the National Register, and thoughtful regulation. Active, engaging education programs and incentives will build broad public support.

Nonprofit organizations. Within the heritage community, nonprofit organizations engage in a wide variety of work from advocacy and bricks-and-mortar preservation to archives and living history. Nonprofit organizations serve the entire heritage community by engaging the public in learning about and interpreting our shared past. The many communities participating in Oregon's Main Street Network drive efforts to culturally and economically revitalize Oregon's historic downtowns. Nonprofit organizations' unique position as advocates for preservation and heritage issues enables them to reach out to elected officials, corporate interests, and the public when government agencies cannot.

Universities, colleges, trade schools, and their students. Educational institutions play a vital role in training the next generation of heritage professionals who will assist their communities with the important work of identifying, evaluating, designating, and treating historic properties and archaeological sites. They are responsible for the curation of our shared heritage and

educating the public. Our universities are leading the way in document preservation, carrying out initiatives to digitize important records and make them available to all Oregonians. These institutions and their students are also important advocates for preservation and heritage issues, bringing needed resources to larger efforts and providing valuable research that illuminates pressing preservation issues.

Professionals and professional organizations. Preservation, building, design, finance, and real-estate professionals, among others in both the private and public sector play a key role in providing specialized services in support of preservation and heritage activities. In addition to these individual efforts, professional organizations serve an important education and advocacy role, both in the interest of their members and the public. Professionals drive efforts by demonstrating the cultural, educational, and economic value of preservation in their work and through volunteering in support of nonprofit organizations and other heritage groups.

Historic property owners. Most of Oregon's historic properties, including the great majority of the state's historic districts, are in private ownership. If these resources are to be preserved, the owners must be engaged in the thoughtful maintenance of their property and, most importantly, the curation of their property's unique story. The broader heritage community can help by providing education materials, incentives, and funding that encourages physical preservation.

Public, businesses, foundations, and trusts. Preserving our history is a community value. This collective effort requires robust public support for tax-supported government and incentive programs, laws, and policies. These systems allow historic properties and archaeological sites to be preserved and interpreted in meaningful and relevant ways. To encourage this, the heritage community must engage the public's many interests to identify what resources are most important.

The SHPO encourages all our heritage community partners to consider the importance of preservation planning and their role in proactively identifying, evaluating, designating, and treating the most important resources for the communities they serve. The issues, goals, and objectives below are not in order of priority, and they are certainly not comprehensive. With this information, the SHPO hopes to embolden advocates in their chosen roles, to reveal any gaps in the network of services, and to reinforce ways the heritage community can work better together.

Issues, Goals, and Objectives

The following section is the core of the Oregon Historic Preservation Plan, which asserts that the SHPO will lead where appropriate and empower others to do likewise. The plan specifically addresses the SHPO's legislative mission to identify, evaluate, designate, and treat historic properties and archaeological sites. Also described are the SHPO's education outreach efforts. Integrated into the narrative are concrete objectives that describe how the SHPO and traditional preservation interests can collaborate with the larger heritage community toward mutually-supportive goals. This broader constituency includes professional organizations and the diverse number of advocacy organizations, museums, archives, and resource-dedicated volunteer organizations involved in curation and interpretation of "heritage resources," including collections, archives, special places, and traditional practice and memory.

The plan is organized into ten key issues that emerged from the SHPO's statewide outreach. Each is discussed below and associated with one or more of the five approaches to preservation planning: identify, evaluate, designate, treat, and educate. For each issue, a broad goal statement encapsulates the desired outcome, followed by specific objectives for achieving that goal. The SHPO's ongoing, regular work to carry out its mission are not listed as objectives, but are noted within each issue. The SHPO's annual work plan develops more detailed action items for each of these strategies. While individual goals may take time, specific objectives will be replaced as they are achieved or as new opportunities and challenges require flexibility.

Issue 1: Government Partnerships

Preservation Planning Approaches: Identify, Evaluate, Designate, Treat, Educate

The SHPO works regularly with many types of government partners, which include local, regional, state, federal, and tribal governments as well as service districts, universities, and colleges. Many of these institutions play critical decision-making roles in determining the fate of a community's historic resources when planning for government-funded or permitted projects. The SHPO's job is to ensure that consultation with its office is reasonable, timely, and professional and to strive for a preservation outcome whenever possible. In this role, the SHPO seeks ways to enable government partners to engage stakeholders in meaningful conversations about cultural resources in their community and to make solid, balanced policy decisions. The SHPO also works with government agencies on proactive preservation projects. The agency administers the Certified Local Government program, which supports cities and counties as they carry out their preservation goals. Research repositories, including universities and libraries are also important partners. It is essential to build relationships at all levels of government to plan for the management of cultural resources before projects are proposed or disasters hit, and to take advantage of opportunities to do good preservation work. These proactive strategies best ensure the appreciation, protection, and appropriate use of cultural resources.

Goal: Leverage partnerships to pool knowledge, experience, and assets to support proactive preservation planning that results in the appreciation, protection, and use of cultural resources.

Objectives:

- 1.1 Work with agencies, tribes, and partners to create a regular process that invites robust, inclusive public outreach efforts early in the project planning process.
- 1.2 Strengthen coordination and relationships with tribes by supporting tribal programs and facilitating the integration of tribal concerns into federal, state, and local project planning.
- 1.3 Work with agencies and local governments to develop effective strategies that address the interests and needs of Oregon's youth and diverse population as they relate to cultural resource management.
- 1.4 Mitigate for adverse project effects through long-term binding interagency management documents that identify Oregon's most significant cultural resources and provide for their long-term protection, appropriate use, and interpretation as opportunity allows.
- 1.5 Work with government agencies, tribes, and partners to review and revise existing agreement documents to streamline procedures for compliance with federal and state cultural resource laws as appropriate.
- 1.6 Review existing processes and seek new innovations to improve service and streamline project reviews under federal and state cultural compliance laws. *See Issue 5, Digital Information Sharing and Accessibility.*
- 1.7 Work with appropriate agencies to create disaster preparedness plans that address cultural and heritage resources.

- 1.8 Deepen relationships with research repositories, such as libraries, archives, and historical societies, and seek opportunities to support digitizing collections and expanding their use for historic preservation purposes.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Partnering with Certified Local Government and Oregon Main Street Network Programs through training, technical assistance, and funding.
- Pursuing cross-training and collaboration with government agencies, tribes, and other partners to improve communication.
- Presenting regularly at partner conferences and training sessions on preservation and heritage resource issues.

Issue 2: Advocacy and Heritage Partner Networking

Preservation Planning Approach: Educate

Advocacy involves leveraging partnerships and taking assertive positions defending and promoting Oregon’s heritage resources. This effort goes beyond opposing a controversial demolition or the shuttering of a local historical society. Effective advocacy for preservation planning means that communities will proactively identify important cultural and heritage resources. This step ensures that appropriate protective laws and policies are in place before a crisis. The SHPO’s role as an advocate for cultural resources is shaped largely by its state agency status. Being part of state government affords the SHPO opportunities to advance preservation solutions. But this role comes with limitations resulting from political and jurisdictional issues. Nonprofit organizations and local advocacy groups are often in a better position to respond to opportunities and challenges. That is why a coordinated advocacy strategy centering on education and proactive planning is so important.

Networking is critical to the health of the heritage community because it allows organizations to educate each other by sharing information and experiences. Doing so keeps the community informed and builds a mutually supportive environment. Sharing knowledge and resources can also offset operational costs and leverage outreach and programming. It is also important to build strong, supportive networks through opportunities to mingle and network, not just within the heritage community, but with agencies, organizations, and businesses that may not have preservation as their primary mission.

Goal: Expand opportunities for coordinated collaboration within the heritage community to promote the appreciation, protection, and use of heritage resources through proactive initiatives and well-targeted response strategies.

Objectives:

- 2.1 Create welcoming, inclusive discussion spaces and initiatives that invite participation and serve the needs of Oregon’s youth and diverse population as active members of the heritage community.
- 2.2 Facilitate conversations between tribes and members of the heritage community in projects beyond federal and state cultural resource compliance laws.
- 2.3 Encourage cooperation on topics of mutual interest among state-level commissions with oversight of heritage resource issues.
- 2.4 Work with partners to identify and develop reports that support the heritage community’s advocacy efforts.
- 2.5 Build working relationships and support for cultural and heritage resources among elected federal, state, and local officials by regularly providing relevant program information.
- 2.6 Work with elected officials and partners to review the state Special Assessment Program tax incentive, set to expire in 2020, and to consider other state-level financial benefits for preservation activities.

- 2.7 Seek regulatory and policy solutions to address protecting cultural resources in the event of a natural disaster.
- 2.8 Work with partner organizations to create and distribute a communications and training toolkit to assist partners with outreach and advocacy.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Strengthening connections and productive partnerships through national and state organizations, such as the Oregon Cultural Trust, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, and National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- Using listservs, social media, and regular statewide regional conferences and workshops to keep the heritage community well-informed and to encourage information and resource sharing, collaboration, innovation, mentorship, and support among participants.

Issue 3: Public Outreach and Education

Preservation Planning Approaches: Treat, Educate

The public is a key partner in protecting Oregon’s special places and heritage resources. Most of the state’s cultural resources are in private ownership, including the homes and businesses in designated historic districts. Ultimately, it is the public that pays for preservation efforts through their tax dollars and generous donations. Public officials make policy and planning decisions in response to what voters tell them is important. Public awareness of the value of preservation and heritage activities makes preservation planning more likely. This entire process results in the appreciation, protection, and appropriate use of cultural resources. Greater understanding can lead to broad support for museums, archives, historical societies, and other heritage organizations. While public outreach and education requires effective communication with the public, it is not a one-way street. The heritage community must listen to ensure that the public finds its mission relevant. Otherwise, its efforts will not be supported. It is our obligation to build participatory programs that allow the larger community to identify what resources are important and to interpret their past for themselves. Taking this step will, over time, turn passive recognition of the importance of our shared past into active support.

Goal: Build public support by promoting the broad appreciation and appropriate protection and use of heritage resources in collaboration with our partner organizations.

Objectives:

- 3.1 Support the education and outreach efforts of government agencies and tribal and heritage advocates by providing timely information and technical assistance, encouraging networking and support among partners, and offering funding as available.
- 3.2 Evaluate existing programs and publications to ensure that that these are relevant and in accessible formats that meet the interests and needs of Oregon’s youth and diverse population, and develop new initiatives as needed and as resources allow.
- 3.3 Develop and support partners’ efforts to create inclusive interpretive materials and programs that speak to the everyday relevance of historic properties and archaeological sites, including plaques, walking tour brochures, websites, traditional and social media, programs, and lectures to connect communities to their special places.
- 3.4 Collaborate with appropriate partners to revisit interpretive materials, exhibits, and signage at publicly-owned historic sites when opportunities arise to ensure the stories are historically accurate and inclusive.
- 3.5 Partner with property owners, tribes, professionals, and research universities on collaborative archaeological investigations and active outreach programs, including presentations and continued and increasing participation in Portland State University’s Archaeology Roadshow and Oregon Archaeology Month to promote these projects as public education opportunities.
- 3.6 Work with partners to leverage national annual events and noteworthy anniversaries and remembrances to create memorable and relevant education programs.

- 3.7 Seek partnerships and collaboration opportunities with nontraditional partners, including professional building, design, finance, and real-estate organizations and leaders in green building and affordable housing, among other interests, to better integrate historic preservation into their agendas.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Raising the profile of preservation awards programs, such as the Heritage Excellence Awards, the George McMath Award, Oregon Main Street Network Awards, and other efforts to demonstrate the impact of preservation efforts.
- Fostering connections between the heritage community and tourism organizations to incorporate educational opportunities into promotional materials and tourist-oriented events and activities.

Issue 4: Professional Preservation Education

Preservation Planning Approach: Educate

Training focused on best practices and aimed at professionals, volunteers, and students is important. Preservation training provides tools and information to address today's heritage resource issues to those people doing the day-to-day work. These trainings also allow individuals and organizations to better take advantage of emerging opportunities and to build up the collective knowledge and human capital across the entire heritage community.

Goal: Support professional-level education and training opportunities across the heritage community.

Objectives:

- 4.1 Support cultural resource, history, design, and related programs at Oregon universities, colleges, and trade schools through scholarships, internships, instruction, grants, and technical assistance.
- 4.2 Grow and develop current programs and efforts, such as existing training opportunities and Mentor Corps, to support the network of experienced professionals providing consulting resources to organizations in need of specific expertise. Provide additional assistance to small organizations and those located in rural areas.
- 4.3 Seek opportunities to leverage existing programs or develop new professional-level continuing education classes for nontraditional partners, including building, design, finance, and real-estate professionals.
- 4.4 Strengthen affiliations with colleges, universities, and trade schools through cooperative multi-agency public education efforts, including the Pacific Northwest Field School.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Providing funding for professionals, volunteers, and students to attend conferences and pursue research through grants and scholarships.
- Creating and distributing timely and relevant digital information and user guides on important heritage resource topics, available programs, and funding opportunities.
- Offering regular in-person and online training, networking, and information sharing opportunities for cultural resource staff within state and federal agencies, tribes, and regional and local governments.

Issue 5: Digital Information Sharing and Accessibility

Preservation Planning Approaches: Identify, Educate

The SHPO is the repository for the master data set for all known cultural resources in Oregon. Its staff maintains databases for both survey and National Register records to provide a reliable reference and planning tool for those who need cultural resource information. These databases also quantify, track, and report on the collected data. The information available on the SHPO's website provides heritage partners with useful tools. The SHPO's email newsletter and social media outlets keep its partners informed and encourage dialogue. The SHPO's efforts to provide information online and offer user-friendly web-based services is aligned with and supported by Oregon's statewide digitization effort. Digitizing records and improving and developing web-based services are among the most important goals for the SHPO in the coming years.

Goal: Develop, grow, and maintain data collection systems and digital media presence with partners to record and share information about Oregon's cultural and heritage resources to encourage their appreciation, protection, and use.

Objectives:

- 5.1 Design and launch an improved and expanded user-friendly GIS- and web-based portal that unifies data from Oregon Heritage programs and allows for digital document submission and response by staff, the heritage community, and the public.
- 5.2 Create a streamlined, digital process for project reviews under federal and state cultural compliance laws.
- 5.3 Redesign the agency website to improve navigability, optimize mobile use, and streamline content to better serve the needs of the heritage community and the public.
- 5.4 Digitize the agency's collection of printed photos and slides and attach to the appropriate records in the Oregon Historic Sites Database.
- 5.5 Work with partner organizations to digitize important historic documents and management records and make them available to users and the public.
- 5.6 Work with federal and state agencies, tribes, regional and local governments, and other partners to exchange digital information on cultural resources for project planning and preservation efforts, and develop GIS maps that identify cultural resources for project planning and emergency management.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Continuing improvement to the SHPO's online services.
- Sharing the growing body of research information available online through the SHPO's projects and the contributions of partners.
- Improving accuracy of GIS-based location information for historic properties and archaeological resources.

Issue 6: Identification and Designation of Cultural Resources

Preservation Planning Approaches: Identify, Evaluate, Designate, Educate

Identifying and evaluating the state’s cultural resources is the first step in preservation planning. Designating significant historic properties and archaeological sites to either the National Register of Historic Places, local registers, or both is the important next step. The SHPO administers the federal National Register program in Oregon, maintains written standards for conducting surveys for cultural resources, and provides grants for important survey projects when funding levels allow.

Increasing the identification and evaluation of cultural resources through survey an important goal for the entire heritage community. The importance of survey cannot be underestimated. It is a critical tool for government planning, from the smallest rural city to the federal level. Knowledge of community resources forms the basis for informed public conversations about what should be preserved and why. Survey is also key to pre-disaster planning. Historic resources and archaeological sites cannot be addressed in emergency preparedness plans if jurisdictions do not know what they have.

Current understanding of historic properties and archaeological sites that may be listed in the National Register has broadened to include the designation of historic agricultural and industrial landscapes that have not been traditionally seen as eligible historic districts. Including, Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), which are sites or districts that physically reflect the cultural practices, traditions, beliefs, lifeways, arts, crafts, or social institutions of a living community.

Designation raises the question about what to list. The National Register of Historic Places can answer this question when it is used thoughtfully. During public outreach efforts for this plan, many participants showed a strong interest in well-known but threatened resources. Including, settlement-era homesteads, forts, and the Oregon Trail. Participants were also interested in resources associated with Native American history from the pre-colonial period to the present and archaeological sites in general. Sites related to Oregon’s varied important industries over time and post–World War II properties were also mentioned. By far, the most interest was in creating a thematically representative National Register, one that represents the broad swath of Oregon’s history and the contributions of all. The State Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation (SACHP) felt that this goal was particularly important. The SACHP is the governor-appointed body responsible for reviewing nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. By prioritizing the listing of significant special places that reflect yet untold stories, public agencies and communities can ensure that their collections of National Register–listed places are balanced and representative of all aspects of the state’s history.

Goal: Expand and diversify Oregon’s state inventory of cultural resources and properties and sites listed in local landmark registers and the National Register of Historic Places.

Objectives:

- 6.1 Work with the SACHP and seek the input of youth, the public, traditional preservation partners, and the larger heritage community to develop priorities for state-level survey and designation projects to create a more thematically representative state inventory and National Register of Historic Places list. Prioritize properties at risk due to development, neglect, and natural disaster.
- 6.2 Support tribal initiatives to identify significant historic properties and archaeological sites and list these in the National Register of Historic Places.
- 6.3 Work with appropriate partners to identify archaeological sites that are thematically representative of the state's diverse population. Prioritize survey and designation of significant sites at risk due to looting, development, and natural disasters.
- 6.4 Work with partners to identify and designate National Historic Landmarks in Oregon.
- 6.5 Facilitate partnerships among community groups, nonprofits, universities, colleges, and schools and provide appropriate tools and training to survey and designate significant resources to local landmark lists and the National Register.
- 6.6 Work with the Oregon Department of Transportation, partners, and the public to identify and protect significant state highway bridges and railroad-related resources as part of ongoing federal planning efforts.
- 6.7 Encourage the use of surveys and nominations to the National Register as mitigation for adverse effects by federal projects.
- 6.8 Streamline and improve the survey and designation process by creating an online submission tool to record properties in the field. *See Issue 5, Digital Information Sharing and Accessibility.*
- 6.9 Create a web-based architectural guide to assist with survey and designation efforts, especially vernacular buildings and structures.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Encouraging and supporting communities to create and update resource inventories and add properties to local landmark lists.
- Working with federal, state, regional, and local agencies to inventory and designate cultural resources under their jurisdiction.

Issue 7: Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Protection of Cultural Resources

Preservation Planning Approaches: Treat, Educate

Physical preservation, rehabilitation, and protection of historic properties and archaeological sites are the core purpose of historic preservation. This requires good planning, including having the appropriate information, guidance, and expertise available to help projects be successful.

Goal: Increase the number of historic property rehabilitation and archaeological site preservation, and stabilization projects.

Objectives:

- 7.1 Collaborate with tribes, state and federal agencies, and regional and local governments to create fact sheets and best practices for the stabilization and preservation of archaeological sites, and distribute materials in a variety of formats to private and public property owners.
- 7.2 Work with partners to expand the number of organizations and professionals available to provide free or low-cost advice for preservation projects statewide, especially in rural and underserved areas. *See Issue 4, Professional Preservation Education.*
- 7.3 Provide partners with technical assistance, advice, and resources as available to identify historic properties and archaeological sites that are at risk from natural disasters, and collaborate to put into place policy and technical solutions to mitigate these risks.
- 7.4 Support a balance between incentives and regulations at all levels of government to promote proper treatment of cultural resources. *See Issue 10, Statutes, Ordinances, Codes, and Processes.*
- 7.5 Seek physical preservation and rehabilitation (rather than simply documentation) as mitigation for project impacts to historic properties and archaeological sites.
- 7.6 Identify successful federal and state tax and grant program preservation projects and track the benefits of preserving, rehabilitating, and reusing historic properties. Provide this information in a variety of promotional and educational formats to legislators, professionals, advocates, and the public to encourage these activities.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Providing design assistance to communities for historic building rehabilitation through the Certified Local Government and Oregon Main Street Network programs.
- Continuing to encourage Certified Local Governments and Oregon Main Street Network communities to establish, maintain, and expand pass-through grant programs for building rehabilitation, facade improvements, and archaeological site preservation and stabilization.
- Working with partners to provide workshops and printed and digital training materials on preservation technology to the public and historic building owners.

- Creating new and updating existing fact sheets and training materials, and providing online and on-site training opportunities about the specialized needs of cultural resources.

Issue 8: Grants and Funding

Preservation Planning Approaches: Identify, Evaluate, Designate, Treat, Educate

Predictably, funding is one of the top needs identified in the outreach effort for the 2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan. Increased financial assistance is essential to virtually every aspect of cultural resource work, including planning, surveys, National Register nominations, archaeological excavation and analysis, site stabilization, feasibility studies, public education, and training. Funding includes not only grants, but also tax incentives and anything else that helps cover costs.

The many grants the SHPO offers underscore our emphasis on incentives rather than regulation as the best way to succeed with preservation. Regulation can be time-consuming and costly, and it is often perceived negatively. Grants leverage resources, build public support, and generate tangible results, which is the ultimate objective. Maintaining grant levels is the goal in times of steady and even moderately declining budgets. Expanding grants should be a priority in good economic times. It is money well spent because it does not create long-term obligations in the way that additional staff or new programs would.

Goal: Strengthen and expand funding, grants, and financial incentive programs and their use for cultural and heritage resources.

Objectives:

- 8.1 Evaluate and assess the effectiveness and impact of grants offered by the SHPO and Oregon Heritage Division to support these programs, direct improvements, and ensure the equitable distribution of funds.
- 8.2 Seek additional funds and resources for existing grant programs and proactively address disaster preparedness and known threats to historic properties and archaeological sites.
- 8.3 Support and grow the Oregon Main Street Downtown Revitalization Grant program by tracking and evaluating projects, assisting Oregon Main Street Network organizations with the application process and project completion, and seeking continued funding.
- 8.4 Work with the Oregon Main Street Network and Certified Local Government programs to expand the use of federal tax credits for rehabilitation projects, especially in smaller towns and underserved regions of the state.
- 8.5 Actively encourage and support the use of easements (and their tax benefits), where appropriate, for historic properties and archaeological sites.
- 8.6 Support initiatives to maintain and create statewide preservation incentives by providing technical advice and supporting evidence to advocates.
- 8.7 Assist local partners in creating financial incentives to inventory, designate, and rehabilitate historic properties.
- 8.8 Encourage public entities to apply for Oregon Emergency Management’s Seismic Rehabilitation Grant program and other funding for disaster preparedness.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Streamlining grant and incentive programs to minimize administrative costs and paperwork and ease the application process.
- Publicizing fundraising success stories and examples of creative and successful private/public preservation partnerships to inspire and guide others.
- Offering workshops on best practices for identifying, applying for, and managing grants with partner organizations.
- Providing appropriate materials and staff support to grant recipients to ensure the successful completion of grant projects, especially to small organizations and those located in rural areas.

Issue 9: Economic Development

Preservation Planning Approaches: Treat, Educate

Economic development centered in a community's people, unique institutions, identity, and heritage resources creates not just memorable spaces and authentic experiences but also revenue and jobs. Partnering with economic development efforts cultivates broad public interest and can generate funds for preservation projects and local heritage institutions. In Oregon, these opportunities most often take shape as downtown commercial revitalization projects and heritage tourism campaigns. Good organization, careful planning, and inclusive community engagement ensure that resources are protected and responsibly interpreted.

Goal: Promote heritage resources as community economic assets, and foster partnerships to support this effort while maintaining the long-term historic integrity of the resources.

Objectives:

- 9.1 Encourage the development of authentic, representative cultural heritage tourism efforts in Oregon communities that feature both historic properties and archaeological sites in cooperation with partners.
- 9.2 Identify and support the development of recreational opportunities that leverage cultural resources and heritage organizations.
- 9.3 Offer resources and training to assist local advocates in building partnerships to make the case that preservation is a key component of economic development in their community. *See Issue 2, Heritage Partner Networking and Advocacy.*

Ongoing Efforts:

- Facilitating development of partnerships among Oregon Main Street Network organizations and Certified Local Governments and their communities to support preservation as an important part of downtown development and revitalization.
- Encouraging federal and state agencies, local governments, and service districts to locate their offices in historic buildings by providing information, technical advice, and funding, where possible and as available.

Issue 10: Statutes, Ordinances, Codes, and Processes

Preservation Planning Approaches: Identify, Evaluate, Designate, Treat, Educate

Federal, state, tribal, and local governments all have regulations that address cultural resource issues and all five preservation approaches (identify, evaluate, designate, treat, and educate) to varying degrees. These include statutes and ordinances as well as land use codes and processes. Federal and state laws provide the framework for preservation activities while specific agencies manage resources under their jurisdiction and provide technical assistance and funding for preservation efforts. But most preservation happens at the local level, which requires strong community support created by well-run, relevant programs. Many local ordinances require revision because they are out-of-date with recent state court and Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) cases and Oregon’s revised Goal 5 Rule, which took effect in April 2017. Goal 5 encourages local governments to create programs that identify and protect cultural resources. In some cases, local laws do not address entire classes of resources, such as archaeological sites, ships, bridges, and other “non-building” cultural resources. Strengthening preservation regulations at any level can be difficult, especially in an era of increased property-rights awareness and budget cuts. That being said, integration of preservation into broader planning efforts, robust education campaigns, well-targeted incentive programs, and streamlined approval processes can build broad public support for preservation efforts.

Goal: Facilitate the development and implementation of state statutes, local ordinances, codes, and processes that provide appropriate incentives and regulations and that create public support for the appreciation, protection, and use of cultural resources.

Objectives:

- 10.1 Encourage communities to cultivate public support for preservation by including incentives in their ordinances and processes.
- 10.2 Work with the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and other partners to develop a model preservation ordinance, historic context statement, historic preservation plan, and related guidance documents and training that are consistent with current laws, recent court cases, and changes in the statewide preservation planning Goal 5 Rule.
- 10.3 Work with partners to encourage the adoption of local ordinances that provide greater design flexibility for cultural resources and take full advantage of existing state-level provisions.
- 10.4 Encourage local jurisdictions to address the identification and protection of archaeological resources in codes and ordinances that follow federal and state laws and best practices by providing training, technical advice, and example documents.
- 10.5 Collaborate with elected officials and partners to review existing state preservation laws and rules, evaluate their effectiveness, and make policy changes that result in the preservation and appropriate interpretation and use of cultural resources as opportunity allows.

Ongoing Efforts:

- Encouraging local jurisdictions to streamline processes and decrease costs by adopting clear and objective administrative design review processes.
- Advocating with appropriate partners for the integration of cultural resource issues into planning documents at all levels of government.
- Encouraging and working with state and local agencies to implement existing state cultural resource protection statutes and rules as opportunities allow.

Implementation and Conclusion

The 2018–2023 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan is a common reference document that helps direct a coordinated and effective statewide effort. It guides the SHPO in its unique, overarching role as the lead preservation agency in the state. It is also written with an eye on the plans and efforts of essential partners within the heritage community, some with direct involvement in traditional preservation activities and others with broader missions. The goal is to enable partners to pursue their own mission within a common framework that will maximize cooperation, avoid duplication, and ensure that there are no gaps in key areas. Such an approach enables every organization to do what it does best while concretely supporting like-minded efforts.

Implementing the plan is the collective responsibility of Oregon’s heritage community, including the SHPO, federal and state agencies, local governments, tribes, educational institutions, professional organizations, property owners and the public, and the diverse number of nonprofit advocacy organizations, museums, archives, and resource-dedicated volunteer organizations.

There are two keys to implementing this plan. First is the pursuit and strengthening of partnerships across the heritage community. The SHPO will continue to host conferences, forums, and training opportunities that foster ongoing conversations and networking about important topics within the heritage community. It will call on partners to be active participants in these activities and to reach out to their peers. The second key to implementing the plan is the SHPO’s annual work plan. Toward the end of each calendar year, the SHPO will develop its work plan for the coming year for the agency, specific program areas, and individuals. Work plans are rooted in the concepts laid out in this plan but include more specific action items and timelines.

The SHPO encourages all preservation partners to develop their own annual work plans that emphasize their organization’s role and unique interests and strengths within the heritage community’s larger goals captured in this plan. Full coordination may not be possible, given all the variables of funding, politics, and unforeseen challenges, 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 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 and challenges to preserving them. This section aims to answer the 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*.

Outreach efforts for the plan identified ongoing challenges resulting from continued population growth and long-standing debates about the role of government. In many communities, growth increases development pressure on historic resources. Adding to this, newcomers are not always attuned to the importance of local identity and landmarks. Outdated cultural resource inventories and designation documents hamper planning efforts, and costs associated with brick-and-mortar preservation are rising. Increasingly, local and state laws and processes protecting cultural resources are challenged as both too restrictive and not protective enough. Recent political developments prompted by controversial historic districts changed the regulatory landscape. In April 2017, the Goal 5 Rule for historic resources was rewritten. The revised Rule removes a local jurisdiction's authority to regulate properties listed in the National Register after the effective date, unless the property is designated in a local landmark register. Local governments must still review a proposed demolition or relocation.

Challenges exist, but support for preservation is growing across the state. Over fifty communities across the state now have their own local preservation programs through the Certified Local Government Program, a partnership between the federal, state, and local government that enables local preservation efforts. Through these programs, historic buildings are protected by local building code regulation. Communities often promote these special places as expressions of local or neighborhood pride and usually as part of heritage tourism and economic development efforts. For example, the Oregon Main Street Network is a downtown economic revitalization program administered by Heritage Programs with over seventy participating cities and towns. Together, these two growing programs and their participating communities accomplish preservation work across the state. Federal, state, and local incentives, emphasis at all levels on rehabilitation and adaptive reuse, and extensive “how-to” information encourage and guide preservation efforts. Archaeological resources are protected through a number of federal and state laws, but are not usually subject to local ordinances.

Important court cases and public processes have placed the regulatory landscape for preservation on an increasingly solid foundation. Notably, the Goal 5 Rule now provides for stronger protection measures for locally-designated properties by limiting the reasons a property may be removed from a landmark register. Preservation advocates can also cheer the Oregon Legislature's unprecedented support of the Oregon Main Street Network with \$7.5 million of tax

bond funded grants for building rehabilitation and economic development through 2021. In 2015, proponents of historic preservation finally got a solid definition of “owner” and a clear understanding of when owners may object to listing their property in a local landmark register under state law in the Oregon State Supreme Court case *Lake Oswego Preservation Society v. City of Lake Oswego*. Supporters of preservation also found good news in the 2015 *King v. Clackamas County* Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) case where the panel found that the proposed adaptive reuse of the Bull Run Power Plant as approved by the County was legal under Oregon land use law, despite the property being in an exclusive forest-use area. The ruling opens the door for finding uses for other properties in exclusive use areas, such as barns in agricultural areas, though the process is neither simple nor easy.

Many challenges facing the preservation community remain, and no doubt there will be new challenges in the future. Yet there are many opportunities. Preservation planning and consideration for heritage resources at the state level is already part of regular processes, but more can be done. Close coordination among partners to build and maintain proactive and relevant programs is essential. These programs engage the public in the identification, evaluation, designation, treatment, and interpretation of their historic places and will, over time, strengthen the existing solid support for preservation.

Archaeological Resources

Most of what we know about Oregon’s archaeological sites is created through the process outlined in federal and state cultural resource compliance laws. The process requires that federal agencies survey and document archaeological sites identified in the path of proposed development projects that require ground disturbance. State agencies are encouraged to do so. The SHPO maintains the information in a master data set, and often federal and state agencies also maintain these records. Agencies and other property owners use this ever-expanding collection of data to help them avoid physical impacts to known sites. When it is not possible to avoid damage, site mitigation is required. Agencies may choose a variety of mitigation measures, including documentation and public outreach activities.

Given that excavation destroys an archaeological site, the preferred mitigation treatment for these resources is to simply leave them alone. 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. Limited testing may be needed to determine the type, extent, and significance of sites. Future technologies may offer more effective and sensitive methods for examining these sites. In partnership with federal, state, and local agencies, the Oregon SHPO is working toward a more proactive approach that identifies important archaeological sites before they are threatened and takes steps to preserve them.

Archaeological resources represent part of the story of human occupation in Oregon that began over 14,500 years ago. These resources comprise objects and features relating to the daily lives and activities of people from the past. All archaeological resources are nonrenewable, meaning once destroyed the valuable information they contain cannot be recreated. In Oregon, archaeological sites are defined in ORS 358.905. Sites are at least seventy-five years in age on

private and state land, and fifty years of age on federal lands, and comprised of at least ten **objects** or a **feature**. Archaeological sites can take many forms: lithic scatters (collections of stone flakes), quarries, villages, middens (trash dumps), camps, hunting grounds, burials, towns, homesteads, industrial or food processing sites, shipwrecks, trails, foundations, refuse scatters, religious or spiritual places, battlefields, forts, wells, privies, and painted or carved images. Archaeological sites represent all cultural groups that lived in Oregon.

Archaeological resources tell us about a specific place in time. They can tell us about places unused for long periods or destroyed by natural disaster. When records are nonexistent, incomplete, or inaccurate, untouched archaeological sites provide clues about how and when a place was used. Much like a modern detective, archaeologists use the context and arrangement of objects and features to learn about the activities that occurred there. Archaeological sites can be related to religious or spiritual places. They can include areas associated with traditional stories, legends, myths, and place names. Combined with tribal and historic records, archaeological resources draw connections between traditional, religious, or spiritual places and speak to the importance of place and time.

Archaeological sites dating to the last 200 years relate to a more complex mix of cultural groups. These sites are a key resource for populations not included in the historical record. The associated archaeological information can help answer questions about the initial contact between native populations and Euro-Americans as well as other groups. For example, through careful study, sites can reveal more about the daily life of US soldiers at army forts; how Chinese Americans maintained connections to their home country; or the challenges faced by early African American communities. A common misconception is that archaeological sites from the last 200 years do not represent indigenous populations. Native American groups were innovative and adapted to modern times, as did everyone else.

Archaeological sites are often not as easily identified or evaluated as historic buildings because they are usually buried, making the cost of doing so much higher. However, evidence of sites can be visible on the ground. Identifying where archaeological objects and features exist on the landscape requires a considerable amount of information. When looking for sites, archaeologists use soil science, geography, geology, environmental analysis, tribal consultation, local informants, maps, and history to gather background information prior to visiting a location. If previous studies identified archaeological resources near the location, this can help by indicating what types of sites may be expected and where they may be found. With the results of their background research, archaeologists then conduct a systematic survey to locate sites.

Several methods exist to determine more information about an archaeological site. One method includes walking along uniformly spaced grids, called a pedestrian survey. In another method, archaeologists systematically dig small cylindrical holes to look for buried sites, also known as a subsurface testing. They may use specialized equipment or remote sensing to identify features before digging. More formal archaeological excavation, such as large block excavation or boundary testing, can determine the breadth and depth of a site.

Oregon has over 40,000 recorded archaeological sites that represent its diverse peoples and history. Since the 1970s, archaeologists have identified sites in all thirty-six counties, most on

federal lands as a result of cultural resource compliance laws. Yet much remains unknown. Archaeologists have surveyed only ten percent of the state, and many sites are unevaluated. Sites between 13,000 to 14,000 years old present an additional challenge because they are difficult to locate or may have been destroyed by erosion. There is great potential to learn more about Oregon's past through the archaeological record.

Many federal, state, and local laws protect archaeological sites, yet these resources still face threats. Lack of awareness of the law means that well-intentioned persons may unknowingly destroy or damage archaeological sites. Infrastructure projects, including powerline and road development, worsen this issue by creating access to sites. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) can be especially destructive when driven over historic trails and sites. Increasing pressure to create housing and industrial developments also takes a toll. Many archaeological resources are potentially subject to looting and vandalism, so state law requires that their precise locations be kept confidential in most cases. Prosecution of intentional violations of the law serves as a reasonably effective deterrent. Loss of archaeological resources to natural processes, such as erosion and decay, may be addressed by robust identification, mitigation, and monitoring strategies. Overall, proactive public education is the best tool in addressing these issues.

Historic Properties

Surveys by cities and counties are among the largest contributors to Oregon's inventory of historic properties. Most of this survey work was done prior to 1995, when the state required that jurisdictions conduct cultural resource inventories under state comprehensive land use planning Goal 5. With over fifty Certified Local Governments (CLGs) in Oregon participating in the federal preservation program, these organizations form a strong network for data collection through regular survey projects. Federal and state agencies continue to add to Oregon's cultural resource inventory through their National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 and Section 110 obligations. The SHPO adds to this inventory through office-sponsored survey programs in support of the Oregon Main Street Network as individual resources are identified during special projects. There is, however, much work to be done.

There are approximately 66,000 historic properties in the SHPO's master historic sites database. Tens of thousands more historic properties remain to be inventoried statewide. Expanding the inventory of Oregon's historic properties is one of the SHPO's highest priorities over the next five years. Fifty-three percent of historic properties inventoried are from 1900–1939. Nineteenth-century resources comprise only 12 percent of the inventoried properties, while World War II-era and postwar resources built between 1940 and 1969 represent about 20 percent of the total, an increase of 4 percent from five years ago and 10 percent in the last ten years. This ongoing increase is not a surprise. The total number of resources from this period is staggering, and communities are addressing their postwar resources through CLG-funded survey. With the fifty-year guideline for National Register eligibility reaching 1968 in 2018, resources associated with the civil rights and justice movements, Oregon's changing society and economy, and the post-modern architectural movement must be identified and evaluated. Scholarship at both the national and state levels for "resources from the recent past" is increasing, but more is needed to help professionals properly evaluate the significance of this vast pool of resources.

There are five basic categories of historic properties: buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts. **Buildings** make up the overwhelming majority (94 percent) of Oregon’s known historic resources. Buildings are the resource type most readily associated with historic preservation by the public, and they are the focus of most historic preservation efforts statewide. Fifty percent of the historic buildings currently inventoried in Oregon are houses. Other building types include commercial, public, institutional, industrial, and agricultural buildings. Many of the identified properties are architecturally notable or associated with well-established historic events. There are many opportunities to document those places associated with Oregon’s less known or recognized, but no less important, history.

Buildings are typically the focus of most preservation efforts, but some types have special concerns. 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 do not accommodate modern equipment or industry standards. Structural improvements, such as seismic retrofitting for unreinforced masonry, can be cost prohibitive. The industry itself may no longer be financially viable or even exist. Oregon’s comprehensive land use law also limits the use, number, and occupancy of buildings in exclusive use zones, such as agriculture and forestry. As a result, these historic resources are more susceptible to abandonment and demolition.

Warehouses continue to be an exception. Many have been successfully converted to new uses in Portland and other Oregon cities where the local economy creates sufficient demand. Their open spaces and sturdy construction serve a variety of new uses. School, city, and county administration buildings often find other community uses or are rehabilitated or remodeled to support their continued use.

Agricultural buildings merit special focus because most of them were not identified in the 1980s when jurisdictions were required to keep an inventory of their historic resources. At that time, surveyors were advised not to include barns and other outbuildings in their inventories unless they were associated with residential buildings. As a result, Oregon’s agricultural resources are severely underrepresented.

Historic **districts** are groupings of buildings, structures, objects, and/or sites that together tell a larger story than a single resource could. Historic districts may include mostly residential or commercial properties or mining, farm, or ranch complexes. Districts vary widely in size. Efforts to preserve the character of historic districts usually include both federal and state tax incentives and local regulation. These incentives and controls are generally more effective for commercial and residential districts. There are currently 130 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 to date.

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 successfully inventoried and evaluated the highway bridges it oversees, though preservation of many of these structures is not feasible given their deterioration, increased traffic, and more stringent safety

standards. That said, the agency upgraded several prominent bridges using innovative solutions. ODOT proactively listed several properties in the National Register, including the Columbia River Highway (also a National Historic Landmark), the McKenzie Highway, the eleven coastal highway bridges associated with noted Oregon bridge engineer Conde B. McCullough, and several bridges over the Willamette River in Portland. Oregon also boasts a strong collection of listed covered bridges. Prompted by recent federal planning efforts, the agency evaluated all highway bridges and compiled a manual for field maintenance crews and a forthcoming coffee table book. In the next five years, future efforts will identify bridges worthy of long-term preservation. A similar project will identify important parts of the state's rail transportation network.

Linear structures are a challenging type of resource both to document and preserve. Some especially vulnerable linear resources include the historic irrigation canals of central and eastern Oregon, which are being piped at a rapid and consistent rate, and historic trails, including segments of the Oregon Trail. Oregon recognizes sixteen historic trails, many of which cross central and eastern Oregon in locations valued by wind farm developers and pipeline planners, which puts them at risk of both direct and indirect adverse effects from energy projects.

There are still no detailed national guidelines for documenting and evaluating resources that stretch for miles, include minimal distinguishable historic features, and require almost constant repair and upgrading. Filling this gap, the Oregon SHPO compiled guidance on the identification and evaluation of linear resources. Within the last five years, the SHPO, federal agencies, and local partners worked toward the completion and submission of a Multiple Property Document (MPD) for federal irrigation projects and are finalizing an MPD for the Oregon Trail. These documents will serve as useful planning tools for the identification, evaluation, and designation of portions of these important historic resources.

Some of Oregon's most unusual historic resources are classified as **structures** or **objects**. These include the large steel "O" on Skinner Butte in Eugene, World War II Patrol Torpedo Boat 658, and Portland's concrete statue of Paul Bunyan. These resources often have active and dedicated groups that ensure their preservation, but they also face unique threats. Apart from museum use, non-building resources are generally not good candidates for adaptive reuse. They are also not usually eligible for traditional incentive programs aimed at buildings. Due to gaps in local code, they are also often not subject to design review. Providing resources and creating processes to ensure these unique properties are adequately cared for is an ongoing challenge.

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 can be expansive. They may be formal historic landscapes, such as gardens or parks designed by prominent landscape architects, or they may be rural historic landscapes shaped over time by use, tradition, or industry. Landscapes are often classified as districts either due to their size or number of resources. Recent efforts to expand recognition of these resources include listing the Halprin Open Space Sequence in Portland, a series of connected urban parks; the Oak Hills Historic District, a residential postwar planned subdivision with a strong emphasis on community open space; Oregon's famous Peterson Rock garden; and a number of cemeteries

notable for their landscape design. Public interest in these important places is increasing, perhaps because of growing development threats.

Tribal governments and the public are increasingly interested in **Traditional Cultural Properties** (TCPs). A TCP is a site or district that physically reflects the cultural practices, traditions, beliefs, lifeways, arts, crafts, or social institutions of an identified and defined living community. TCPs reflect a community's history and are important to maintaining the group's cultural identity. Usually categorized by the National Register as either a "district" or a "site," TCPs meet the same documentation standards as all other National Register properties. TCPs may include an area associated with a tribe's origin story or an urban neighborhood that reflects the beliefs and practices of a population. TCPs can be difficult to quantify, describe, and document. For any TCP, the documentation must first make the case that the identified group of people share a culture, and secondly that the TCP physically reflects that important cultural connection. Some TCPs may be quite large, or their boundaries may be difficult to define. This is especially true for those TCPs associated with patterns of traditional use over time, such as places related to hunting and gathering. TCPs often have deep religious and cultural significance for tribes, who may be reluctant to share sensitive information. Several tribes are seeking to nominate TCPs associated with their traditional culture to the National Register. The SHPO addresses TCP questions from non-tribal groups as well. The SHPO's understanding of TCPs will grow as more are identified, evaluated, and designated.

During the next five years (2018–2023), the Oregon SHPO will develop more accessible and user-friendly digital systems, expand public outreach, and work with our partners to identify, evaluate, designate, and treat significant historic properties and archaeological sites.

Appendix II

Bibliography

- Cossons, Sir Neil. "Industrial Archaeology: The Challenge of the Evidence." *The Antiquarians Journal* 87 (2007): 1-52.
- Curran, Christine. "A Look Back at Oregon's Future with Space, Style, and Structure." *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 117:3 (2016): 434-439.
- Delumbra, Madeline. *Economic Effects of Historic Preservation in Oregon*. Prepared for the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. Vancouver, WA, E. D. Hovee & Company, 1999.
- Griffin, Dennis and T.E. Churchill. "Cultural Resource Management in the Pacific Northwest: Working Within the Process." *Journal of Northwest Anthropology* 37, no. 1 (2003): 27-42.
- Griffin, Dennis. "The Evolution of Oregon's Cultural Resource Laws and Regulations." *Journal of Northwest Anthropology* 43, no 1 (2009): 87-116.
- Historic Preservation League of Oregon. *Special Report: Healthy Historic Districts: Solutions to Help Preserve and Revitalize Oregon's Historic Downtowns*. Portland, 2010.
- Meeks, Stephanie with Kevin C. Murphy. *The Past and Future City: How Historic Preservation is Reviving America's Communities*. Washington, Covelo, London: Island Press, 2016.
- National Park Service and National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. *Preserving Your Community's Heritage through the Certified Local Government Program*. Washington, D.C., 1995.
- National Trust for Historic Preservation. *Preservation for the People: A Vision for the Future*. Washington, D.C., 2017.
- Oregon Heritage Commission. *Oregon Heritage Vitality 2010: The Challenge of the Past for Oregonians Today and Tomorrow*. Salem, 2011.
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. *Centennial Horizon: Shaping the Future of Oregon's Parks, Recreation, Conservation, and Preservation*. Salem, 2008.
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon Heritage Division. *Annual Report of the Oregon Main Street Program*. Salem, 2016.
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon Heritage Division, Oregon Heritage Commission. *Oregon Heritage Plan, 2014-2019*. Salem, 2014.

- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. *Guidelines for Conducting Field Archaeology in Oregon*. Salem, 2013.
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resource Surveys in Oregon*. Salem, 2015.
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. *Oregon Model Historic Preservation Ordinance*. Salem, 2010.
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. *State of Oregon Archaeological Reporting Guidelines*. Salem, 2009.
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. *The 2005-2010 Oregon Historic Preservation Plan*. Salem, 2000, 2005, 2011.
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. *Guidance for Recording and Evaluating Linear Cultural Resources*. Salem, 2013.
- Page, Max and Marla R. Miller. *Bending the Future: Fifty Ideas for the Next Fifty Years of Historic Preservation in the United States*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016.
- Schmickle, William Edgar. *Preservation Politics: Keeping Historic Districts Vital*. Lanham, New York, Toronto, Plymouth, UK: Altamira Press, 2012.
- Walker, Peter A. and Patrick T. Hurley. *Planning Paradise: Politics and Visioning of Land Use in Oregon*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2011.
- Walton Potter, Elizabeth. "The National Preservation Act at Fifty: How a Wide-Ranging Federal-State Partnership Made its Mark in Oregon." *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 117:3 (2016): 378-397.
- Walton Potter, Elizabeth. "Significant Events in the Historic Preservation Movement in Oregon." *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 117:3 (2016): 440-451.
- 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.