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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Every 10 years the Texas Historical Commission (THC) develops a Statewide Historic Preservation Plan. It’s a collaborative process and one of our key responsibilities as a State Historic Preservation Office under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The THC facilitates the development of the plan, which can then be used by the agency and all stakeholders as the basis for individual action plans. At the THC we think of the Statewide Historic Preservation Plan as an opportunity to lay a pathway, or perhaps blaze a trail, for Texans to preserve, protect and leverage our historic and cultural fabric for the betterment of our communities statewide. At its most basic definition, historic preservation is the process of identifying, protecting, enhancing and interpreting buildings, places, objects and landscapes of historical and cultural significance. The benefits and impacts of preserving our built and cultural environment are far reaching, however. Historic preservation equals jobs, tax dollars, tourism, downtown and neighborhood revitalization, community pride, environmental sustainability and overall quality of life.

Some of the guiding principles in developing this plan include:

- The process was designed so that stakeholders across Texas participated in the development of this plan from the ground up.
- The plan articulates practical, specific and achievable goals for the many different types of preservation stakeholders in Texas. There is something for everyone in this plan.
- The plan exists as a document and also an online information tool, chock-full of case studies, resources, best practices and links to more information. Visit the plan at http://www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-statewide-preservation-plan for the full experience.
- The plan will evolve and grow as partners across Texas contribute to it.

From kicking off the plan with a public survey to finishing the process with local meetings throughout the state, we provided many different ways for stakeholders to be involved and stay informed.

Highlights of the planning process include:

- We assembled a Steering Committee and an internal staff team to guide the development of the plan from the beginning. The Steering Committee is a collaborative of roughly 25 members who represent the diversity of stakeholders and disciplines related to historic preservation across the state.
- We conducted an online public preservation survey in early 2010 with 1,089 people responding. This survey gave us a snapshot of local and statewide preservation strengths, challenges and opportunities, and informed the development of the plan’s issues, goals and outcomes.
- We hosted a Statewide Plan Roundtable at the Preservation Texas Summit in February 2010 to elaborate on the survey results and confirm the issues guiding the development of the plan.
- More than 100 people contributed to the vision for preservation in Texas through workshops and a vision wall at the THC’s Annual Historic Preservation Conference on April 22–24, 2010 in Houston.
- The Steering Committee and THC staff developed outcome-based goals in May 2010.
- Nine communities across the state hosted statewide planning forums during the summer of 2010 with more than 250 stakeholders attending. We heard their feedback on the vision and goals, shared local success stories and solutions and developed community applications for the plan.
- We concluded our process with a THC staff planning forum in early September 2010, fine tuning the vision and goals and developing agency connections to the statewide plan.
- We emailed stakeholders and posted updates on the plan’s website throughout the process to give everyone the opportunity to stay involved and provide feedback on the plan.
Plan Elements
We see Texas’ Statewide Historic Preservation Plan as a living, growing tool for preservation across the state. As a way to communicate this message, we created an image that makes it easy to understand and interact with the main elements of the plan. The “Preservation Plan Tree” starts with soil nourished with values of cultural diversity, partnerships, communication, focus on authentic places and acknowledgement that preservation contributes to our quality of life. We practice these values and work to weave them into all of our activities, enriching the outcomes of our efforts. The roots of the tree are our state’s diverse historic and cultural resources, the real places that make up our heritage and tell the stories of Texas. The trunk is a solid base of partners from which the goals, or branches, of the plan grow. The leaves are ideas that support the fruit, or the ultimate outcomes of the plan. The tree reaches towards the horizon, or vision, represented in the clouds, sun and earth.

The Vision
In the year 2020, as a result of our collective work to preserve the state’s historic and cultural resources, we have achieved the following:

- All cultures and generations in Texas value historic places.
- We learn the diverse stories of Texas everyday through living, working and playing in historic places.
- Historic preservation is a fundamental strategy for economically, socially and environmentally healthy communities.

The Values
Values are beliefs that are shared among the community of people interested and invested in the preservation of historic and cultural places. These values are woven into our day-to-day work, in the projects we endeavor and in the decisions we make. We not only practice these values, we educate and train ourselves to use these values to enhance our effectiveness. The key values we hold and that drive our work in this plan are:

- **Quality of life**: Historic places enhance the general well-being of individuals and communities
- **Authenticity**: Focus on telling the real stories of the state’s history through the places, structures, sites and cultural landscapes that convey them authentically
- **Cultural Diversity**: Preserve the places and stories of Texas’ rich cultural heritage and communities
- **Partnerships**: Work together across cultures, interests and disciplines to achieve mutually beneficial goals
- **Communication**: Keep people informed and develop strong lines of communication with partners and stakeholders
The Goals
The goals of the plan help us achieve our vision in a practical and measurable way. All goals are supported with measurable outcomes, actions, local applications, case studies and resources for more information. You can explore each goal more fully in Section VI of this document or by visiting the Statewide Plan website.

Goal 1: Survey and Online Inventory
Texans undertake a comprehensive survey of the state’s diverse historic and cultural resources resulting in a publicly accessible online inventory.

Goal 2: Emphasize Cultural Landscapes
Communities are active in the identification, protection and interpretation of cultural landscapes.

Goal 3: Implement Policies and Incentives
Cities, counties, the state, federal agencies and tribes implement preservation policies and incentives to effectively protect historic and cultural assets.

Goal 4: Leverage Economic Development Tools
Communities leverage preservation-based and traditional economic development tools to revitalize historic areas.

Goal 5: Learn and Experience History through Place
Texas residents and guests of all ages learn and experience the state’s diverse history through formal education, recreation, and everyday interactions with historic places.

Goal 6: Connect Preservation to Related Fields
We connect and integrate preservation into related fields and activities, building a broader, stronger, and more diverse community.

Goal 7: Cultivate Political Commitment
We cultivate political commitment for historic preservation at the state and local level.

Goal 8: Build Capacity of Preservation Community
The existing preservation community develops its organizational capacity to strengthen and expand preservation skills.

Partners in Implementation
Preservation happens through a vibrant network of public and private partnerships at the local, regional, state, tribal, and federal level. Reaching our statewide preservation vision and goals depends on us all implementing this plan. Visit the plan online at http://www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-statewide-preservation-plan and add yourself or your organization to the preservation network, an online directory of people, organizations and agencies interested in preserving the historic and cultural resources of the state. Share your local success stories and implementation projects that get us closer to achieving the vision and goals of the plan. Use the vision and goals of this plan as a framework for your own local preservation planning and customize strategies for your community or organization.
II. PLAN FUNDAMENTALS, TIMEFRAME, AND IMPLEMENTATION

The development of a Statewide Historic Preservation Plan (Statewide Plan) is a required and essential responsibility of each State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), as codified in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended). The National Park Service provides requirements and guidelines for creating a Statewide Plan, but allows room for crafting a process and a final product that is customized to the unique personality and environment of each state. In a nutshell, Statewide Plans must:

• Have a statewide focus — the entire state is the boundary for planning.
• Be resource-focused — the plan is for and about the full range of historic and cultural resources across the state.
• Be developed and implemented with active public involvement from diverse stakeholders.
• Consider broad social, economic, political, legal, and environmental conditions and trends relating to preservation.
• Coordinate with other local, regional, state and federal planning efforts in the state.
• Link implementation to expenditures of the federal Historic Preservation fund grant.

Our vision is to translate the Statewide Plan into an online information resource for individuals, public and private organizations, and government agencies that are invested in the use and protection of historic and cultural resources across the state. By expanding the planning document in this way, it becomes a gateway for timely preservation information. Its accessible nature promotes and increases its use, empowering people and organizations by guiding and inspiring their own plans and actions. This online format also allows the Statewide Plan to be monitored and updated as the THC and stakeholders accomplish goals, contribute ideas and redirect efforts when circumstances change. Through this effort, we are:

• Harnessing a unique opportunity for preservation. The social, economic and political climate is shifting in a way where using and conserving our existing resources has new relevance to people.
• Defining a common agenda that focuses on the historic and cultural resources in the state, and not any one entity or group of stakeholders.
• Building working partnerships across disciplines for the benefit of our state’s historic and cultural resources.
• Using technology to develop this plan into an information tool and virtual network for preservation.

This plan sets a 10-year course for historic preservation activities across the state. We will have opportunities for everyone to discuss the plan, share accomplishments and evaluate its effectiveness and implementation, both via the plan’s website and at scheduled events with stakeholders. We will make a formal assessment of the plan’s accomplishments and relevance at the five-year mark in 2015 and we will begin the process to revise this plan in 2019, in anticipation of publishing the next iteration in 2020.¹

¹ This assessment was completed at the end of calendar year 2015. A summary is provided in a new section, Gauging our Progress, beginning on page 31.
III. DEVELOPING THE PLAN
From kicking off the plan with a public survey to finishing the process with local meetings throughout the state, we provided many different ways for stakeholders to be involved and stay informed. Each step in the process built upon the former, and we used communication and meetings with different stakeholders and the public to review and refine existing information, as well as develop new elements to the plan.

Leadership
We assembled a Statewide Plan Steering Committee and an internal staff team to guide the development of the plan from the beginning. The Steering Committee is a collaborative of members who have informed the plan’s development, helped spread the word, kept the goals realistic, and made important connections with partners across the state. This committee represents a diversity of public, private and professional organizations related to and impacting historic preservation and cultural resource management across the state, including Preservation Texas, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, General Service Administration, Texas Downtown Association, Texas Municipal League, Texas Travel Industry Association, Association of Rural Communities in Texas, Texas Association of Museums, Texas Education Agency, Texas Comptroller’s Office, Center for Archeological Research, University of Texas at Austin, and several private cultural resource management and non-profit consulting firms. Several members also serve on Texas’ State Board of Review and the Antiquities Advisory Board. See Appendix A for a full roster of the Statewide Plan Steering Committee.

Online Public Survey
The process was launched with an online public survey open between December 15, 2009 and February 7, 2010. The survey was released broadly to the public through press releases, newspaper announcements, direct email invitations, social media (blog and Facebook) partner distribution via email and websites, and a central link on the THC website. The purpose of the survey was to engage Texans in the planning process and to gauge their opinion on the benefits, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of local efforts to preserve historic and cultural resources. The results of the survey directly informed the issues, goals and outcomes developed for the Statewide Plan. Visit the plan’s website for an illustrated analysis of the survey, or to directly view the raw data.

1,089 people responded to the survey representing 64% of the 254 counties in Texas. 59% of respondents are from urban/suburban areas; 41% are from rural areas/small towns. 77% of respondents are over 45 years old; 23% are under 45 years old; 64% respondents are female; 36% are male; 87% of respondents are Anglo; 7% are Hispanic; 3% are African-American. Over half of the respondents were interested residents of the state, as opposed to preservation professionals or active volunteers. 98% of people who took the survey believe there are direct benefits for their community that results from the work of historic preservation.

The top three identified community benefits of historic preservation include:

1. Preserve important places and stories.
2. Retain a sense of place and identity.
3. Develop the economy (downtown revitalization, heritage tourism, job growth, etc.).

Respondents were asked to rank the effectiveness of preservation efforts in their community. The top three strengths of local preservation are: 1) promoting a community’s history; 2) supporting the tourism industry; and protecting archeological sites and cemeteries. Conversely, efforts that ranked lowest in the effectiveness of local preservation illustrate weaknesses. The top three weaknesses of all respondents include: 1) providing affordable housing; 2) stabilizing property values; and 3) supporting the owners of historic properties through financial incentives.

Respondents were asked to identify the top three challenges or threats to local historic and cultural resources, as well as the most threatened types of resources. The top threats are: 1) lack of financial incentives and economic tools for historic preservation; 2) growth and development pressure (i.e. urban sprawl); 3) not enough understanding or appreciation of historic preservation by the general public. The most threatened or endangered resources identified are: 1) downtowns/Main Streets; 2) neighborhoods/historic districts; 3) homes.

People indicated the following three tools as being the most effective for preserving Texas history and places: 1) economic development tools and programs used in conjunction with historic preservation; 2) local historic preservation ordinances; 3) local, state and federal tax incentives.
When asked what three activities Texas should improve to better preserve its historic and cultural resources, the majority of respondents chose:

1. Provide economic development incentives or programs that incorporate historic preservation.

2. Enact stronger state and local historic preservation laws.

3. Provide education and training for the general public.

Respondents generally shared the same perspective throughout the survey, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, age and geography. The biggest variation between geography and demographics occurred when asked what three things should be improved to better preservation efforts. Economic development programs topped the list for all groups and locations. However the second and third spot varied greatly. Urban areas highlighted strengthening local and state laws and providing training for public officials. Rural areas highlighted education for the general public and developing heritage tourism. African-Americans highlighted enforcement of existing laws and ordinances and developing better partnerships. Hispanic respondents were consistent with the average response.

The survey asked several open-ended questions pertaining to how the Statewide Plan can be a resource in efforts to preserve historic and cultural resources, local tools that would be beneficial to communities, and other issues or ideas that should be considered in developing the plan.

These were the primary themes of the 1,452 comments submitted:

- The plan can be a model or framework for communities that do not have the resources or expertise to develop their own plans.

- It needs to be implementation-focused; goals and actions need to be measurable, people at the local level need to be prepared to carry out the plan, and the plan needs to be tied to funding, grants and incentives.

- It should be an educational tool, including educating the general public, outlining benefits of preservation to strengthen local discussions, and serving as a central clearinghouse of information for preservation.

- It should create networks and collaborations, sharing ideas, best practices and what is working and not working for different types of communities.

- It needs to encourage survey and inventory of historic and cultural resources.

- It should focus on financial resources and incentives available for preservation.

- It should focus on the history and contributions of culturally diverse populations.

- It should recognize the importance of educating younger generations, especially in elementary schools.

The public survey was an ideal tool to initiate the plan and engage the broad public in the process from the outset. Stakeholders across the state identified key issues that set the stage for the development of the plan, including the importance of linking preservation with economic development tools and financial incentives, strengthening local and state preservation policies, educating the public and decision makers about the benefits of preservation in the community, and underscoring the need for the plan to serve as an information center and networking site. This information directly informed the issues of the plan, and is addressed by the goals and outcomes guiding the state's agenda for the next 10 years.
Preservation Summit Statewide Plan Roundtable

We hosted a Statewide Plan Roundtable at Preservation Texas’ biennial Preservation Summit in February 2010. The Preservation Summit roundtable was a unique opportunity to inform attendees about the Statewide Plan, discuss the survey results and work through draft issues of the plan. After a brief presentation about the Statewide Plan, we discussed the draft survey results and solicited roundtable participants’ feedback. We developed nine working issues based on the survey results and asked participants how these issues are reflected in their communities or preservation experiences. We concluded the meeting with participants voting on the issues that are their highest priorities for the plan to address.

The nine issues developed during the Preservation Summit Roundtable form the backbone of this plan:

- Preservation-based economic development
- Preservation education
- The information infrastructure
- Preservation awareness
- Cultural landscapes
- Diversity in preservation
- Support for historic housing and homeowners
- The legal framework of historic preservation
- Preservation and sustainability

You can learn more about these issues in Section V or by visiting the issues page on the website.

Visioning

More than 100 stakeholders contributed to the vision for preservation in Texas through workshops and a vision wall at the THC’s Annual Historic Preservation Conference on April 22–24, 2010 in Houston. The vision wall was a place where attendees could contribute their ideas between conference sessions or during breaks. It was self-paced and open all-day during the conference. The vision wall elicited a broad range of responses, from local accomplishments to statewide change, to the question, “How do you want Texas (or your community) to look as a result of preservation in action? What have we accomplished?” In addition, there were two facilitated workshops during the conference where 70 participants worked individually, in small groups, and then as a whole to develop elements of a 10 year vision.

Vision ideas were organized into the following themes, which carried through to the ultimate vision for the plan:

- A culturally diverse, multi-generational community knowledgeable and active in the preservation of Texas’ historic places.
- Preservation is an economic generator, revitalizing downtowns and communities.
- Historic buildings are a key ingredient in healthy, livable and sustainable communities.
- Texas has a comprehensive survey of historic places across the state and a technologically savvy information network for preservation.
- Communities champion local preservation through planning, policies and incentives.
Outcome-Based Goal Setting
The Statewide Plan Steering Committee and THC staff used the input from the public survey, the issues discussed at the Preservation Summit Roundtable and the vision elements created at the Annual Historic Preservation Conference to refine the vision, formulate goals and measurable outcomes in May 2010. The vision, eight draft goals and accompanying outcomes formulated at this session were presented to stakeholders at the public planning forums across the state for their feedback. This group also worked through the vision elements to create a visual representation of the desired future, the Preservation Vision Tree, which served as an important discussion tool during the public planning forums. There was substantial revision and refinement of the vision and goals as a result of public input.

Public Planning Forums
Nine communities across the state hosted public planning forums during the summer of 2010 with more than 250 stakeholders attending. We heard feedback on the draft vision and goals, shared local success stories and solutions and developed community applications for the plan. These meetings were in locations that represented the diverse geographic regions of Texas: Canyon, Canton, Beaumont, El Paso, Alpine, Brownsville, San Angelo, Austin, and our first web-based planning forum in Nacogdoches. We are grateful to our many partners who hosted these forums, including County Historical Commissions, Main Street Programs, Texas Heritage Trail Regions, universities, museums and city preservation offices. For a full list of the public forums and their hosts, please visit http://www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-statewide-preservation-plan/plan-development.

Stakeholders at these meetings represented a broad base of interests, organizations and agencies, a sampling of which included local County Historical Commissions, city landmark commissions and staff, Main Street programs and economic development organizations, museums, genealogical societies, staff from the National Park Service, staff from Texas Parks and Wildlife, architects, archeologists, planners, historians, tourism professionals, professors and students, local preservation advocacy organizations, arts organizations, the Texas Governor’s Office, interested residents, staff from the Mexican Consulate, and elected officials including mayors, judges, county commissioners, state Senators and Representatives.

Each forum began with the local host presenting a community preservation success story that could serve as a case study for one of the goals of the plan.
A few examples of these cases studies, many of which can be found in the plan, include:

- In Austin, the Travis County Historical Commission and Hicks and Company (a local environmental consulting firm) presented their recently completed Historic Resource Survey of Northeast Travis County, which focused predominantly on rural resources and cultural landscapes, illustrating the importance of the survey and cultural landscape goals of the plan.

- In Canyon, the Canyon Main Street Program presented the full restoration of the Randall County Courthouse and its role as anchor of a revitalized downtown and courthouse square, emphasizing historic preservation and the Texas Historic Courthouse Preservation Program as an economic development tool.

- In Brownsville, the Gorgas Science Foundation presented the restoration of the Alonso Building and its role in revitalizing the surrounding neighborhood. This case study emphasized the importance of creating partnerships that reach across disciplines. In this case, the Gorgas Science Foundation connected their mission of ecological conservation with preserving the historic built environment, which has resulted in many successful restoration projects in Cameron County. They have now developed a program teaching the craft of building restoration to building trades students at the University of Texas as Brownsville.

- In El Paso, the El Paso County Historical Commission presented their work, in partnership with the Concordia Heritage Association and the Chinese Benevolent Society, to preserve and enhance the historic Chinese Section of Concordia Cemetery, articulating the cultural landscape goal as well as the value of cultural diversity.

Participants at each meeting discussed the draft elements of the plan, and then worked individually and in small teams to brainstorm success stories and develop local implementation ideas for each goal that was shared with the larger group. All the forums concluded with stakeholders voting on the goals that were highest priority. These meetings were brought to life through video testimonials of participants that were posted on the plan’s website.
IV. CONTEXT FOR THE PLAN

The Historic and Cultural Fabric of Texas

Texas embraces a vast collection of sites, objects, districts, buildings and structures recognized for cultural, historic, architectural or archeological significance within its 268,581 square miles. Scratching the surface of the variety of cultural and historic resources reveals Hispanic ranches, maritime vessels, bungalow neighborhoods, prehistoric Indian rock art, midcentury hotels, slave cemeteries, farmsteads, iron truss bridges and urban parks. These are but a few examples of the countless real places that tell the real story of Texas.

Scattered across the state of Texas lie the traces of at least 12,000 years of human occupation in an estimated one million archeological sites. Prehistoric sites include ancient bison and mammoth kills in far West Texas and in the High Plains, pictographs and petroglyphs along the canyons of the Lower Pecos and in the El Paso area, earthen mounds constructed by Caddo Indians in East Texas, mesa-top villages along the Canadian River in the Texas Panhandle and encampments that reflect generations of hunting and gathering subsistence in all regions of the state. These and other sites contain the only clues available about generations of life in the place that is now encompassed by our state boundaries. Even in the centuries following European contact, written records often contain scant information about past life in Texas. Historic exploration and settlement sites such as La Salle’s Fort St. Louis, Spanish presidios and missions (including the Alamo), shipwrecks, frontier forts, battle sites, simple homesteads and early industrial locales are integral to our understanding of the past. It is important to note that more than 90 percent of archeological sites in Texas are privately owned and many are damaged or lost each year.

To date, nearly 3,000 archeological sites, including historic shipwrecks, Native American pictographs and petroglyphs, prehistoric middens, and historic farmsteads and battlefields, are designated as State Archeological Landmarks. This designation applies legal protection to archeological resources in accordance with the Antiquities Code of Texas (Natural Resources Code, Chapter 191). The Historic Texas Lands Plaque program was developed in 2001 to recognize Texas landowners who preserve important archeological sites on their properties. The THC also reviews approximately 6,000 proposed development projects that may affect archeological sites each year and requires approximately 400 archeological surveys annually. There are more than 300 Texas archeological properties listed in the National Register. Archeological sites are inventoried in the Texas Archeological Sites Atlas, a restricted-user database due to the sensitive nature of these sites.

Our current statewide historic resources inventory, as represented in the publicly accessible online Atlas (http://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/), contains written information, photographs, and negatives chronicling nearly 300,000 sites in Texas. Among these are:

- 3,000 buildings, districts, sites, structures, and objects listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Of these listings, 350 are historic districts containing more than 30,000 contributing buildings and structures.
- 46 properties designated as National Historic Landmarks (see Appendix B for a full list)
- 15,000 Official Texas Historical Markers that interpret and promote history.
- 3,600 buildings designated as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks.
- 1,400 officially designated Historic Texas Cemeteries, which are recorded in county deed records.
- 235 historic courthouses that can serve as the focal point of their counties.
• 20 state historic sites managed by the THC and open to the public.

• 13 national parks and more than 120 state parks, cultural and historic sites established to protect and interpret the nation’s and state’s history.

In addition, thousands of sites are inventoried at the local level, many of which are designated as community landmarks and historic districts. However, countless historic places remain unidentified throughout the state.

The Texas landscape has been shaped over time, resulting in a vast collection of properties reflecting its rich and diverse heritage. Historic buildings include the homes of well-known Texas leaders and those of everyday Texans. Some are significant works by famous architects, while others are vernacular designs that reveal the nexus of tradition, function and availability of materials. They include schools that reflect the reality of segregation, entertainment venues that represent the diversity of Texas cultures, and large and small businesses and workplaces that helped shape local, state, and national economies. Significant cultural landscapes include rural districts centered on ranches, farms and agricultural processing facilities, commercial districts and residential neighborhoods in cities and small towns, as well as roadways and other transportation networks, parks, and industrial facilities.

Several property types deserve special attention in the area of designations. Commercial properties, especially those clustered in districts, are often eligible for federal tax credits and other incentives, so their designation would help expedite economic development throughout the state. Other places represent the under-told stories of Texas, especially the ethnic and racial diversity of the state. Communities must make it a priority to identify and designate properties that represent all ethnic and religious groups, including Jewish, Tejano, African-American, historic Native American, and Asian peoples. Establishing historic contexts for groups of related properties and nominating them at one time can be an effective way to ensure that important aspects of Texas history are considered. Rare and fragile resources, such as 18th century elements of El Camino real de los Tejas, as well as more recent buildings and structures, such as those associated with Route 66, can be designated through this process.

Many facets of Texas history are worthy of comprehensive study through historic context reports. Some contexts are general, and relate to broad concepts of American history, including the significance of colleges and universities, places of worship, ethnic settlements, industry and agriculture, parks and other public facilities, projects of the New Deal, architecture of the postwar period, roads and roadside architecture, entertainment venues such as theaters, and the effects of suburbanization. Other contexts are directly related to things that make Texas distinctive, including dance halls, the works of important Texas architects, and the celebration of the Texas Centennial. Often the scope of general contexts can be limited to specific geographic regions, as in the multiple property submission to the National Register of Historic Places for “Historic Farms and Ranches of Bexar County,” which was initiated by the San Antonio Conservation Society, and serves as an example that can be followed in other parts of the state. See Appendix C for a list of current Multiple Property Submissions listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and Appendix D for links to historic context reports.

Among the most recognized collections of historic buildings are Texas’ 235 historic county courthouses. The state’s courthouses offer superior examples of architectural trends, styles and technological advances in building methods. Since 1999, the Texas Historic Courthouse Preservation Program has awarded nearly $251 million in matching grants and assisted 91 county courthouses with preservation work. These courthouses serve as the center point of community pride and their preservation has generated significant economic and social benefits, including more than 10,000 jobs, nearly $239 million in income and more than $325 million in gross state product.

With each passing year, thousands of additional properties reach the fifty-year threshold of being old enough to be considered for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
Register of Historic Places. Texas saw tremendous growth after World War II into the 1960s and 70s as industry and population migrated out of the east and mid-west into Sun Belt states in the south and west. Coupled with immigration from Mexico and Latin America, population growth doubled, if not tripled, in most mid-sized to large cities in Texas during this time. Texas cities have an abundance of resources from this postwar building boom that can now be evaluated for their historic significance.

The Social and Economic Climate
The Texas economy outpaced the national economy in recovery from the Great Recession, which officially lasted from December 2007 to June 2009, and the state continues to demonstrate strong performance in job growth, sales tax collection, and housing sales. Pre-recession Texas employment peaked in August 2008 at 10,638,100. This number was surpassed in November 2011 while the US job market did not recover all recession-hit jobs until May 2014.

The strong state economy also reflects a steadily increasing population, with the recession having little impact on population data. Demographic projections show a state growing, diversifying, and aging substantially in the coming decades, and Texas is expected to remain among the fastest-growing states in the nation. The U.S. Census confirmed 25,145,561 people living in Texas in 2010, a 20 percent increase from 2000. The Census estimated the state population as 27,469,114 in 2015. This steady population growth is expected to continue, due largely in part to migration, with numbers exceeding 30 million by 2019. Significant to this growth is the change in demographics. Hispanics are projected to be the majority by 2017. By 2040, it is projected that at least 60 percent of residents will be non-Anglo and the average resident will be over the age of 50.

Demographic changes will be accompanied by trends in land development. As the population of Texas continues to increase, so will development in metropolitan regions as well as in unincorporated areas surrounding urban areas. In 2000, approximately 86 percent of the Texas population lived in metropolitan areas. By 2020, 87.7 percent of the population is projected to live in metropolitan areas. Eight of the fifteen fastest growing large U.S. cities are in Texas with Houston, San Antonio, Austin, Dallas and Fort Worth attracting the largest numbers of people in 2013.

Historic preservation programs across the state are directly tied to the economy and are impacted by changes in population, income, employment, and increased local tax revenue. While a strong economy is good for preservation as whole, it also means an increased demand for programs and services. Private property owners are more likely to reinvest in historic buildings; therefore, more design services, financing tools, and funding sources are needed. Economic development programs and historic preservation-based tax incentive programs also experience higher participation levels when the economy is stable. As the state’s population continues to trend towards major cities, areas containing previously undisturbed archeological and historic resources are targeted for growth and new development, which increases the demand for regulatory reviews and may mobilize local advocacy groups depending on the resource at risk. This population migration also results in intense pressure on low-density historic resources. These demographic trends often have the reverse impact on rural communities. The state’s more rural areas suffer both population and economic decline as people migrate to urban centers. Access to heritage tourism and downtown revitalization resources, as well as advocacy training and grant funding, is essential for these communities.

---

In light of the current economic and social context, the public preservation survey results, public forums and discussions with the Steering Committee and THC staff, nine key preservation issues were identified for the statewide plan to address. These issues form the backbone of the plan and informed the development of the vision, goals and ultimate outcomes.

**Preservation-Based Economic Development**

Historic preservation has proven and sustainable economic benefits for communities. Preservation equals jobs, tax dollars, local business development, tourism revenue, downtown revitalization and a myriad of other contributors to the economy – often times at a greater return on investment than traditional economic development strategies. Many communities in Texas look to the rehabilitation of their historic assets as an integral component in their economic development. Many others still, especially in rural areas, struggle to find the resources, tools and policies to leverage their historic places into economic generators. The recent statewide preservation survey overwhelmingly confirmed community interest in partnering historic preservation with economic development; it ranked as the number one approach (and tool to improve) to accomplishing local preservation.

Research, Steering Committee and staff discussions, and feedback at public meetings revealed the following key challenges:

- Communities are not aware of economic development tools, or how to use them, for the purposes of historic preservation
- The economic benefits of preservation are not readily available or clearly understood for communities to use in their discussions and decision-making.
- Economic development tools and their use for historic preservation is not a “one size fits all” model; applying these tools effectively requires a thoughtful, tailored analysis and approach.
- Historic preservation is not taken seriously as an economic development tool.
- Studies on the economic impact of historic preservation in Texas are outdated; the last comprehensive study was published in 1999.

**Preservation Education**

Our youth today are the stewards of Texas’ history tomorrow. The future of preserving Texas’ historic places depends upon educating younger generations about its value and importance. Historic places provide an authentic and interactive experience of history, making it a valuable learning tool for educators and students (public and private school teachers, homeschoolers, parents and grandparents included). Students in K-12, community college, trade schools, colleges and universities are all prime audiences for learning about historic preservation through curricula in related studies.

Encouraging and providing resources for the continuing education of individuals already in the field of preservation, or in related fields such as architecture, planning, public administration, tourism, etc., is also critical. Technologies, methods, policies and tools for historic preservation change and evolve. In some cases, traditional building craft is becoming a lost art, and there are few skilled craftspeople carrying on the knowledge and techniques of historic building methods.

**Preservation education was the most often discussed and highest priority for stakeholders at the public meetings, with the following challenges identified:**

- Lack of preservation integrated into formal history curricula in 4th and 7th grades
- Need for preservation education for public officials and policy makers
- Need for preservation education for professionals in complimentary disciplines, such as architects, planners, public administrators, public historians, economic developers, tourism professionals, etc.
- Traditional building methods and materials conservation is becoming a lost art
- Stronger opportunities for continuing education and resources for preservation professionals
The Information Infrastructure

Information is a powerful tool. The most basic yet critical information for successful preservation activities is the simple identification of historic and cultural resources. If we don't know what exists, how can we preserve it, let alone use it as an asset for our communities? With every year that passes, we consider more properties as significant. A comprehensive online statewide survey and inventory is the missing foundation piece for effective preservation planning, cultural resource management, heritage tourism and community revitalization.

The dialogue about preservation is more than compiling information on resources and methods, however. Preserving place is an ongoing public discourse with a myriad of contributing perspectives. New social media developments can allow for this discussion and exchange of ideas in spite of the geographical distances of the state. There is a huge opportunity for preservation to tap into new social media venues to engage a broader and more diverse constituency in the preservation dialogue, especially with younger audiences. Stakeholders highlighted the need to develop effective information systems for historic preservation, including improvements to the THC’s Atlas, as an essential element to the Statewide Plan.

Discussions centered around:

• Need for a comprehensive online statewide survey and inventory as the basis for effective preservation planning, cultural resource management, heritage tourism and community revitalization

• Lack of an effective clearinghouse of information on preservation tools, issues, practices, etc.

• Opportunity for preservation to tap into new social media venues to engage a broader and more diverse constituency in the preservation dialogue, especially younger audiences

• Need for up-to-date and consistent statistics and information that illustrate the economic and social benefits of preservation

Preservation Awareness

As Texas’ population increases and changes, preservation awareness becomes critical. Texans are proud of their state and heritage, however a preservation ethic is not widespread. Misconceptions about preservation mingle with strong property rights attitudes in rural and urban areas alike. In Texas, preservation is not widely known as a proven mechanism for economic development and community revitalization. It is critical to promote preservation to mainstream audiences and stakeholders, engage decision makers and organizations who impact preservation efforts (public officials, developers, real estate professionals, contractors, etc.), and separate the myths from realities of historic preservation.

Discussions at public meetings and responses to the public survey focused on:

• Promoting preservation to mainstream audiences and stakeholders.

• Engaging fields and organizations who impact preservation efforts (developers, real estate professionals, contractors, etc.).

• Providing education and training to the general public about preservation was the second most important approach to improve.
Cultural Landscapes

Cultural landscapes allow us to see, interpret and experience places that emphasize the interaction between human beings and nature over time. They provide a comprehensive perspective of historic resources situated within their environment. As defined by the National Park Service, a cultural landscape is a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four general types of cultural landscapes: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes. Because most of our environment is shaped by people, cultural landscapes are broadly defined. Examples include cemeteries, ranch lands and farmsteads, public parks, industrial sites and processes, and entire historic districts.

According to the Cultural Landscape Foundation, these places “provide scenic, economic, ecological, social, recreational, and educational opportunities helping communities to better understand themselves.” Growth and development, neglect, and a lack of public awareness and understanding, jeopardize these important places in Texas, whether they are a working ranch, a scenic highway or an urban designed park. With so much of Texas defined by people's relationship to the land, cultural landscape preservation is an important tool to tell the compelling stories of our communities and state and protect these places, traditions and practices for future generations.

Public discourse during the planning process focused on the following:

• Cultural landscapes are an endangered resource in Texas. Historic ranches, agricultural lands and farmsteads are being lost to development around urban centers at a rapid rate.
• The majority of land in Texas is privately owned, adding to the challenge of identifying and preserving important cultural landscapes throughout the state.
• The challenge of identifying, documenting, evaluating, designating, protecting and interpreting large tracts of land.
• It is critical to raise the level of awareness of cultural landscape preservation, to preservation professionals and the general public.
• There is no cultural landscape initiative or program in Texas to provide technical assistance and information resources to property owners and communities.

Diversity in Preservation

Texas' past, present and future are the sum of the efforts and vision of a diverse population. The hands of Native Americans, Tejanos, Mexicans, African-Americans, Europeans and countless others built the Lone Star State. Yet this diversity is not evident in the state's preservation constituency, nor in most of the places and stories we focus our preservation efforts on. This diversity must be represented and respected in the historic and cultural landscape and within the community that preserves Texas' built legacy. Likewise, the preservation community must rethink how historic and cultural resources and traditions are interpreted, seeking out inclusive, but often challenging, new meanings to people, events, practices and places. We have an opportunity to retool preservation programs and activities to focus on culturally diverse places and underrepresented stories and create inclusive opportunities and partnerships for preservation.

Opportunities that the public identified include:

• Retooling preservation programs and activities to focus on culturally diverse places and underrepresented stories
• Creating inclusive opportunities and partnerships for preservation
• The need for interpretation and/or the re-interpretation of sites to tell the complete story(ies)
• Introducing and engaging young Texans in preservation
Historic Housing and Homeowners
Historic homes comprise the vast majority of Texas’ historic built fabric and residents of historic places are our largest constituency. The issues facing homeowners and historic residential areas are complex and diverse. Rural communities face the continuing trend of out-migration to urban areas, leaving historic homes and neighborhoods vacant and neglected. Urban residential neighborhoods are confronted with varied market forces. “Hot” neighborhoods continue to be affected by development pressure, particularly where historic homes are demolished and replaced with structures that are out of character in scale, massing, footprint and design to what exists in the neighborhood.

As some low income areas become desirable, urban neighborhoods are challenged with the involuntary displacement of residents who can no longer afford to live there. Urban historic neighborhoods perceived as undesirable face abandonment and demolition by neglect, leaving clearance and rebuilding as the only viable option to recovery. In all of these scenarios, whether in urban or rural areas, the lack of preservation planning and appropriate policies leave Texas’ historic housing stock in jeopardy. Homeowners need the information, technical and financial assistance to best preserve, maintain and live in the historic places that are the foundation for healthy communities across the state.

Research, Steering Committee and staff discussions, and feedback at public meetings revealed the following key challenges:

- Lack of a state and federal tax incentive for historic homeowners.
- Local historic preservation regulations perceived as an unfriendly and burdensome process to property owners.
- Difficulty for small and rural communities to develop and implement preservation policies.
- Perception that rehabilitating and/or restoring a historic house will be more expensive than buying new(er) construction.
- Historic lower-income neighborhoods challenged with demolition by neglect and abandonment; when interest develops in neighborhood, then confronted with gentrification issues.
- The “teardown” trend of historic building demolition with replacement structures that are out of character and scale.
- The disconnect between new “green” improvements and incentives with historic preservation.

Legal Framework
The laws and policies that protect historic and cultural resources, whether they be at the local, state or federal level, are essential and often the most effective tools to accomplishing historic preservation. In general, counties and unincorporated areas in Texas lack land use power to protect historic and cultural resources, leaving counties limited tools to protect these places. In fact, Texas is the only state lacking comprehensive land use and planning authority outside city limits. County land use is limited to reviewing the subdivision of land, which they leverage to also control land development related to transportation, water supply, wastewater, and other environmental issues, such as creating habitat conservation plans for areas that contain threatened or endangered species.

Counties do have the authority to purchase conservation easements for natural, historic and cultural properties, as well as provide local tax abatements for historic properties. In addition, the Texas Code grants specific counties land use powers, which includes zoning. These powers have been granted to different counties and allow them to regulate impacts of development to and around specific natural, cultural and historic features. Examples include unincorporated areas of South Padre Island, Lake Tawakoni, the El Paso Mission Trail, and Zapata County (which has passed zoning that incorporates historic preservation). These arrangements for specific counties are few and far between. The limited nature of county land use power has resulted in counties unable to control development in an acceptable manner, especially in rapidly growing unincorporated areas. With each legislative session, counties lobby for more land use control to no avail.

County land use aside, many incorporated municipalities throughout the state do not have land use or historic preservation policies, and those that do often struggle with enforcement. At the state and federal level, the Section 106 process is an important, but often misunderstood and underutilized community tool for preservation.
Public discussion during the planning process focused on the following:

- Counties in Texas lack zoning controls and land use power to protect historic and cultural places; county land use control is limited to the subdivision of land and how it effects transportation, water, wastewater and some environmental issues.
- Many incorporated municipalities do not have the will or the resources to implement preservation policies.
- Communities that have passed preservation policies often struggle with enforcement.
- There is a public perception that preservation policies take away property rights.
- Section 106 is an important, but underused, community tool for preservation.
- Information about preservation laws in Texas is not presented in a clear, concise or readily accessible format.

Preservation and Sustainability

Architect Carl Elefante summed up the connection between historic preservation and sustainability in this simple sentiment, “The greenest building is one that is already built.” Preservation and sustainability both hold common values including stewardship, conservation, place making and most of all considering future generations as we make decisions about meeting our current needs. Sustainability encompasses a wide range of environmental, social and economic practices, from green building and smart growth to recycling and family farming (just to name a few), however historic preservation is seldom found in the vocabulary or core strategies of sustainability. The two practices are even perceived at times to be in conflict with one another. Yet when it comes to the real numbers of energy and environmental costs for building and development, reusing and adapting our existing building stock is the easy answer.

With so much momentum and promotion of environmentally-friendly practices world-wide, there has never been a better opportunity to forge a formal partnership between historic preservation and sustainability. Historic building design and materials are often inherently green, yet consumers are led to believe new materials and technologies are superior. There is a clear need for information on how to use green building technologies and materials in a compatible manner with historic buildings. As building projects continue to pursue LEED certification (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design), historic preservation should be better integrated into LEED standards, including those for neighborhood development.

Preservation and sustainability was a hot topic during the planning process, with stakeholders identifying these key challenges and opportunities:

- Preservation and sustainability are natural allies; yet there is no formal partnership and even a perception of conflict between the two.
- Lack of information about the efficiencies of historic building materials; building owners automatically think new, “green” technologies are superior, yet this is often not the case.
- Lack of information on how to use green building technologies and materials in a compatible manner with historic buildings.
- Need for historic preservation to be better integrated into LEED standards and certification, including LEED for neighborhood development.

These nine issues were in the forefront of all discussions and informed the development of the vision, goals and outcomes of the plan. The plan does not address every aspect of every issue, however strives to impact the highest priorities in the most creative and effective way possible.
VI. AN ORGANIC PLAN

The Vision
In the year 2020, as a result of our collective work to preserve the state’s historic and cultural resources, we have achieved the following:

• All cultures and generations in Texas value historic places.

• We learn the diverse stories of Texas everyday through living, working and playing in historic places.

• Preservation is a fundamental strategy for economically, socially and environmentally healthy communities.

The Values
Values are beliefs that are shared among the community of people interested and invested in the preservation of historic and cultural places. These values are woven into our day-to-day work, in the projects we endeavor and in the decisions we make. We not only practice these values, we educate and train ourselves to use these values to enhance our effectiveness.

The key values we hold and that drive our work in this plan are:

• Quality of life: Historic places enhance the general well-being of individuals and communities

• Authenticity: Focus on telling the real stories of the state’s history through the places, structures, objects and traditions that convey them authentically

• Cultural Diversity: Preserve the places and stories of Texas’ rich cultural heritage and communities

• Partnerships: Work together across cultures, interests and disciplines to achieve mutually beneficial goals

• Communication: Keep people informed and develop strong lines of communication with partners and stakeholders

The Goals
The following eight goals articulate the positive change that we want to achieve over the next 10 years. Each goal is accompanied with outcomes, which illustrate the accomplishments we can monitor and measure as we implement this plan. We have provided examples of actions, both at the statewide level (a collaboration of THC and partners) and at the local level, and will continue to add to this list for different types of stakeholders as we work the plan. We have also included success stories and case studies after each goal that demonstrates how partners across Texas are accomplishing the plan. Visit our website at http://www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-statewide-preservation-plan to learn more about these goals and discover additional outcomes, case studies, and action ideas. We invite you to connect your local initiatives to this bigger plan, and share your successes with us throughout the duration of the planning timeline.
Goal 1: Survey and Online Inventory

Texans undertake a comprehensive survey of the state’s diverse historic and cultural resources resulting in a publicly accessible online inventory.

- **Outcomes**
  1. Increase in historic and cultural resources surveyed statewide by 2020
  2. Functioning map-based web database that links all surveys and inventories (all state agencies, local inventories, National Register eligibility determinations, etc.)
  3. THC Atlas and other relevant inventories are continually updated and managed to keep pace with the increase in survey data and improvements in technology
  4. New THC website assists customers in locating information quickly and easily

- **Statewide Action Idea:** Develop survey form template and mobile application for people to submit local survey information to main database

- **Local Action Idea:** Survey Scholar Program – college classes taking on local survey projects

- **Local Case Study:** Northeast Travis County Survey Project

  The Travis County Historical Commission undertook a Historic Resource Survey of Northeast Travis County, which focused predominantly on rural resources and cultural landscapes of a rapidly urbanizing area just northeast of Austin.

- **Local Case Study:** Austin Historical Survey Web Tool Project
  (http://beta.austinhistoricalsurvey.org/)

The Austin Historical Survey Web Tool is a collaborative project between the University of Texas at Austin and the City of Austin to develop an online interactive tool for volunteer-driven historic resource surveys. It brings together citizens’ local knowledge with the expertise of preservation professionals to improve historic survey information. Anyone with knowledge of a historic property in Austin will be able to enter information into the moderated survey web tool. The Web Tool will support the citywide, neighborhood, and thematic surveys of historic resources. It combines an interactive map interface with survey data collection screens to give professional users and citizens the ability to share information, scanned documents, and photographs.
Goal 2: Emphasize Cultural Landscapes
Communities are active in the identification, protection and interpretation of cultural landscapes.

- **Outcomes**
  1. Statewide survey includes cultural landscapes (e.g. parks, roads, farms, cemeteries and ranches)
  2. Increased tourism partnerships and opportunities through preservation and promotion of cultural landscapes
  3. Increased preservation capacity through training and resources for local cemetery committees
  4. Local communities participate in the Historic Texas Highways Program

- **Statewide Action Idea**: Develop information resources for heritage and cultural landscape preservation

- **Local Case Study**: Historic Farm and Ranch Complexes of Bexar County

  The San Antonio Conservation Society and the City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation spearheaded a survey and educational campaign for historic farms and ranches in Bexar County. Members have documented more than 100 sites resulting in the multiple property submission for “Historic Farms and Ranches of Bexar County,” allowing property owners a streamlined process for listing their farm or ranch in the National Register of Historic Places. Ten of the seventeen properties located within the city limits of San Antonio were also designated as City of San Antonio local landmarks in 2008. These complexes represent the diverse ethnic and cultural settlement patterns between 1718-1890s, and include Spanish, Mexican, Tejano, Texian, German, Irish, Anglo, Swedish, and French family complexes, among others. These places are the last visual vestiges of these cultural groups; each year more and more of these complexes are lost to development, vandalism, and deterioration.

- **Local Case Study**: Park Road 4 National Register Historic District, Burnet County

  Park Road 4 is a 15.5 mile scenic parkway linking U.S. 281 and State Highway 29 and passes through Longhorn Cavern state park, in Burnet County, Texas. The two-lane drive follows the steep inclines and sweeping curves of the Central Texas Hill Country. Built largely by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930s and early 1940s, designers employed a “rustic aesthetic” using hand labor and appropriate, native materials to reflect the unique geology, history, and culture of the area. Designers of Park Road 4 used native stone features and built the road to follow the natural contours of the land, a countryside that changes from open pasture and woodlands to lake views and jagged rock formations. Today, the road remains unchanged from its original alignment and offers scenic views into adjacent and distant landscapes for its entire length. The district, encompassing the road and park, was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in February 2011.
Goal 3: Implement Policies and Incentives
Cities, counties, the state, federal agencies and tribes implement preservation policies and incentives to effectively protect historic and cultural assets.

- **Outcomes**
  1. Newly adopted master plans include preservation policy
  2. 50 more restored historic courthouses
  3. Increased community involvement and utilization of Section 106
  4. Main Street cities are Certified Local Governments

- **Statewide Action Idea:** Pass state enabling legislation for counties to have greater land use control for historic preservation

- **Local Case Study:** Ransom and Sarah Williams Farmstead Project
  
  The Ransom and Sarah Williams Farmstead Project began in 2007 and is still in progress. It is a “cultural resources management” (or CRM/Section 106) project where cultural resources survey, evaluation, and mitigation of adverse effects are required by state and federal laws because of a planned road construction project. The project involves the investigation of a historic farmstead owned and occupied by an African American family from ca. 1871 to 1905 in Travis County, 11 miles south of downtown Austin. This multi-faceted project went above and beyond the traditional community involvement for CRM projects; in addition to the archeological investigation of the site, the team planned a community-based, public archeology project, including 18 oral histories of the African American descendant community, and numerous public outreach events.

- **Local Case Study:** El Paso Vacant Building Ordinance
  
  The City of El Paso adopted a vacant buildings ordinance in August 2010 to proactively address neglect in its built environment, many of the buildings of which are historic and located downtown. The ordinance encourages rehabilitation and requires property owners to register vacant buildings with the city and keep them well maintained. The ordinance has been in effect since March 2011 and the city is actively working on enforcement and implementation. The Richard Caples Building (at left), designed by Henry Trost and listed in the National Register of Historic Places, is an example of a neglected historic building in downtown El Paso. Listed as one of Texas’ Most Endangered Properties by Preservation Texas in 2008, the owners are now restoring and re-glazing the windows as a result of the new vacant buildings ordinance.
Goal 4: Leverage Economic Development Tools
Communities leverage preservation-based and traditional economic development tools to revitalize historic areas.

- **Outcomes**
  1. Increased % of economic development tools being used for historic preservation
  2. Historic preservation is proven conclusively and promoted as an economic engine
  3. Increased visitation statewide at historic sites

- **Statewide Action Idea:** Develop preservation-based economic development information clearinghouse

- **Statewide Action Idea:** Update statewide “Economic Impact of Preservation” study

- **Local Case Study:** Brewster County Signage Project

The Brewster County Historical Commission (BCHC) has partnered to develop informational signage to be installed along the highways throughout Brewster County to assist tourism programs in the region. This project is a joint effort between the BCHC and the Brewster County Tourism Council and is being funded by hotel/motel tax. It will consist of 35 new interpretive signs that promote the county's historic, cultural, and natural attractions. This program is in cooperation with the Texas Highway Department using highway right-of-way space. A review committee from the BCHC and the Center for Big Bend Studies will assemble historical data for each sign. The archives at Sul Ross State University and other area partners will assist in the research and dedication programs. The project approach and fabrication methods have already been shared with surrounding counties in anticipation of their contribution to this regional tourism and education initiative.

- **Local Case Study:** Study of the Value of Historic District Designation in Houston

Preservation Houston (formerly the Greater Houston Preservation Alliance) commissioned a study by the University of Houston's Hobby Center for Public Policy (HCPP) to illustrate the value of historic district designation in dollars and cents. The results of this study clearly illustrates the positive impact historic district designation has on property values in Houston. HCPP conducted a comparative analysis of Harris County Appraisal District records from the past ten years. Appraised values in three designated City of Houston historic districts were measured against values of comparable properties in adjacent historic neighborhoods that are not designated historic districts. Separate analyses were conducted for land values and improvement values. Values for more than 1,500 separate properties were analyzed. The HCPP findings show that Houston’s results are in line with those for other cities: Historic properties in designated historic districts have higher appraised values and maintain those values better than those in comparable adjacent neighborhoods that are not designated historic districts.
Goal 5: Learn and Experience History through Place
Texas residents and guests of all ages learn and experience the state’s diverse history through formal education, recreation, and everyday interactions with historic places.

- **Outcomes**
  1. 4th and 7th grade kids learn community/regional culturally-inclusive history through place
  2. Adults within a community learn local history and value of preservation
  3. Increased visitation at historic sites statewide
  4. Increased participation of underrepresented people in historic preservation

- **Statewide Action Idea:** Create web-based history curricula for major ethnic groups in Texas

- **Local Action Idea:** Utilize Teacher Service Centers to connect with teachers and promote teaching place-based history

- **Local Action Idea:** Site-based interpretation of the how’s and why’s of preservation

- **Case Study:** Egypt Plantation Slave Cabin Field Trip

  Two dozen students in 2nd-5th grade from Wharton Elementary spent the day at Egypt Plantation in Wharton County, learning about slavery and contemporary lessons of tolerance and freedom through a hands-on, immersive environment. Sponsored by the Texas Association of African American Living History in coordination with the THC and Joseph McGill’s Slave Cabin Project in Texas, kids were able to learn about slavery through song and dance, passing the cotton around while hearing about what life was like as a slave. At one point, all the children huddled in mass inside the tiny cabin that once housed an entire family and listened to Joseph McGill talk about life as a slave.

- **Case Study:** Kerr County Historical Commission Newcomer Outreach (http://www.co.kerr.tx.us/historical/)

  The Kerr County Historical Commission (CHC) contracted with a newcomer welcome service, the Kerr Country Greeters, to publicize opportunities for new county residents to learn of the county’s heritage. Newcomers were encouraged to attend meetings for educational presentations and volunteer opportunities. They also were informed about the Kerr CHC archive collection at the local university where they could become knowledgeable of the county’s history. Each newcomer was provided brochures that guide driving tours to historical markers and cemeteries and a brochure listing the Kerr CHC’s archive content. The newcomer welcome service contacted thirty-five new residents each month, educating them on the opportunities for enjoying Kerr County’s culture and heritage.
Goal 6: Connect Preservation to Related Fields

We connect and integrate preservation into related fields and activities, building a broader, stronger, and more diverse community.

Related fields include, but are not limited to, archeology, anthropology, geography, architecture, environmental conservation, planning, economic development, tourism, education, museums, and genealogy.

- **Outcomes**
  1. Historic preservation is a core strategy in sustainability and green building practices
  2. Preservation is a topic at non-preservation conferences/events/trainings
  3. Resources and training provided to real estate professionals

- **Statewide Action Idea:** Annual Preservation Session at Texas Association of Counties and Texas Municipal League Trainings

- **Local Case Study:** Galveston Historical Foundation Green Revival
  (http://www.galvestonhistory.org/preservation/green-revival)

Galveston Historical Foundation’s Green Revival used a 19th-century historic home to demonstrate the connection between green and sustainable building practices and historic preservation. As part of the Partners in the Field grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Galveston Historical Foundation moved a hurricane damaged house built in 1891 to 3101 Ave. Q. and rehabilitated it to become a model for energy-efficient technology in a historic home. The house received a LEED Platinum rating and was sold to private owners.

- **Local Case Study:** Fort Worth Historic House Specialist Course

Historic Fort Worth, in cooperation with the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Greater Fort Worth Association of Realtors, held a full day course to educate realtors on the variety of aspects to selling a house that is 50 years or older. Topics included local and state designations, tax incentives, inspecting a historic home, research and identification, restoration and remodeling, as well as understanding the green aspects of historic buildings. Participants earned 7 hours MCE (mandatory continuing education) credit, and were awarded with a Historic House Specialist certificate.
Goal 7: Cultivate Political Commitment
We cultivate political commitment for historic preservation at the state and local level.

• **Outcomes**
  1. Establish Preservation Caucus in Texas Legislature
  2. Increased opportunities for effective engagement with political leadership at the state level
  3. Legislature supports preservation programs and projects

• **Local Case Study:** Tom Green County Historical Commission “Official” Outreach

Tom Green County Historical Commission has developed ongoing positive relationships with its elected officials through consistent communication, engagement in local projects, and connecting with their personal interest in local history. As a result of their developing close connections with their elected officials, their County Judge requested they coordinate tours of historic sites for attendees of the West Texas County Judges and Commissioners Regional Conference. Elected officials are specially invited and frequent guests at meetings, events and celebrations of local history and preservation.

• **Statewide Case Study:** 2011 Preservation Day

Every two years during the legislative session, Preservation Texas hosts Preservation Day, a series of educational and advocacy sessions to provide a statewide voice for preservation in the Texas Legislature. The sessions are focused on educating attendees about current preservation issues and the upcoming legislation agenda. In 2011, attendees spent the day discussing emerging issues in the current Texas legislative session as well as national priorities, and worked in small groups to develop a clear and concise message about the importance of historic preservation activities. The following day, attendees met with their legislators to discuss local and statewide preservation priorities.
Goal 8: Build Capacity of Preservation Community

The existing preservation community develops its organizational capacity to strengthen and expand preservation skills.

- **Outcomes**
  1. Effective County Historical Commission (CHC) in every county
  2. Information clearinghouse developed for historic homeowners
  3. Increased training opportunities for local/regional preservation advocacy non-profits
  4. Larger percentage of preservation organizations/projects securing funding and resources

- **Local Action Idea:** Collaborative Gathering of Regional/Area Preservation Organizations

- **Statewide Case Study:** Preservation Summit

  Preservation Texas hosts a Preservation Summit every two years as a forum to identify issues related to the preservation of the historic built environment, develop strategic approaches and solutions to the issues, and cultivate partnerships across the state. The Summit is not a conference with presentations and question/answer sessions; it is a dynamic format that is to be inclusive, to promote the exchange of preservation experiences, and is result based.

- **Local Case Study:** San Antonio Homeowners Fair

  The City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation sponsored a Historic Homeowner Fair in 2009 and 2010. With attendance estimated at 300 participants and 42 vendors, educational session topics included: sustainability and older homes, preservation theory and grass roots advocacy, appropriate landscaping in historic areas, tax incentives and financial assistance available to owners of historic properties, restoring wood windows, making appropriate repairs and additions to older properties. Professionals specializing in historic homes hosted a variety of workshops throughout the day and the Exhibitor's Hall featured products and services of interest to owners of older homes. This free, family-friendly event also included fun activities for school-age children throughout the day. The City of San Antonio also has a Handbook for Historic Homes available to residents.
VII. PARTNERS IN IMPLEMENTATION

Preservation happens through a vibrant network of partnerships and collaboration at the local, regional, state, tribal, and federal level (see Appendix E). Reaching our statewide vision and goals depends on the entire preservation community and our partners with complementary missions carrying out their work in ways that are consistent with the overarching goals.

Here are some ways to contribute:

- Make copies of this plan for members of your organization or interested friends, family and colleagues. Visit our website to download a one page summary of the plan, making it easy to distribute and reference.

- Visit the plan online at http://www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-statewide-preservation-plan and add yourself or your organization to the preservation network, an online directory of people, organizations and agencies interested in preserving the historic and cultural resources of the state. Appendix E also contains a reference list of links to national, state and local organizations who are involved in preserving historic and cultural resources.

- Share your local success stories and implementation projects that get us closer to achieving the vision and goals of the plan. Help us build the plan into a dynamic information clearinghouse for preservation across the state.

- Use the vision and goals of this plan as a framework for your own local preservation planning and customize strategies for your community or organization.
VIII. GAUGING OUR PROGRESS

The Texas Historical Commission, as the State Historic Preservation Office, monitors ongoing progress toward the state’s preservation goals aided by feedback from individuals with a stake in historic preservation as well as from the interested public. A review of progress for the current plan (2011 – 2020) was conducted at the end of calendar year 2015. The process included:

- Research, data collection and analysis of measures and outcomes;
- A public survey;
- Stakeholder review meetings; and,
- Conversations with local advocacy partners on their progress and challenges.

The purpose was to determine if the goals continue to accurately articulate the preservation priorities for the state and identify if any external factors – such as economic and political conditions – may call for a minor course correction of the implementation strategies. The review provided an opportunity to celebrate progress and identify areas of focus for the duration of the planning timeline through 2020.

In summary:

- The eight goals continue to reflect the statewide priorities and desired future vision for historic preservation in Texas.
- The most progress has been made in the following focus areas: survey and online inventory; emphasizing cultural landscapes; and, experiencing history through place.
- Cultivating political commitment, connecting preservation to related fields, and building organizational capacity continue to be the greatest challenges for preservationists in Texas. Partners at every level strive to increase capacity, connect with broader and larger audiences, and positively engage policy-makers. Goals 6, 7, and 8 should be priority areas for Texas over the next five years.
- The context for the plan changed shortly after it was completed and released to the public in early 2011. Later that same year, the THC experienced a 50% budget reduction and lost 47 staff members, which hampered the agency’s ability to provide essential public services, and federally and state-mandated activities. While the agency is well on its way to exceeding pre-2011 budget and staffing numbers, progress towards some of the specific measurable outcomes was impacted. In this updated version, several of the outcomes have been adjusted to reflect more realistic measures. The statewide preservation community has regained momentum and the next five years promise to be innovative and exciting.

The following pages in this chapter feature some of the accomplishments of Texas’ many preservation partners over the past five years. Intended to be representative, not exhaustive, the summary is organized around the eight broad goals.

### State Historic Resource Inventory Comparison 2011 – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Register</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,229</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Building, Districts, Sites, Structures and Objects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Historic Districts</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Multiple Property Nominations</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Historic Landmarks</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Texas Historical Markers</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>16,069</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Texas Cemeteries</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Texas Courthouses</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Sites</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011 Data - Cited from 2011-2020 Plan
2015 Data - Accessed November 2015, Texas Historic Sites Atlas
Goal 1. Survey and Online Inventory

Texans undertake a comprehensive survey of the state’s diverse historic and cultural resources resulting in a publicly accessible online inventory.

Outcomes:
1. Increase in historic and cultural resources surveyed statewide by 2020
2. Functioning map-based web database that links all surveys and inventories
3. THC Atlas and other relevant inventories are continually updated and managed to keep pace with the increase in survey data and improvements in technology
4. New THC website assists customers in locating information quickly and easily

Survey – The THC hired a survey coordinator in 2013 to manage survey efforts and data. This has resulted in updated survey information including a catalog that is accessible on the THC’s website. The historic resource survey manual and the digital database template have been revised and made available to the public to facilitate high quality local surveys that can be easily added to the statewide inventory.

Historic Sites Atlas – At the time the plan was drafted in 2011, the Texas Historic Sites Atlas had been operational on the web for 13 years. Making historic resources data publicly available has been an ongoing priority for the agency but significant progress has been made since 2011. A new staff member dedicated to its management was hired 2014 and the Atlas 1.5 was introduced to the public in 2015, which includes a major upgrade of the server platform and code conversion to modernize the Atlas websites. Now that Atlas 1.5 is nearly complete, work is starting on Atlas 2.0 with new features planned for the searching, mapping, and downloading components of the website. Major changes to the back-end of the Atlas are underway to achieve these goals.

Increased Accuracy of Archeological Data – Plans to automate the transfer of survey data between the Texas Archeological Research Lab at the University of Texas at Austin (TARL) and the THC Atlas program have started. This will decrease the time between updates and accuracy of the archeological survey data.

Website – As called for in 2011, the THC completed a new website and introduced it to the public in January 2013.

Local Success Story:
Palestine’s Downtown Historic Resource Survey
The city of Palestine completed an update to the Downtown Historic Resource Survey in 2014, which was conducted to National Park Service standards using minimal funding and a team of volunteers. Each historic resource within the district was surveyed utilizing the standard electronic survey form provided by the THC and includes an image, physical information, available history, ownership information, and specific geographic location. Each form was compiled into the standardized THC Historic Resources Survey Access database. Of the 127 buildings located within the downtown historic district, 87 were identified as historic resources. These 87 were then assigned a priority based upon criteria consistent with that utilized in the original historic resource survey (1993) and updated to account for changes in significance as well as integrity that may have occurred in the interim. Survey information has been made available to the public and plans are in place to add the information to the city’s website. Palestine was able to survey downtown with a total cash expenditure of $3,000. The city was awarded a $3,000 grant from the Certified Local Government program in FY2013 to pay a consultant to conduct approximately 16 hours of on-site training for a team of 10 volunteers and one staff member. Volunteer hours and staff time were used to provide the local in-kind contribution for the grant match totaling approximately $16,000.

Trends 2011-2015:
• Increased demand for electronic survey tools and online access to data.
• Local partners challenged to find funding for surveys.

Areas of Focus 2016-2020:
• Increase training to enable high quality volunteer surveys.
• Make mobile application available for local surveys.
• Continue to prioritize efforts to make historic resource data available to the public in web-accessible formats.
• Conduct THC data collection audit.

Project of Interest:
• Palestine’s Downtown Historic Resource Survey

An example of the resource type found in Palestine’s updated Downtown Historic Resource Survey, 2014.
Goal 2. Emphasize Cultural Landscapes

Communities are active in the identification, protection and interpretation of cultural landscapes.

Outcomes
1. Statewide survey includes cultural landscapes
2. Increased tourism partnerships and opportunities through preservation and promotion of cultural landscapes
3. Increased preservation capacity through training and resources for local cemetery committees
4. Local communities participate in the Historic Texas Highways Program

Identification, Survey and Nomination – Over the past five years, one third of the Certified Local Government funds granted for survey projects have supported cultural landscape projects and 15% (23 of 157) of resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places have featured cultural landscapes. Some of these include the first in Texas World War II-era Enemy Alien Internment Camp (Crystal City), the Butterfield Overland Mail Route Corridor in Culberson County and the Old Spanish Trail in Colorado County.

National Historic Trails – TxDOT, the National Park Service, El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Association, county historical commissions, local county judges and the THC have all contributed to creating signage to mark the historic El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail. The multi-faceted project included: the design of sign plans, funding agreements with counties or cities, and TxDOT approval and installation. Since 2011, sign plans have been executed and signs have been installed or will be installed in 2016 for the following counties: Milan, Zapata, Victoria, Brazos, Comal, Hays, Bexar (along Nacogdoches Road in San Antonio only), Sabine, Robertson, and San Augustine. Using the same process outlined above, El Paso County has a signage plan in place that will be installed in 2016 to create signage for El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail.

Heritage Trails – The 10 Texas Heritage Trail Regions work to promote a myriad of cultural landscapes including, but not limited to, state parks, natural areas, cemeteries, frontier forts, historic sites and districts in urban and rural areas, farms and ranches, walking tours and scenic drives. The Texas Time Travel website catalogs these sites and assists the Regions in promoting them to the public. The website now features nearly 500 cultural landscape sites actively promoted in the 10 regions.

Mobile Tours – A series of mobile tour software applications, or “apps,” were developed by the Texas Historical Commis-

sion and released to the public in 2015. While these document broader historic themes, cultural landscapes figure significantly in their content. The seven mobile tours contain 211 entries that represent cultural landscapes all across the state ranging from Palo Duro Canyon—the backdrop to the battles of the Red River War—to the La Salle Odyssey tour, which features a range of historic resources and public parks in the vicinity of the shipwreck that help visitors gain a better understanding from a much broader context than previously interpreted.

Cattle Trail Initiatives – In 2009 Congress passed the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act calling for the Secretary of the Interior to conduct the study of the Chisholm and Great Western Cattle Trails for qualification for designation as a National Historic Trail. Public scoping meetings took place in 2010 and a public draft was issued in 2014 for comment. Texas figures prominently in these routes. Currently, TxDOT is leading a new initiative to restore the 44 original Chisholm Trail metal markers installed across the state in 1930. Twenty counties are on the list of original sites. In addition, the Texas Lakes Trail Region board members have been involved since 2013 installing cement markers along the Texas Chisholm Trail.

Historic Roads and Highways Program – At the time the Statewide Plan was released in 2011, House Bill 2642 had recently established the Texas Historic Roads and Highways Program, the goal of which is to identify, designate, interpret, and market historic roads and highways in Texas. The THC and TxDOT entered into an agreement to administer projects relating to this program and utilized Federal Transportation Enhancement funds. This project has produced a historic context for Texas highways statewide, a cultural resources survey of much of the Bankhead Highway, a dedicated webpage, a travel brochure, and a series of successful tourism workshops to train local communities on tourism product development related to historic highways focusing on the Bankhead.

Ten communities participated in public workshops during the survey of the Bankhead (Texarkana, Mt. Vernon, Dallas, Fort Worth, Mineral Wells, Eastland, Abilene, Midland, Van Horn, El Paso) and 10 communities participated in public workshops during survey of the Meridian (Decatur, Fort Worth, Waco, Georgetown, San Antonio, Cotulla, Laredo, Bryan, Houston, Galveston). Grass roots efforts to preserve the state’s historic highways have taken place as well. Interpretative plaques and reproductions of the original Bankhead highway signs were created by an avocational historian and promoter and are made available at a minimal cost to interested communities or sites. There are nearly 30 locations that currently have installed these.
Local Success Story: 
**Bankhead Highway Tourism Products**
The 2015 Bankhead Highway workshops focused on creating new heritage tourism products in three pilot communities: Mount Vernon, Weatherford, and Big Spring. Each community developed at least three new events or interpretive experiences. Other cities wanting to enhance their visitor readiness for Bankhead travelers were invited to selected sessions in the pilot communities. Over 50 participants from 20 Bankhead cities or counties participated overall. This work has helped shape a new model of heritage tourism celebrating historic highways, one that engages and benefits both the local community as well as the visitor. As an example of this work, Big Spring (as well as the other pilot cities) undertook a project entitled History Mystery Panels. A series of large format informational panels feature historic images of downtown Big Spring relevant to Bankhead history. The panels—installed in storefronts and exterior walls of buildings throughout downtown—pose questions to visitors, who must then use the historic images in combination with the surrounding contemporary downtown to answer the "history mystery" challenge. Answers can be confirmed at the Heritage Museum of Big Spring. The panels engage the public and enliven distressed downtown buildings while increasing awareness of Big Spring's significant highway-related historic resources.

Big Spring’s—Summers on the Green—brings together community members and visitors during a series of monthly movie and entertainment events held on the lawn of the recently restored Hotel Settles. This new green space is located adjacent to the historic Municipal Auditorium, providing an ideal venue, while effectively strengthening the local preservation ethic regarding downtown Big Spring through engaging family experiences. The inaugural event featured cinema style shorts produced by local radio personality Tumbleweed Smith, a classic car show, and performances by Howard College theater students, who took on the roles of personalities famous in the days of the Bankhead Highway.

**Trends 2011-2015:**
- Mobile technology allowed for new interpretative experiences of cultural landscapes.
- New models were developed for historic highway resource identification, preservation, and interpretation.
- Elimination of federal Transportation Enhancement funds reduced funding for Heritage Tourism initiatives.

**Areas of Focus 2016-2020:**
- Increase local capacity to protect endangered cemeteries.
- Study trends to determine if formal Cultural Landscape Initiative is needed (see page 18).
- Determine the future of the Historic Roads and Highways program (without Transportation Enhancement funds).

**Project of Interest:**
- Bankhead highway tourism product development
Goal 3. Implement Policies and Incentives
Cities, counties, the state, federal agencies and tribes implement preservation policies and incentives to effectively protect historic and cultural assets.

Outcomes
1. Newly adopted master plans include preservation policy
2. 50 more restored historic courthouses
3. Increased community involvement and utilization of Section 106
4. Main Street cities are Certified Local Governments

Strengthening City Preservation Policies – Of the new or recently updated city comprehensive plans identified by survey (adopted FY2011-FY2015), more than 70% contain substantive preservation policies. Some have included specific, measurable performance indicators for historic preservation like Houston’s new general plan, Plan Houston, which was adopted in 2015. The goal, “A community that respects our history” is associated with two performance indicators: 1) the number of historic buildings and sites listed in the National Register, state and/or city historic designation; and 2) square mileage of locally designated historic districts which includes the number of parcels located in historic districts. The current numbers are included in the plan, and these will provide a benchmark whereby progress can be accurately and easily determined as the plan is implemented.

Historic Districts as a Tool to Protect Neighborhoods – Preservationists continue to work hard to demonstrate the value of local historic districts in places experiencing increased development pressures. Over the last few years, Preservation Austin has worked to promote the local historic district program amid challenging political conditions. The organization provides guidance to neighborhood leadership, a design standards template, and funding in the form of $5,000 grants to district applicants. In Fort Worth, a local district nomination process is currently underway for the iconic Fort Worth Stockyards. The recommendation by the City Council came as a result of the preservation community’s involvement in a long, arduous process to create basic design guidelines to guide new development in the area.

Continued Success Saving Texas Courthouses – The nationally recognized and award-winning Texas Historic Courthouse Preservation Program (THCPP) continues to be a flagship preservation strategy for the state. Since its inception in 1999, the program has granted more than $251 million to 91 counties for courthouse planning and restoration work, generating $174 million in local matches. In November of 2010, 46 county courthouses had been fully restored and rededicated. Since that time, 17 more were fully restored and rededicated. The program received an additional $20 million from the Texas Legislature in 2015 ensuring this important work will continue.

Streamlining Section 106 – Section 106 was identified in the 2011 Statewide Plan public process as an underutilized tool and the THC, as the program administrator, has made much progress in the last five years on providing training and education to make the process more accessible to the public. The THC worked closely with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the Historic Bridge Foundation in developing content and hosting open houses about historic bridges between 2014 and 2015. In 2014, the group focused on bridges constructed between 1945 and 1965, and the agency is in the process of negotiating a Programmatic Agreement that would enable TxDOT to streamline compliance issues related to the nearly 100 of those bridges that are significant for their engineering history. In 2015, the three organizations worked to increase awareness of the state’s historic metal truss bridges, an increasingly rare resource type. Through new online content, open houses, and educational materials, the group is helping the public understand what it means for a bridge to be historic, and how local governments can plan for future rehabilitation and replacement projects. Nearly 120 people attended the four open houses. In addition, the THC is working to develop an online Section 106 system. A selected group of beta testers began using it in Fall 2015 and it is planned to be fully functional in 2016. TxDOT is assisting THC staff in mapping project review data which will be shared with external users as part of the new online review system.

Excerpt from Plan Houston illustrating measurable indicators to track preservation progress, adopted 2015.
Local Success Story: 1890 Throckmorton County Courthouse Restoration

The Texas Historic Courthouse Preservation Program continues to make it possible for rural counties and those with smaller populations to restore their grand historic courthouses. The Throckmorton County Courthouse, in the town of Throckmorton, is a recent example of the impact of this program. The town has a population of just over 800 people, and the county is approximately 1,600. Built in 1890, the Italianate courthouse is a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark, a State Antiquities Landmark, and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The stone courthouse was designed by Martin, Byrnes and Johnston Architects of Colorado City, Texas.

By the 2000s, the courthouse had fallen into disrepair and the county leadership determined the best way to make the necessary repairs was to undergo a complete restoration. The county received a THCPP planning grant in 2010 and was awarded a nearly $2.4 million THCPP construction grant in 2012. The county’s contribution totaled approximately $400,000.

The transformation undertaken over a three-year period included removal of the exterior addition and restoration of the wood windows and doors. The cupola and roof were reconstructed, and the interior wood floors, wainscot, doors and transoms, ceilings, stairs, and shutters were restored. The concrete floor, plaster walls, and vaulted corrugated metal ceilings were painted in the historic colors. Functional improvements were made to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), including an elevator and wheelchair accessible entrance ramp and new bathrooms. An exterior metal fire stair, a fire protection system, security features, and audio/IT equipment provide compliance with modern building codes. Finally, HVAC, plumbing, and electrical systems were replaced, including restoration of historic light fixtures. Storage areas for vital records, property deeds, and court documents were moved to the recently rehabilitated annex, and the historic vault door was restored and returned to the courthouse. Approximately 40 different contractors were employed on the project from the plaster specialists to Campbellsville Industries who rebuilt the cupola.

The restored courthouse was rededicated on June 12, 2015. More than 150 people attended the rededication, which included photo opportunities, a cook-out, a ceremony and a street dance. Upon its completion, it joins more than 60 other fully restored courthouses across Texas.

Trends 2011-2015:
- Preservation policy included in majority of new master plans, but local communities cite continued challenge of implementing strong preservation ordinances.
- Main Street data demonstrates minimal increase in those cities that also are Certified Local Governments (29% in 2010 vs. 32% in 2014).

Areas of Focus 2016-2020:
- Strengthen historic preservation ordinances in Main Street cities.
- Secure more resources for HPOs (access to training, best practices and grant funds).
- Consider preservation policy study to identify trends and best practices for city-wide comprehensive and/or preservation plans.

Project of Interest:
- Plan Houston’s preservation policy indicators for measuring implementation progress.
Goal 4. Leverage Economic Development Tools
Communities leverage preservation-based and traditional economic development tools to revitalize historic areas.

Outcomes
1. Increased % of economic development tools being used for historic preservation
2. Historic preservation is proven conclusively and promoted as an economic engine
3. Increased visitation statewide at historic sites

Updated Economic Impact Study – The Statewide Plan recommended updating the 1999 statewide “Economic Impact of Preservation Study,” which was at the time one of the earliest and most comprehensive efforts on the subject. A team comprised of economists from the University of Texas at Austin’s Center for Sustainable Development and the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers University completed the new report in early 2015, which updated the economic impact investigations and includes programs launched since 1999. Major findings include:
• More than 10.5 percent of travel in Texas is heritage related.
• Private property owners invest almost 741 million annually in the rehabilitation of designated historic buildings.
• Every dollar from federal and state historic preservation incentives triggers $4-$5 of private sector investment.
• Texas Main Street cities produce an average of $310 million annually in the state GDP with cumulative reinvestment in Main Street areas totaling over $5.2 billion since the program’s inception in 1981.
• The Texas Historic Courthouse Preservation Program has created more than 9,600 jobs and added $651 million to the state GDP while spurring downtown revitalization in counties large and small.

The findings demonstrate the substantial impacts of preservation to the Texas economy, but more work is needed to translate the results into materials that increase public and political support for preservation.

Increasing the Number of Incentives Used for Downtown Revitalization – The Texas Main Street Program celebrates its 35th anniversary in 2016 and continues its track record of success in generating substantial and measurable reinvestment results in historic Texas downtowns. One of the plan measures called for an increase in the number of financial tools being used to support downtown revitalization. An analysis of financial incentives by cities participating in the Texas Main Street Program demonstrates that there has been an increase in the number of economic development tools over the past five years. In 2010, cities reported the average use of five available tools/incentives and in 2014, cities reported an average of six. Data also reflects new trends in the types of tools being used. There was a general decline in loan programs and property tax abatements, while incentives like utility rate reductions and fee waivers increased. The communities also reported a significant increase in fundraising to support downtown incentive programs.

Historic Tax Credit Programs – Texans celebrated a major preservation victory in 2013 when the 83rd Texas Legislature adopted a new 25% credit against the franchise tax and assigned oversight to the THC. The state program may be combined with the existing federal credit of 20% allowing for a potential total credit of 45% for qualified historic rehabilitation projects. Use of the federal tax credit has grown steadily since 2006 and the ability to combine the two is expected to precipitate a significant number of new rehabilitation projects. Data demonstrates an 80% increase in submission of the Federal Part A application (Evaluations of Significance) from 2011-2015 compared to the previous five years (2006-2010). And in one year, the state tax credit program saw 98 submittals for Evaluations of Significance (Part 1) with 13 of these requesting Certifications of Completed work (Part 3). This is more than four times the average number submitted for the federal program (23). The state tax credit’s minimum project threshold of $5,000 also opens up the opportunity for smaller projects to benefit. An analysis of the geographic distribution of tax credit applications in 2015 already demonstrates the independent use of the state program in smaller communities.

Local Success Story:
Historic Tax Credits Put to Work on Elgin’s Main Street
The ability to combine the federal and state historic tax credit programs is already proving a powerful revitalization tool in downtowns of all sizes across Texas. In addition to some of the large scale redevelopment projects seen in the major metropolitan areas, the incentives are helping make the numbers work for smaller scale projects as well. Elgin is a nationally accredited Texas Main Street city with a population of just over 8,400 people. The city has steadily worked over the years to create the right combination of policy and incentives to attract reinvestment. Since 1990, the Main Street program has recorded just over $13 million in public and private sector reinvestment; however, downtown experienced a significant amount of redevelopment activity in 2015.

Elgin’s recent downtown success is best exemplified in the redevelopment of a two-story building at 101 N. Main, a former saloon and boarding house, which had sat vacant for many years in the heart of the downtown district. New owner, Allan Tolbert, had recently bought property near Elgin to escape from city life in Austin. After driving past it one too
many times, Tolbert purchased the building with the desire to be part of “making good things happen downtown.” He renovated the building in 2015 using the 20% federal tax credit, 25% state tax credit and a $25,000 reimbursement grant from the Elgin Economic Development Corporation offered to projects investing $100,000 or more. The building now contains four historic lofts and commercial space on the ground floor.

A recent zoning change allows mixed use including first floor residential in the rear 50% of a building. This change, along with a housing study that stated a demand for new rental units, gave Tolbert confidence investing in downtown Elgin. He has since gone on to purchase three more buildings including another two-story mixed use property, which will have eight loft apartments and two single story buildings. Renovations are underway and the historic character attracted a flower shop to relocate from the highway into downtown and pickle factory to relocate from outside of town. In addition to his own projects, Tolbert is also mentoring other new property owners on rehabilitation projects.

Trends 2011-2015:
• Historic preservation proven as an economic engine for the state.
• Historic tax credit program experienced immediate influx after implementation of state tax credit.
• Local incentives shifted from cash grants to utility rate reductions and fee waivers.

Areas of Focus 2016-2020:
• Increase education and public outreach efforts on the overall economic benefits of historic preservation.
• Develop preservation-based economic development information clearinghouse (see page 25).
• Provide tailored resources/training to help communities clearly understand how to use these tools (see page 16).

Project of Interest:
• Elgin’s small-scale historic tax credit rehabilitations

Goal 5: Learn and Experience History through Place
Texas residents and guests of all ages learn and experience the state’s diverse history through formal education, recreation, and everyday interactions with historic places.

Outcomes
1. 4th and 7th grade kids learn community/regional culturally-inclusive history through place
2. Adults within a community learn local history and value of preservation
3. Increased visitation at historic sites statewide
4. Increased participation of underrepresented people in historic preservation

Teaching Young People Texas History – The Statewide Plan emphasizes the importance of educating younger generations about the value of Texas’ historic places. This is an area of the plan which requires the cooperation of a diverse group of partners within many disciplines. One of the best examples is TeachingTexas.Org, a tool for educators that brings together the wide range of sources for teaching Texas studies to save time and promote awareness of what is available. The entries are linked to the 4th and 7th grade Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). The site is a collaborative project between the Texas State Historical Association, the University of North Texas Library’s Portal to Texas History, and Texas Heritage Online. It is hosted by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission with funding made possible in part by Humanities Texas. At the end of 2015, an impressive list of 25 partners varying from state agencies to libraries to regional museums support this large and dynamic effort. As identified as a priority outcome, partners such as the Texas Holocaust and Genocide Commission and the Institute of Texan Cultures, provide diverse and culturally-inclusive content.

The THC added a new educational specialist position in 2014 who develops educational training and materials highlighting THC historic sites and programs. Accomplishments to date include 12 Historic Sites Educator Guides, 14 Teaching with Historic Places lesson plans complete or under development, military history lesson plans for middle and high school students, an updated version of Texas Archeology in the Classroom, an updated A Shared Experience: A Teacher’s Companion. Finally, the THC now has educators or staff who provide education programs at 13 of the 20 historic sites, which serve to attract younger and more diverse audiences.

Historic Site Visitation Numbers – Visitation at the THC’s 20 historic sites has steadily increased over the past five years. Total visitation in FY2011 was recorded at 271,846 and FY2015 saw 301,971 total visitors, an 11% increase.

101 N. Main in Elgin was rehabilitated using both the federal and state historic preservation tax credit programs in 2015.
Preserve America Youth Summits – In addition to the curriculum development and educational programs mentioned above, Texas hosted a Preserve America Youth Summit in the summer of 2015 at the San Antonio Missions National Historic Park. Nine preservation partners including the National Park Service and National Park Service Foundation brought 75 13-18 year olds together to foster a better understanding of heritage, history and historic places; connect them to a place associated with diverse cultures and viewpoints; and also learn their perspectives on preservation and heritage tourism issues. The 2016 Texas Preserve America Youth Summit is scheduled for June 7-10 at the LBJ National Historical Park in Johnson City.

Using Social Media to Reach Underrepresented Groups – In 2014, the National Park Service included underrepresented communities as a new planning focus for statewide historic preservation plans. These are defined as communities that have had no or limited roles in previous planning efforts, or that have a stake in resources that have not been the focus of preservation work. Over the past few years, new approaches by the THC utilizing technology and social media have yielded notable results in reaching communities that are not otherwise engaged in the agency’s work.

In 2014 and 2015, the THC’s heritage tourism program staff produced a series of short, documentary style videos for use in the recently released Texas Time Travel Tours mobile applications or apps. The videos feature stakeholders from communities across Texas who present first person accounts of their local histories. The videos lack official “experts” who represent local histories on behalf of communities, and as such the videos contain a more authentic representation of local stories. Following the release of the mobile app, the THC’s heritage tourism program staff recognized an opportunity to promote the app by sharing the videos across the THC’s social media channels. The efforts began by posting the mobile app videos to the THC’s Facebook page, and THC Facebook followers responded with significant numbers of likes and comments on the videos. Perhaps more significantly, THC Facebook followers then themselves shared the videos across individual and group Facebook pages, eliciting discussions about the videos among online communities who are not otherwise connected to the THC’s social media channels. Many of the individuals engaged in these secondary and tertiary discussions are part of underserved communities that the THC—through the effective use of social media—now meaningfully reaches and engages in discussions of issues related to Texas historic preservation.

For example, a video produced for the mobile app’s Hispanic heritage tour, San Felipe residents—and graduates of San Felipe High—tell the story of the former San Felipe Independent School District’s establishment in the 1920s, which represented an unprecedented legal victory for an historically marginalized and underserved neighborhood in Del Rio, Texas. The video produced more than 10,500 views, 289 likes, 50 comments and 414 shares. Twelve additional videos have been shared that work to tell the stories of underrepresented groups in historic preservation.

Local Success Story: Pecos County Texas History Day Poster Contest
The Pecos County Historical Commission has had major success engaging middle schoolers with the Texas History Day 7th Grade Poster Contest and Field Trip. County Historical Commissions (CHC) are committed to providing preservation-related activities for young people across the state. The Pecos County project was launched in March 2012, with a small group of 11 volunteers. The first year saw only one poster submission; however, the following year a field trip during Old Fort Days was added and the submissions totaled 101. For the last two years, over 150 have been submitted each year. In 2015, they reached participation from all schools in the county. The CHC believes the contest and field trip is a positive way to introduce students to the historic buildings the CHC oversees for Pecos County and the experience as a whole effectively engages young people in the county’s broader history. Pecos County’s outreach activities were also featured in the article “Sowing Seeds” published in the July 2015 issue of the Texas Association of Counties County Magazine.

![CHC members with Gabby Gonzalez and her poster](courtesy of Pecos CHC, 2014.)
**Local Success Story:**

**Heritage Tourism Partnerships in South Texas**

The County Historical Commission in Jim Hogg County partnered with the Texas Tropical Trail Region to host the September 2014 Texas Tropical Trail meeting in Hebbronville. Other partners included the Museum Foundation of Hebbronville, the Vaquero Festival Association, and local businesses. Events like these occur regularly throughout Texas as a result of the partnerships developed by the Heritage Trails program. The meetings draw participation from all over their respective regions and not only help attendees experience local history, but also increase the exposure of these sites as tourism destinations. This meeting began with Hillcrest Tortilla Factory providing a tour of their state of the art factory along with samples of their tortillas, tamales, and baked goods which are distributed all over South Texas. A tour of the restored museum followed along with a driving tour of the Hebbronville historic district and lunch at Frank’s Café, a well-known local institution that has been featured in *Texas Monthly* magazine. Entertainment during the meal included a history of the 100 year-old business and a documentary about the local vaquero culture. After lunch, the group visited The New York Store, another 100 year-old family-owned business. The First National Bank of Hebbronville provided their meeting room for a presentation on local ranching and vaquero history by representatives of the Vaquero Festival Association. Many community members joined the group for this final presentation. This event enjoyed excellent participation with 36 attendees representing nine counties in the Tropical Trail Region.

**Trends 2011-2015:**

- Visitation at historic sites continued to rise.
- Technology and social media proved effective in reaching underrepresented groups.
- CHCs continued to be some of the most active local preservation partners in the state, especially in more rural areas.
- The public indicates this is the area where the state has made the most progress since the plan was drafted.

**Areas of Focus 2016-2020:**

- Continue efforts to creatively engage underrepresented groups.
- Integrate preservation into formal history curricula.
- Continue work to interpret and re-interpret sites to tell complete stories (see page 18).
- Better engage public officials and policy makers in preservation trainings, conferences and events (see page 16).

**Project of Interest:**

- THC’s Heritage Tourism video engagement strategy

---

**Goal 6: Connect Preservation to Related Fields**

We connect and integrate preservation into related fields and activities, building a broader, stronger, and more diverse community.

**Outcomes**

1. Historic preservation is a core strategy in sustainability and green building practices
2. Preservation is a topic at non-preservation conferences/events/trainings
3. Resources and training provided to real estate professionals

**Sustainability and Resiliency Planning** – In 2014, the National Park Service included disaster and resiliency planning for cultural resources as a new planning focus for statewide historic preservation plans. This should be a critical focus for Texas as well, as our state is susceptible to a wide range of climate-related disasters. The City of Galveston has already proved itself a leader in sustainability and resiliency planning for cultural resources by creating design guidelines and standards for its historic districts that address both storm-safety features on historic buildings and provide sustainability standards for historic properties (adopted 2012). The guidelines and standards were created after the devastating impact of Hurricane Ike and were the result of a positive public process – property owners were eager for this type of tool and guidance. The resulting document takes into account unique characteristics of the island that may seem to be in opposition to traditional preservation principles, such as raising historic structures and moving them altogether. However, these methods were used historically in Galveston to maintain and preserve historic architecture, so the community decided these should continue to be an acceptable way to continue to preserve and maintain their historic homes. The result is a more resilient community that has retained its historic character.

**Resources for Homeowners** – Advocacy partners from the major metropolitan areas report specialized programming to educate homeowners on historic preservation and sustainability. Preservation Austin began offering a series of workshops entitled *Greening Your Vintage Home* in 2015. The engaging series focused on retrofitting older homes with energy efficiency in mind. Presenters from across the fields of architecture, preservation, sustainable design, energy efficiency, and landscape design covered a variety of topics from energy retrofit to historic zoning and green building initiatives. The workshops were held at a home design and performance center with a focus on health, sustainability, and quality. The events were successful at reaching an audience beyond the existing local preservation network and the workshops will continue in the future.
**Resources for Real Estate Professionals** – Advocacy partners in the major metro areas also report popular and well-attended residential real estate trainings including Dallas, Fort Worth, Austin, San Antonio, and Houston. Preservation Dallas offers one of the most extensive, which immerses participants in Dallas’ historic preservation community. The Historic House Specialist course is offered twice per year and the popular two–day seminar includes: lectures from local experts on architectural history; architectural styles with a focus on Dallas; the City of Dallas preservation ordinance and its impact on the homeowner; the City of Dallas property tax incentives program; how to research the history of a building; an overview of historic interiors; an extensive mobile workshop and bus tour of Dallas’ historic neighborhoods; and, a luncheon in a historic house museum. Participants receive 8 hours MCE credit, a copy of Virginia McAlester’s *Field Guide to American Houses*, as well as a complimentary one-year membership with Preservation Dallas. Around 1,000 realtors have gone through the program since its inception.

**Events that Connect Preservation to New Audiences** – Local partners across the state host hundreds if not thousands of creative events that engage communities not typically associated with preservation. Advocacy partners relay that while membership numbers have increased minimally, attendance at special events helps them meet their funding goals and much of their current efforts focus on programming and enhancing these events. For example, each September Historic Fort Worth, Inc. (HFW) produces a month-long, multi-faceted event called Preservation is the Art of the City™ at the Fort Worth Community Arts Center. The event is “a celebration of good design for great cities” and offers programming to appeal to all ages and interests. The primary component is an art show and sale that runs the entire month. Recognizing that great cities need studio artists who can earn a living, the studio artists in this show receive 65% of the sales price of their sold artworks and have the option of entering works into a special section called Stories of the City, where artists may choose to enter a painting with their written description about what makes this painting a preservation story. During the month thousands of people visit the show. HFW has found that artists and art-related events draw a diverse audience and help serve as a bridge to introduce new people to their preservation-driven mission.

**Local Success Story:**
**San Antonio’s Power of Preservation PROM**
The Power of Preservation Foundation began hosting PROM, a celebration of San Antonio’s unique cultures, traditions and built environment, in 2012 at a notable historic site in the city. This is no typical gala; PROM creates an unforgettable experience for its diverse attendees in such locations as the Mission Road Power Plant, the historic Stinson Municipal Airport and Hemisfair Park. The event is held annually and brings business leaders, community activists, developers, city officials, architects and designers together for one night to celebrate the preservation efforts made within the city during the past year. The Power of Preservation Foundation (PoP), is a coalition of advocates, businesses, neighborhoods, and agencies interested in promoting the literal “power” of preservation in the community. Attendance has steadily increased every year with 2015’s event attracting around 450. Proceeds average between $40,000 and $50,000 and support the city’s historic preservation education and outreach programs including S.T.A.R. (Students Together Achieving Revitalization).

**Trends 2011-2015:**
- Texas cities demonstrated historic preservation planning is an important strategy in creating resilient and sustainable communities.
- High quality historic real estate trainings consistently provided for residential property in urban areas.
- Partners developed impressive events to expand their audiences.

**Areas of Focus 2016-2020:**
- Identify vulnerable resource sets and collaborate to plan for pre-disaster and post-disaster strategies.
- Continue work to resolve the disconnect between “new” green improvements/incentives with historic preservation (see page 19).
- Prioritize engaging fields who impact preservation efforts (real estate, developers, etc., see page 17).

**Projects of Interest:**
- Galveston’s unified *Design Standards for Historic Properties*
- San Antonio’s Power of Preservation PROM
**Goal 7. Cultivate Political Commitment**

We cultivate political commitment for historic preservation at the state and local level.

**Outcomes**
1. Establish Preservation Caucus in Texas Legislature
2. Increased opportunities for effective engagement with political leadership at the state level
3. Legislature supports preservation programs and projects

**Legislature Supports Preservation Programs** – This plan was released to the public in early 2011. However, later that year in the 82nd meeting of the Texas Legislature, the Texas Historical Commission’s budget was cut dramatically. For the past five years, the THC has been operating with a budget that is nearly one third of what it was expected to be at the time this plan was created. The most recent budget session was a positive one for preservation in Texas and the agency has now nearly restored operations and customer service capability levels achieved prior to the major budget reductions in 2011. Visible special projects received funding as well, such as the Texas Historic Courthouse Preservation Program, the National Museum of the Pacific War historic site, San Felipe de Austin historic site visitor center, and maintenance expenses for Capitol Complex historic buildings. Other statewide partners experienced turnover and transition as well, such as Preservation Texas, but the statewide preservation community has regained momentum and the next five years promise to be innovative and exciting.

**New Initiatives to Cultivate Political Support** – The Texas Heritage Trails Program was previously funded through a contractual agreement with TxDOT using funding made available from the federal Transportation Enhancements program. Changes in federal transportation policy eliminated this source in 2015 and the heritage preservation community in Texas is now strategically working on cultivating legislative support for this important program which helps millions of travelers find state and local historic sites. It includes 10 trail regions with independent boards and staff and is supported by hundreds of volunteers statewide drawn from businesses, chambers, economic development offices, visitor bureaus, cities, counties and community activists. A high profile conference, Real Places 2016, is now being planned for summer 2016 to bring together the state’s heritage tourism network for discussion, education, and advocacy work to cultivate the necessary political support to secure the program’s future.

**Major Funding for the Alamo** – For the first time in contemporary history, the Legislature provided major funding for Texas’ most well-known historic site, the Alamo. The Spanish colonial mission chain’s designation as a World Heritage site in 2015 provided momentum for planning efforts and the Legislature contributed a total of $31.5 million for care of the Alamo and an implementation plan for future redevelopment of Alamo Plaza. The City of San Antonio, Texas General Land Office and Alamo Endowment entered into an agreement to jointly develop and carry out the master plan.

**Trends 2011-2015:**
- After the significant budget reduction in 2011, historic preservation programs received steadily increasing support from the Texas Legislature.
- The public indicates this is the area where the state has made the least progress since the plan was drafted.

**Areas of Focus 2016-2020:**
- Continue discussions among preservation stakeholders on the potential to create a Preservation Caucus (see page 28).
- Provide opportunities to effectively connect constituents with legislators.
- Better educate constituents on political advocacy strategies.
Goal 8. Build Capacity of Preservation Community

The existing preservation community develops its organizational capacity to strengthen and expand preservation skills.

Outcomes

1. Effective County Historical Commission (CHC) in every county
2. Information clearinghouse developed for historic homeowners
3. Increased training opportunities for local/regional preservation advocacy nonprofits
4. Larger % of preservation organizations/projects securing funding and resources

Strong County Historical Commissions – CHCs are some of the most active local historic preservation groups in Texas and are involved in a myriad of preservation projects and advocacy issues in their respective regions. Up until 2011, members of CHCs attended the THC’s Annual Conference and participated in extensive training to help them be effective in their local communities. Now regional trainings are offered and a Distinguished Service Award is granted to the County Historical Commissions that meet certain criteria for preservation activities and advocacy. In 2010, 72 CHCs received the Distinguished Service Award and in 2014, 90 (out of 162 reporting). This represents a 25% increase.

Preservation Summit – Preservation Texas hosts an annual Preservation Summit where people from all over Texas gather to learn about historic preservation issues and strategies. This program began in 2008 as a bi-annual counter-point to the State Advocacy Day, held on even-numbered years when the Texas Legislature was not in session. Preservation Texas no longer distinguishes between the two statewide events, and the annual event in Austin is called the Preservation Summit whether the Legislature is in session or not.

Starting in 2016, Preservation Texas also began coordinating its annual Honor Awards Ceremony with the Preservation Summit in order to increase participation and consolidate the statewide events. This consolidation represents a shift of focus to Regional Meetings that can better engage with local preservationists on issues of local significance.

The annual Preservation Summit is an opportunity to highlight issues related to the preservation of the historic built environment, develop strategic approaches and solutions to the issues, and to cultivate partnerships across the state. Attendance grew steadily from 2008 with around 60 registered attendees to 2015 with nearly 125 attendees, but then spiked in 2016 with over 240 attendees thanks to increased membership, improved promotional materials, and the coordination of the Honor Awards Ceremony on the same day that led to significant overlap in attendance.

Texas’ Most Endangered Places Program – The Preservation Summit provides a highly visible platform to announce Texas’ Most Endangered Places, another PT program with the purpose of equipping individuals, non-profit organizations and local communities with the resources to preserve historic buildings. Since its creation in 2004, this program has brought attention to more than 130 historic buildings, site or resource types including such diverse resources as courthouses, farms, homesteads, structures in municipal parks, theaters, hotels, ranches, bridges and depots. In that time, eight of the structures have been lost. The average time between listing and demolition was 4.6 years. The average age of demolished buildings was 88 years. Of note, is that nothing has been demolished that has been listed after 2009. Of the sites listed as Most Endangered Places since 2004, 36 have been determined by PT to have been saved, or no longer threatened. Many representatives of these saved sites, point to their listing as an MEP as a contributor to the ‘saving’ of the site.

Trends 2011-2015:

- Lack of statewide annual meeting or conference impacted the ability to effectively train local preservation partners.

Areas of Focus 2016-2020:

- Provide an organized advocacy training program for local nonprofits/advocacy groups.
- Revisit annual conference concept for all statewide partners.
- Prioritize Preservation Summit as premier platform for access to legislators.
- Support further development of localized historic homeowner resource centers.

The 2016 Preservation Texas Summit postcard announcement, courtesy Preservation Texas.
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www.gsa.gov/portal/content/104441

Bruce MacDougal
Executive Director
San Antonio Conservation Society
www.saconservation.org/
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Executive Director/CEO  
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Dr. Steve Tomka  
Director, Center for Archaeological Research  
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### Appendix B: National Historic Landmarks in Texas as of August 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year listed</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamo</td>
<td>December 19, 1960</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alibates Flint Quarries</td>
<td>October 15, 1966</td>
<td>Fritch</td>
<td>Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo Mission Control Center</td>
<td>October 3, 1985</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastrop State Park</td>
<td>September 25, 1997</td>
<td>Bastrop</td>
<td>Bastrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamizal National Memorial</td>
<td>February 4, 1974</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealey Plaza Historic District</td>
<td>October 12, 1993</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End Historic District</td>
<td>May 11, 1976</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELISSA (Bark)</td>
<td>December 14, 1990</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espada Aqueduct</td>
<td>July 19, 1964</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Park Texas Centennial Buildings</td>
<td>September 24, 1986</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Belknap</td>
<td>December 19, 1960</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Brown</td>
<td>December 19, 1960</td>
<td>Brownsville</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Concho</td>
<td>July 4, 1961</td>
<td>San Angelo</td>
<td>Tom Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Davis</td>
<td>December 19, 1960</td>
<td>Fort Davis</td>
<td>Jeff Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Richardson</td>
<td>November 27, 1963</td>
<td>Jacksboro</td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Sam Houston</td>
<td>May 15, 1975</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nance Garner House</td>
<td>December 8, 1976</td>
<td>Uvalde</td>
<td>Uvalde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Mansion (Austin)</td>
<td>December 2, 1974</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Travis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangar 9, Brooks Air Force Base</td>
<td>December 8, 1976</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrell Site</td>
<td>July 19, 1964</td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park Shopping Village</td>
<td>February 16, 2000</td>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J A Ranch (Goodnight Ranch)</td>
<td>December 19, 1960</td>
<td>Amarillo</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndon B. Johnson Natl Historic Park</td>
<td>December 2, 1969</td>
<td>Johnson City</td>
<td>Blanco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Ranch</td>
<td>November 5, 1961</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>Kenedy, Kleberg, Nueces, and Willacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landergin Mesa</td>
<td>July 19, 1964</td>
<td>Vega</td>
<td>Oldham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock Lake Site</td>
<td>December 22, 1977</td>
<td>Lubbock</td>
<td>Lubbock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Date/Year</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lucas Gusher, Spindletop Oil Field</td>
<td>November 13, 1966</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Majestic Theatre</td>
<td>April 19, 1993</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mission Concepcion</td>
<td>April 15, 1970</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Palmito Ranch Battlefield</td>
<td>September 25, 1997</td>
<td>Brownsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Palo Alto Battlefield</td>
<td>December 19, 1960</td>
<td>Brownsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Plainview Site</td>
<td>January 20, 1961</td>
<td>Plainview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Porter Farm</td>
<td>July 19, 1964</td>
<td>Terrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Presidio Nuestra Senora De Loreto De La Bahia</td>
<td>December 24, 1967</td>
<td>Goliad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Randolph Field Historic District</td>
<td>August 7, 2001</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Samuel T. Rayburn House</td>
<td>May 11, 1976</td>
<td>Bonham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Resaca De La Palma Battlefield</td>
<td>December 19, 1960</td>
<td>Brownsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Roma Historic District</td>
<td>November 4, 1993</td>
<td>Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sam Houston House</td>
<td>May 30, 1974</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>San Antonio Missions</td>
<td>November 10, 1978</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>San Jacinto Battlefield</td>
<td>December 19, 1960</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>San Jose Mission</td>
<td>October 15, 1966</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Space Environment Simulation Laboratory, Chambers A and B</td>
<td>October 3, 1985</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Spanish Governor's Palace</td>
<td>April 15, 1970</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Strand Historic District</td>
<td>May 11, 1976</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>TEXAS (USS)</td>
<td>December 8, 1976</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Texas State Capitol</td>
<td>June 23, 1986</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Trevino-Uribe Rancho</td>
<td>August 5, 1998</td>
<td>San Ygnacio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Texas Multiple Property Nominations (by county) as of August 31, 2015

MPS = Multiple Property Submission  
MRA = Multiple Resource Area  
TR = Thematic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palestine, Texas MPS</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelina County MRA</td>
<td>Angelina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastrop Historic and Architectural MRA</td>
<td>Bastrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Architectural Resources Associated with the Rosenwald Schoole Program in Texas</td>
<td>Bastrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Chase Field MPS</td>
<td>Bee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belton MPS</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salado MRA</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Air Force Base MPS</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Farms and Ranches of Bexar County</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Settlement of Bosque County TR</td>
<td>Bosque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Columbia MPS</td>
<td>Brazoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan MRA</td>
<td>Brazos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hot Springs MPS</td>
<td>Brewster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney MPS</td>
<td>Collin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hill Texas MRA</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East and South Dallas MPS</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian Revival Buildings of Southern Methodist University TR</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Cliff MPS</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Century Pottery Kilns of Denton Co. TR</td>
<td>Denton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuero MRA</td>
<td>DeWitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Structures of El Paso by Henry C. Trost TR</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennis MRA</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxahachie MRA</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District MRA</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston Central Business District/Downtown MPS</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Heights MRA</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Heights MPS</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Architectural Resources of Rural Hays County</td>
<td>Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos MRA</td>
<td>Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Hidalgo County MPS</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro MRA</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford MRA</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris MRA</td>
<td>Lamar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacogdoches MPS</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsicana MPS</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Road Infrastructure of Texas, 1866-1965</td>
<td>Palo Pinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherford MPS</td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources Associated with Milton Faver, Agriculturalist, MPS</td>
<td>Presidio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Architectural Resources of Tyler MPS</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches with Decorative Interior Painting TR</td>
<td>statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Bridges of Texas MPS</td>
<td>statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexican Pastor Sites in Texas Panhandle TR</td>
<td>statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenwald Schools</td>
<td>statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 66 in Texas MPS</td>
<td>statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture of Dionicio Rodriguez</td>
<td>statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources of El Camino Real de los Tejas National Trail</td>
<td>statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine MPS</td>
<td>Tarrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Architectural Resources of Mansfield MPS</td>
<td>Tarrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilene MPS</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Angelo MRA</td>
<td>Tom Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Austin MRA</td>
<td>Travis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park MPS</td>
<td>Travis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Travis County MPS</td>
<td>Travis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria MRA</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A and M University MPS</td>
<td>Waller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenham MPS</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton MPS</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappell Hill MRA</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown MRA</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D: Historic Context Studies in Texas published by Texas Department of Transportation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*These studies were published by the Texas Department of Transportation and may contain information and recommendations that the Texas Historical Commission has not concurred or approved.*
Appendix E: Links to National, State and Local Organizations

Within the preservation community are many important preservation partners. Below is a sampling of national, state and local agencies and organizations with preservation or complementary missions.

**National Preservation Resources**
- African American Heritage Preservation Foundation: www.aahpfdn.org
- The Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation: www.ahlp.org
- The Alliance for National Heritage Areas: www.nationalheritageareas.com
- American Cultural Resource Association: www.acra-crm.org
- American Institute of Architects: www.aia.org
- American Planning Association: www.planning.org
- American Society of Landscape Architects: www.asla.org
- Association for Preservation Technology International: www.apti.org
- Conservation Online: www.cool.conservation-us.org
- The Cultural Landscape Foundation: www.tclf.org
- Historic Bridge Foundation: www.historicbridgefoundation.com
- National Alliance of Preservation Commissions: www.uga.edu/napc
- National Center for Preservation Technology and Training: www.ncptt.nps.gov
- National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers: www.ncshpo.org
- National Film Preservation Board: lcweb.loc.gov/film/
- National Historic Landmarks Program: www.nps.gov/nhl/
- National Main Street Center, Inc.: www.preservationnation.org/main-street
- National Park Service: www.nps.gov/history
- National Register for Historic Places: www.nps.gov/history
- National Trust for Historic Preservation: www.preservationnation.org
- Preservation Action: www.preservationaction.org
- Preservation Magazine: www.preservationnation.org/magazine
- Preservation Trades Network: www.preservenet.cornell.edu
- PreserveNet: www.preservenet.cornell.edu
- Rails to Trails: www.railstotrails.org
- Partners for Sacred Places: www.sacredplaces.org
- Scenic America: www.scenic.org
- Transportation Action Network: www.transact.org
- Trust for Public Land: www.tpl.org

**State Preservation Resources**
- American Planning Association, Texas Chapter: www.txplanning.org
- Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum: www.thefirststoryoftexas.com/
- Council of Texas Archeologists: www.counciloftexasarcheologists.org
- Friends of the Texas Historical Commission, Inc.: www.thcfriends.org
- Institute of Texan Cultures: www.texancultures.com
- The Handbook of Texas Online: www.tshaonline.org
- State Preservation Board: www.tspb.state.tx.us
- Texas Archeological Society: www.txarch.org
- Texas Association of Counties: www.county.org
- Texas Downtown Association: www.texasdowntown.org
- Texas Escapes: www.texasescapes.com
- Texas Historical Commission: www.thc.state.tx.us
- Texas Historical Foundation: www.texashistoricalfoundation.org
- Texas Legislature Online: www.capitol.state.tx.us
- Texas Parks and Wildlife: www.tpwd.state.tx.us
- Texas Rural Leadership Program: www.trlp.org
- Texas Society of Architects: www.texasarchitect.org
- Texas State Historical Association: www.tshaonline.org
- Tribal Contacts for Texas: www.thc.state.tx.us/project-review/tribal-consultation-guidelines/tribal-contacts
Local Non-Profit Preservation Partners
Abilene Preservation League www.abilenepreservation.org
Galveston Historical Foundation www.galvestonhistory.org
Preservation Houston www.preservationhouston.org
Historic Fort Worth www.historicfortworth.org
Historic Mesquite www.cityofmesquite.com
Historic Tyler www.historictyler.org
Preservation Dallas www.preservationdallas.org
San Antonio Conservation Society www.saconservation.org

Reference Sites with Links to Preservation Organizations, Resources and Communities
Links to partners on the THC website www.thc.state.tx.us/links-partners
Link to Guidelines for Tribal Consultation www.thc.state.tx.us/project-review/
tribal-consultation-guidelines
Link to partners on Preservation Texas’ website www.preservationtexas.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=20&Itemid=19
Link to County Historical Commission websites www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/
county-historical-commission-outreach
Link to Main Street cities www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/
texas-main-street
Link to Certified Local Governments in Texas www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/certified-local-government
Archeology Links www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/archeology/external-archeology-links