



***Beyond Information. Intelligence.***

*Consulting*

*Database Marketing*

*Economic & Social Impact  
Studies*

*Research*

*Training*

**SMS**

1042 Fort Street Mall  
Suite 200  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Ph: (808) 537-3356  
Toll Free (877) 535-5767  
Fax: (808) 537-2686  
E-mail: [info@smshawaii.com](mailto:info@smshawaii.com)  
Website: [www.smshawaii.com](http://www.smshawaii.com)

**State Historic Preservation Plan  
Best Practices Report**

*Prepared for: National Park Service and  
Hawaii State Historic Preservation Division*

***SMS Affiliations and Associations:***

---

Warren Dastrup – Kauai Affiliate  
Experian  
International Survey Research  
Interviewing Service of America  
Solutions Pacific, LLC  
Ka'ala Souza Training  
3i Marketing & Communications

**Table of Contents**

**INTRODUCTION..... 1**

**COMMON ELEMENTS..... 1**

**BEST PRACTICES ..... 7**

**BEST PRACTICES EXAMPLES ..... 8**

**CONCLUSION ..... 11**

## INTRODUCTION

Given the variation in scope and content of the more than 50 state historic preservation plans that are currently in effect across the nation, the team responsible for drafting and finalizing Hawaii's plan has a wealth of approaches to choose from in order to deliver a plan that is suitable for Hawaii. In this report we attempt to provide the best elements of these historic preservation plans and examples of current plans that Hawaii can use as the team moves forward in the drafting process. Our approach relies on examining previously written reports and determining which of those place an emphasis on outlining measurable goals and objectives that can be used for short-term evaluation and accountability of those in the historic preservation community. Thus for the purpose of this report best practices refer elements in other state historical plans that demonstrate quantifiable targets Hawaii's historic preservation plan should strive to include. Specifically, we note the best practices used by other states in creating preservation plans that stand out in terms of information, methodology, trends, and future goals and objectives.

In order to determine the best practices of other state historic preservation plans we reviewed the plans of all 50 U.S. states as well as those for Guam and American Samoa in March and April of 2012. We highlighted areas of commonality (see below), areas of differences, and unique items that we believed added value to these plans. At the time of the review, most of the plans covered the existing preservation plan cycle; however, some of the plans were reviewed were a) either old plans for which an update was in process, or b) old plans for which no update appears to have been implemented.

The following report begins with a section that addresses common elements of state historic preservation plans that are currently in use across the nation. The list of elements is not exhaustive but it does cover the salient topics that many plans attempt to address. The next section discusses our definition of best practices and lays the foundation for the elements we believe constitute best practices. We are unabashedly in favor of plans that articulate measurable goals and objectives as a way to evaluate progress and enhance accountability. Following that section, we denote three preservation plans that are examples of best practices preservation plans. We discuss the elements that give them prominence and show examples that underscore the justification for highlighting these particular plans. Finally, we conclude this report with a summary of what we have learned and how the findings can be used to move forward and generate Hawaii's new historic preservation plan.

## COMMON ELEMENTS

Each of the state historic preservation plans we reviewed are as diverse as the states themselves. However, there are elements common to many of these plans—elements that are both required by the National Park Service and provide the context necessary to understand and ultimately implement each respective plan. According to the *Historic Preservation Fund*

*Grants Manual, Chapter 6*, each historic preservation plan should include, at a minimum, the following elements or section:

- A summary of how the State Plan was developed, including a brief description of how the public participated;
- A summary assessment of the full range of historic and cultural resources throughout the State; including current important issues facing historic preservation, threats and opportunities, and the current state of knowledge about historic and cultural resources or classes of historic resources throughout the State;
- Guidance for the management of historic and cultural resources throughout the State, such as typically expressed in policies, strategies, goals, and objectives, that provide a vision for the State as a whole, and a direction for the SHPO office;
- The time frame of the State Plan (or “planning cycle”), including when the State Plan is next scheduled for revision or review; and,
- A bibliography of special studies and other support documents used in preparing the State Plan.

Below we provide examples these elements—as well as those that have been included but are not required—as a means to document how other states have approached their historic preservation plans. In this section we note features of other historic preservation plans that can and should be used in crafting Hawaii’s own state historic preservation plan.

Historic preservation primer: A handful of states begin their historic preservation plans with a general primer of historic preservation. To this end they provide readers of their plans with items such as a definition of historic preservation, explanations of how historic preservation works in the state (including the roles and functions of State Historic Preservation Offices and the process to add an item to the National and/or State Historic Register), and a discussion of why historic preservation is important (which usually focuses on economic and quality of life benefits). In these instances the role of the primer is to set up the context for the plan as well as substantiate the goals and objectives found later in these plans.

Justification for plan/planning process: Almost all plans include a section that explains the purpose of the plan and what steps were taken to generate the plan. Many plans discuss the creation of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the subsequent mandate that each state must provide their own state historic preservation plans over certain time intervals. The plans usually provide details of what each historic preservation plan is intended to do, especially as it relates to the different contexts of each state. For example, some states’ plans place more of an emphasis on increasing the number of items that are preserved or added to the National Register, while other states’ plans may emphasize greater awareness of historic preservation.

Additionally, almost all plans provide explanations of how the plans are formulated and ultimately created. They discuss, in great detail, the use of surveys and meetings to obtain community input; the use of surveys and executive interviews to obtain information from

experts such as historians, preservation professionals, non-profits, government officials, tribal representatives<sup>1</sup> and preservation commissions; and the link between goals and findings of previous state plans. In many cases the plans explain the sequence of actions that take place in order to develop, refine, and eventually finalize the goals and objectives found in these plans. These sections demonstrate why each state has a historic preservation plan and the process each state conducts in order to develop their state historic preservation plan.

Inventories: Some of the state historic preservation plans address their inventories of items that are of archaeological, cultural, or historic importance to their state. It is important to note that inventories do not simply report those items on the National Register of Historic places, rather they include other historically important items and places such as landmarks, cemeteries, parks, and battlegrounds. These plans tend to provide a brief discussion of the number of items (in the tens of thousands), some basic descriptions of the types of items included in these inventories, and a discussion of the percentage of the state that has been surveyed to obtain these items.

Histories or historical contexts: Many state plans include state histories or historical contexts to give readers a better understanding of what items are historically important and may merit preservation. For example, some states provide histories that span the scope of time from the Paleo-Indian Period to the Post-World War II Period of their states. These historical contexts provide information and insight about the periods, address why the periods are important for the state, and in some instances discuss the types of items that could be found from each period that has been or would be worthy of historic preservation. Oftentimes these histories separate archaeology and more recent state history, or even archaeology, architecture and cultural histories as a means for demonstrating the variation in approaches to preservation. Alabama, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin are unique in that in addition to state histories, they also provide synopses of the history of historic preservation in their states.

Trends affecting preservation/Opportunities and threats: As a means to address the factors that both impede and enhance the ability for historic preservation, many state plans have devoted a section of their plans to discussing the trends that affect historic preservation. These include, but are not limited to:

- *Economy/reduction in budgets-* State governments have had to reduce their budgets, including those for historic preservation, which in some cases has led to the elimination of jobs and the ability to assist constituents with the historic preservation process.

---

<sup>1</sup> A handful of plans specifically mentioned that tribal participation was included in the planning process, usually by way of including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers on advisory committees or similar bodies during the planning process. The state of Washington actually states that its Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation had a meeting that consisted solely of tribal representatives from the state in which they responded to the same questions presented during public meetings. In addition, individual tribal members were invited to and attended the regular public meetings and participated by interacting through the plan's website.

Furthermore, reductions in budgets and funding can hamper programs such as CLGs and Main Street.

- *Population*- Often as a result of the macroeconomic climate of the U.S., states are dealing with in-migration and out-migration. In some places established communities are being inundated with people unfamiliar and insensitive to the history and culture of that area, which may lead to less appreciation and less willingness to preserve. Population shifts also increase the need for housing and/or affordable housing. Additional housing can work against preservation in that older structures may be torn down in favor of new developments. However, historic properties can be rehabilitated using historic preservation tax credits and thus potentially provide lower cost affordable housing.
- *Economic development/land ownership*- Residential and commercial development can place pressure on individuals and communities to sacrifice historic preservation in favor of employment growth. Similarly, ever increasing private land ownership laws allow private entities to tend to their land how they choose, regardless of the impact on historical sites. On the other hand, historic preservation is deemed to be more labor intensive compared to new developments, and thus can be an economic boon and employment catalyst.
- *Environment*- Environmental trends can be both a positive and negative force for historic preservation according to some states. On one hand, environmental changes (some natural, some manmade) can threaten or even destroy historic landscapes and archaeological sites found in vulnerable areas (e.g., coastal areas). On the other hand, the push to “go green” and support sustainability may help advance the historic preservation cause by highlighting the importance of maintaining existing buildings or structures. As is pointed out by many of the plans that address this trend, “the greenest building is one that is already standing.”
- *Transportation*- The addition of roads and mass transit is a negative prospect for many historic preservation advocates because of the destruction that may accompany it. Cultural landscapes in particular are threatened.
- *Attitudes and education*- Some states decry the reduction of courses in state history and culture, which may lead to a citizenry less knowledgeable and sympathetic to historic preservation. The major fear is that residents who do not know their own history and culture will be less inclined to protect and preserve historical places.
- *Agriculture*- There are concerns that as urban centers grow and sprawl into the countryside agricultural land—and hence archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, and historical resources—will be lost to new development. Additionally, as was the case that states who lost manufacturing bases, states that decrease their agricultural production also increase the likelihood of losing items and objects of historic and cultural importance.
- *Tourism*- Tourism, and in particular heritage tourism, present an opportunity for historic preservation. States that rely on heritage tourism have an advantage in that they can push historic preservation as a way to support their industry and attract more visitors to locales that have greater authenticity as a result of historically preserved places.

Tools for preservation: Most of the plans we reviewed had a section of their plans devoted to the tools available to individuals, communities, and governments to ensure historic preservation. The most frequently mentioned tool used to support historic preservation was the National<sup>2</sup> and State Register process. Almost every plan provided information about the National Register, the steps necessary for adding an item to the register, and the consequences of adding items—in particular properties—to the register. Some state plans provided a significant amount of detail about the technical assistance available to persons interested in pursuing this option as a means for historic preservation.

Some of the plans also discussed the economic tools available for different groups to use to assist with historic preservation. For instance, some states discuss tax credits that are offered to ensure historic preservation. Often these states discuss multiple types of credits (Federal and State Rehabilitation tax credits and local property tax credits) that are available for different circumstances along with examples of buildings or places that were preserved as a result of the credit<sup>3</sup>. The state of Arkansas went so far as to include a full economic impact assessment of historic tax credits on the state to show the positive economic impact these tools have for both historic preservation and economic development. The data is dated (2000-2006), but claims that historic preservation added \$970 million and over 23,000 job each year to the economy of Arkansas.

Other preservation plans also included additional economic tools, such as grants-in-aid opportunities for historic preservation from sources like historical trusts and Certified Local Government sub grants.

Preservation laws and programs: A few historic preservation plans provided specific laws and programs that states can use to support historic preservation. The plans that included this information tended to provide a litany of Federal and State laws that have been enacted over the past 50 years that have been used to protect historic places threatened by destruction. These include the American Antiquities Act (1906), National Trust for Historic Preservation, Creation and Purpose (1949), and the American Battlefield Protection Act (1996) amongst others.

In addition to laws, these programs also tended to discuss some of the prominent programs available in each state to help with the historic preservation process. The two most prominently featured programs were the Certified Local Government (CLG) and Main Street programs, both of which provide provides sources of revenue and direction for historic preservation in smaller locales. Plans for Illinois and Michigan also included a list of all CLGs, their websites, and the grants amount received for historic preservation projects.

Goals and objectives: The one element common to all state historic preservation plans is the section that articulates each plan's goals and objectives. This section usually consisted of a

---

<sup>2</sup> This includes the National Register of Historic Places and the National Historic Landmarks Program.

<sup>3</sup> Michigan's plan actually includes a section on the limitation of the state's historic preservation tax credit and how it can be strengthened.

handful of prominent goals, their corresponding objectives, and in a few cases specific strategies for achieving the specified objectives. The goals vary considerably from state to state, however, there are four commonalities across the spectrum of goals we reviewed. These four areas included the following goals:

- Expand the existing inventory
- Increase public awareness and support
- Promote historic preservation as an economic tool
- Develop and maintain partnerships across the historic preservation community

Many of the plans did not articulate which goals were meant for which groups and therefore it is unclear if the plans can truly hold the various historic preservation groups accountable for achieving or failing to achieve the goals and objectives set by these plans. However, a few plans were unique in addressing these deficiencies. For example, Oklahoma set objectives for citizens, historic preservation organizations, state agencies and the Oklahoma SHPO itself. Similarly, Guam provided agency actions and community actions for each of the goals established in its historic preservation plan. Wyoming provided even further differentiation by setting goals for specific aspects of historic preservation (i.e., National Register, Planning and Historic Context Development, Federal Historic Rehabilitation Tax Incentives). Nebraska appears to have the most nuanced section of all in that it outlines issues, goals, objectives, and strategies for the specific historic preservation issues of cultural preservation, planning and law, economics, archaeology, education, and public participation.

Objectives achieved from previous plans: Georgia, Minnesota, and Oregon are among small group of states whose preservation plans provide small demonstrations of the objectives achieved from previous preservation plans. Essentially, the plans list previous objectives and provide an example of what was undertaken and how the objective was achieved<sup>4</sup>. Massachusetts, for example, provides examples of projects that fulfilled the previous plan's objectives in terms of identification, registration and protection of historic items. The purpose of this element is to show that previous plans have been followed, objectives have been met, and the goals for historic preservation have been advanced.

Success stories/vignettes: Connecticut, Florida, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico and Virginia each provide what they deem as historic preservation success stories. Generally, these examples include the name and background of an item or object that was in peril, the steps taken to preserve the item, how the item or structure will be used in the future, and lessons learned by those groups or individuals involved in the process. These examples generally demonstrate the variation in techniques used for historic preservation as well as underscoring the benefits of these projects to individuals and communities alike. Additionally,

---

<sup>4</sup> It is important to note that most plans do not list or mention the accomplishments for previous plans and even those that do are selective in what they choose to emphasize. Perhaps even more importantly, most of the current plans do not mention that their goals and objectives are written with the explicit purpose of measuring these outcomes over time. In reality, most plans have objectives that are abstract.

these stories demonstrate that the historic preservation process is relevant and that the plan can have tangible results using examples that are familiar to those within the state.

Survey questionnaires and results: In the appendices of many of the plans are the survey questionnaires used during the formulation of each state plan. In most cases the instruments included are those used exclusively to collection information from the general public, but in a few instances some plans also included the survey instruments used to collect data from historic preservation experts.

Of those plans that included the survey questionnaires, most also included the response frequencies to the questions asked in the survey instrument (although some states just chose to show the top three answers regardless of percentages). A few of the plans were kind enough to provide graphical representation of the data, including pie charts and bar charts.

Preservation partners: Also found the appendices of these plans are lists of preservation partners across the state that are instrumental in providing historical preservation resources or assistance. The groups are often separated by public entities and private entities, and include these groups at the state and local levels. These elements serve the purpose of demonstrating the extent of the historic preservation community, the identity of major facilitators of historic preservation, and in many cases the entities responsible for achieving goals and objectives of these plans.

Items on National and State Registers of Historic Places: Many plans simply provide a list of items on the National and/or State Historical Register. These lists generally include the name of the item, the year it was listed<sup>5</sup>, and its location (both city and county). The states of Arizona and Pennsylvania went so far as to include a map of the state with the number of items listed on the National Register of Historic Places in each county.

## **BEST PRACTICES**

The purpose of this report is to determine existing state historic preservation plans that demonstrate best practices, so that those developing the historic preservation plan for Hawaii can utilize best elements in that preservation plan. In essence, we want to know what elements of other plans can be used to make Hawaii's plan a model to be copied and emulated.

For this report we define best practices as those plans that are the most innovative, incorporate information necessary to understand the development of the plan, and provide for the evaluation of progress and accountability<sup>6</sup>. They will include many of the common elements mentioned above but also stand out in terms of utility for a wide variety of individuals, groups, and organizations across the historic preservation community in each state. Plans that connote

---

<sup>5</sup> Some states only included those added to the register in the period covering the preservation plan.

<sup>6</sup> We note these aspects because they work in tandem with the SHPD's shift in orientation due to the corrective action plan. We feel this plan should emphasize an evidence-based approach that allows for clearer actions and greater accountability.

with best practices will be those that provide insight and context about historic preservation, including the strategies and tools (with substantive examples) that have been used successfully to preserve historic items or places. Most importantly, these plans articulate tangible goals and objectives, which over time can be measured and assessed for progress. By providing measureable outcomes those involved with historical preservation, including the general public, can determine if progress towards stated goals is being achieved and if improvements can be made. Ultimately, these plans provide for accountability.

## **BEST PRACTICES EXAMPLES**

The three plans that we believe represent best practices are those for Georgia, Texas, and Colorado. Below we discuss the benefits of each plan, including those aspects that differentiate them from others and give credence to being best practices.

*Georgia:* Georgia's state historic preservation plan exemplifies best practices due to its scope and utility for future planning purposes. The plan includes a lengthy section on trends affecting historic preservation in the state, which include population, housing, transportation, agriculture, tourism, and government. It also provides an explanation of the planning process and includes summaries of responses to the public opinion survey used to facilitate the planning process. The plan provides historical context by way of discussions about Georgia's historic properties and archaeological properties.

Georgia's plan also contains two elements that differentiate it from other state historical plans. First, the plan includes a section about the mission, vision and goals of the plan that outline how the plan should be used in the future. Specifically, the plan lists goals, objectives to achieve said goals, multiple strategies that can be followed to achieve the objectives, and specific action items that can be made that are consistent with the strategies offered. All of the action items are tasks that can be measured to determine a) if they were acted upon and b) to what extent were the actions completed. The plan provides specific steps that can be taken to causally link the action items to the overarching goals of the plan.

Second, at the outset the plan denotes the accomplishments made from (and as a result of) the last state historic preservation plan. In particular, the plan lists 2-3 accomplishments in the areas of archaeology, identification and evaluation of historic properties, preservation grants and tax incentives, publications and outreach, and preservation planning. These accomplishments not only highlight goals and objectives achieved from the previous plan—they demonstrate that the plan can and should be written with an emphasis on establishing measureable results that demonstrate the plan's effectiveness with regard to historic preservation.

Georgia's plan reflects best practices because it contains many of the common elements listed below and incorporates these elements in a manner meaningful to those who will utilize the plan. The plan also contains two elements that distinguish it from other plans. These elements

demonstrate that the plan has been and potentially will be a useful tool for enhancing historic preservation in the state of Georgia.

*Texas:* The state historic preservation plan for Texas contains many of the common elements seen in other plans. For example, the plan addresses the purpose of the preservation plan, it includes a small section devoted to the state's inventory, it contains a list of National Historic Landmarks, and it contains Internet links to national, state, and local organizations devoted to historic preservation. The plan also addresses trends affecting historic preservation in the state, including economic development, historic preservation education and awareness, and information related to historic preservation. The plan does not have an extensive section devoted to historic context; however, it includes links and a bibliography of relevant historical context studies in the appendix.

We believe the Texas plan is unique for other plans for three reasons. First, it includes a section on the development of the plan that is perhaps the most comprehensive of any plan being used today. The plan discusses in great detail the creation of a Statewide Plan Steering Committee, the creation, dissemination and results of the on-line public survey, the development of issues at the Preservation Summit Roundtable, information gleaned from workshops and a "vision wall" held at the Texas Historical Commission's Annual Historic Preservation Conference, and the public planning forums held to discuss drafts of the plan's vision and goals. The plan does an excellent job of winnowing down information collected from the on-line survey to the goals and outcomes that were incorporated into the plan.

Second, the plan is different from others in that it is a ten-year plan rather than the customary 5-year plan. Of relevance here is that the plan calls for formal assessments of the plan's accomplishments and relevance at the five-year mark (in this case, 2015)<sup>7</sup>. Thus this particular plan specifically denotes that the goals and outcomes will be reviewed at the midway mark to determine the effectiveness of the plan.

Third, but related to the second point, the plan specifically outlines the vision and values that underlie the goals of the plan. The goals, in turn, include measureable outcomes, statewide action ideas, local action ideas, and case studies of success stories related to these specific goals. Furthermore, the website for the plan includes an "implementation tracker" for each goal so that interested individuals and those pursuing projects in alignment with the plan can submit evidence to achieve the codified outcomes.

Like Georgia's plan, the state historic preservation plan is unique and represents an example of best practices due in part to its specificity and attention to detail. The plan provides a comprehensive view of the planning process and demonstrates the steps that were taken by

---

<sup>7</sup> We would like to emphasize that we are impressed with the stipulation of a formal assessment after a set period of time rather than the time frame itself. Hawaii is in a unique situation with regard to the previous attempt at a historic preservation plan and the on-going corrective action plan and we acknowledge that the time frame for the new historic preservation plan should be shorter and the goals and objectives should be realistic given the constraints the state faces at the moment.

the Texas Historical Commission to develop a plan that was inclusive of the state. The plan also goes further than most other plans in identifying quantifiable outcomes that can be measured and assessed to have an idea of the fidelity of the plan. Perhaps even more impressive is the fact that the plan allows for public input and monitoring, and thus greater accountability.

*Colorado:* Colorado's historic preservation plan is arguably one of the most comprehensive in the nation. It includes sections that: address the importance of historic preservation in the state, demonstrate the plan's vision through the year 2020, link the previous two preservation plans to the existing plan, explain the planning process, including surveys of both historic preservation experts and the community (including summaries of the survey results), discuss trends affecting historic preservation in the state, provide examples of historic preservation success stories, and provide a detailed inventory of historic artifacts across the state. Each of these sections is meticulously explained and their relevance to the plan is unambiguous.

There are two distinguishing features of Colorado's plan that provide support for our assertion that it is a best practices plan. First, the plan contains four sections (found in the appendices) that provide auxiliary information of historical preservation relevance. There is detailed information about historic preservation programs and services across the state, partner organizations, preservation legislation, and preservation funding sources. Overall, this particular information provides a comprehensive picture of the historic preservation players, rules, and opportunities in the state of Colorado. It provides the plan with technical information and context that can be used by anyone who in the future may want to follow the plan or understand the goals and objectives of the plan.

Second, the Colorado historic preservation plan may provide the most detailed information about achieving the vision of its plan compared to any other state plan. As is the case with both the Georgia and Texas plan, the Colorado plan outlines goals, measurable objectives to reach these goals, and strategies that can be applied to achieve the objectives. It is different than other plans, however, in that it also establishes target dates for when the objectives should be achieved, as well as the lead implementers for who should ensure the objectives are achieved (e.g., local governments, the University of Colorado-Boulder, the National Park Service, History Colorado, non-profits, Colorado Department of Transportation, tribal contacts). Thus the plan specifies the "when" and "who" with regard to achieving the goals and objectives set forth by the plan.

These two distinguishing elements of Colorado's plan make it unique and innovative, but the plan itself is comprehensive and includes a wealth of information that make it stand alone compared to other state historic preservation plans. Overall, it provides readers with information about the current state of historic preservation in Colorado, trends and challenges for the future, a vision and mission to overcome those challenges, and the goals and outcomes needed to meet the vision. In essence, the plan demonstrates all the elements that the Hawaii plan should strive to include and address in its state historic preservation plan.

## CONCLUSION

Our review of other state historical preservation plans reveals that many of these plans contain the same elements or address the same issues. Good preservation plans generally include an element that provides perspective on historical preservation in general and underscores its importance, both in terms of economics and quality of life. These plans discuss the planning process itself (including the use of survey instruments and meetings), and explain how the goals and objectives found in the plans were determined. They provide historical contexts for readers and note state inventories as a means for demonstrating existing capacity for preservation. The plans also articulate trends that have or may potentially affect preservation in the future, and outline the laws, programs, and tools available to assist different entities with historic preservation. They provide goals and objectives and in some cases demonstrate achievement of previous goals and objectives. Good plans provide preservation success stories and often document historic preservation partners who assisted in these examples. Finally, these plans supply lists of items on National and State Registries of Historic Places and Landmarks as a way to show achievement in historic preservation.

Great plans, on the other hand, include additional information or insight that distinguishes them from the others. As we have seen, these plans include specific details about the planning process, including establishing links between public surveys, community meetings and the goals and objectives found in the plans and noting how the objectives will be evaluated. Likewise, great plans include goals and objectives that fit the needs of the state's idiosyncrasies and offer clear, measurable objectives that specify when they should be achieved and by whom. Finally, great plans enhance accountability by giving the public the opportunity to match the goals and objectives of the plan with fieldwork that corresponds to these goals and objectives.

Given this review we recommend the historic preservation plan team place their primary focus on soliciting input from various members of the community and using this information to define clear goals and objectives. There are time constraints associated with this plan, and in order to maximize time and effort attention should be placed on the elements of the plan that allow it to guide everyone in the same direction with regard to historic preservation. As was the case with the plan for Texas, over the next few years data related to the goals and objectives can be collected and evaluated to determine the plan's success in moving the historic preservation community towards the goals articulated in the plan. At that point, the objectives of the plan, and also the plan itself, can be reevaluated and revised according to the context that will exist in the state at that point in time. Thus we envision that the plan currently being drafted will evolve from one that basically specifies measurable goals and objectives to one that will be used to plan, evaluate, and hold the historic preservation community accountable for achieving the goals set in the plan.

The historic preservation plan for Hawaii is in a position to benefit from our knowledge of other states' historic preservation plans. This report demonstrates both good and great elements gleaned from these other plans and provides the team with information it can use to write a historic preservation plan that is comprehensive and forward-thinking for the people of Hawaii.