

The Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan: An Analysis of Best Practice Qualities

Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation, Draft: 02-26-19

Background

In 2014 the City of Madison formed an ad hoc committee to rewrite Madison's 40-year old landmark ordinance. Known as the Landmarks Ordinance Revision Committee (LORC), it was composed of five alders, two of whom represented historic districts and three of whom did not. They met 21 times over a two-year period and in July 2015 with the help of Amy Scanlon, Madison's preservation planner, and Assistant City Attorney John Strange, produced a new ordinance and assigned it to Chapter 41 in the Municipal Code. However, by design they deferred action on subchapter G that covers the Madison's five historic districts to a "Phase 2."

Also left for Phase 2 were two related projects: a comprehensive historic preservation plan (CHPP) and a survey of historic resources that focused on Native Americans, women, the LGBTQ community, and several ethnic groups including African-Americans, Hmong, and Hispanics.

In 2016 the City issued a Request for Proposal for a consultant that could provide these three remaining historic preservation tasks and Legacy Architects Inc. was selected. Public engagement meetings and work on the special survey of underrepresented group began in 2017. The CHPP project was begun in 2018 under the guidance of a new special purpose committee, the Madison Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee, staffed by Legacy Architects and the City. The final ordinance work was begun by the reactivated LORC in early 2019 staffed by Legacy, the city's preservation planner, and the assistant city attorney.

Our citizen committee, the Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation, was formed in 2014 to assist the City with its major ordinance revision. We argued that the new ordinance should have its own dedicated chapter in the Municipal Code, Chapter 41, suggested that Madison should base its new ordinance on a new model ordinance recommended by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and prepared the initial drafts of Chapter 41.

In late 2018 we decided to reactivate our Alliance to assist the City with its Phase 2 tasks. Nearly all of our members from 2014-2015 agreed to serve again and we were pleased to add several new members. A roster of our current members is provided in Appendix A.

We intend to focus our work on two fronts: (1) the revision of Subchapter G, Historic Districts; and (2) the development of the CHPP. We have already submitted several reports Subchapter G to LORC and will submit several more. This is the first of three reports we hope to prepare to assist the City with the CHPP project. We also intend to produce two other CHPP-related reports:

- *A proposed outline for Madison's CHPP*
- *How all elements in the Advisory Committee's "laundry list" can be accommodated in the proposed outline for Madison's CHPP.*

We hope that Legacy, City staff, the Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee and all others who read our report will find our work constructive and timely.

A Model Template for Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plans (CHPP): 10 Best Practice Qualities

As our Alliance members reflected on our work during the creation of Chapter 41 (2014-2015), we concluded that one of our most important recommendations was to use the new National Trust-recommended model ordinance as a template for Madison. Therefore, we concluded that during Phase 2 we could be most helpful to the City by identifying the qualities of a *model CHPP*. We made this decision for four reasons.

First, we wanted Madison to have a state-of-the-art CHPP.

Second, as we studied CHPPs we quickly learned that remarkably little has been published on best practice CHPPs in spite of its capstone role in the toolbox of preservation planners. Therefore, we realized that we would have to conduct our own analysis of this highly specialized genre.

Third, although Madison has produced several “preservation plans,” none was a CHPP in the sense that the preservation planners use that term today. In fact, the CHPP produced by Legacy and the Advisory Committee will be Madison’s first true CHPP—a sophisticated guidance system for the next decade.

Fourth, one of the primary purposes of a CHPP is to sustain and enhance a city’s distinctive and beloved qualities, and Madison has plenty! Indeed, from the time it was founded in 1836, visitors, residents, planners, and city-ranking organizations have declared Madison to be a very special city based on its unique isthmus site, its vaunted national beauty, its elegant capitol on a dominating hill at the waist of the isthmus, its rare mix of government, education and commercial functions, its distinctive residential neighborhoods, its unusual radial street plan modeled after Washington D.C, and its distinction of being the only city in the country to have the streets in the original plat named after signers of the Constitution.

For our analysis we sought several of the most highly-regarded CHPPs in the country. Some were highlighted by Madison’s preservation planner on the City of Madison website, some were recommended by an expert at the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and some emerged from our own research. A summary of those eleven CHPPs is provided in Appendix B.

Our CHPPs varied in length from 40 to 290 pages and included cities that ranged in age from 114 to nearly 400 years and in population from 38,000 to 672,000, and were published between 2000 and 2018. We do not say that our sample is scientific, but we do assert that it is *representative* of best practice CHPPs

It is hard to exaggerate the benefits we derived from reading these documents. They sparkled with ideas and concepts and from our analysis of them we identified *ten best practice qualities* we believe should be incorporated in Madison's CHPP. Those ten qualities are the focus of this report.

QUALITY 1. THE UNIQUE CAPSTONE ROLE AND SHARED SPECIFICATIONS OF CHPPs

A. The unique capstone role of CHPPs

Among professional preservation consultants the CHPP is widely considered to be the most complicated and sophisticated product of their repertoire. This is because the CHPP forms the basic framework, context, and rationale for all historic preservation plans, programs, policies, ordinances and their

relationships with economic development, planning, zoning, and all other public policies and purposes. The CHPP is the foundation document for everything; it is a city's historic preservation master plan.

B. Shared specifications of CHPPs

1. Unique comprehensive scope and tools

The CHPP is the only document in the preservationist's repertoire that is truly comprehensive in scope and uses nearly every tool in the preservationist's toolbox. This is why best practice CHPPs use the term "comprehensive" in their title. CHPPs typically include the following tools:

Regulatory tools

- Ordinances
- Historic districts
- Conservation districts
- District-specific standards and guidelines
- Design manuals
- Zoning
- Historic resource surveys
- Landmark designations
- Context statements
- Project approval procedures

Financial incentive tools

- Tax credits
- Tax incremental districts
- Incentive funds

Educational tools

- Signage
- Walking tours

2. Relatively rare

Relatively few cities with preservationist ordinances and commissions have CHPPs. This is partly because CHPPs are generally done by communities *after* they have reached a relatively high level of preservation sophistication and partly because only a few preservation planners specialize in this difficult and demanding genre.

3. Definition of historic preservation

We found the following definition of historic preservation from the 2008 St. Paul, Minnesota CHPP to be outstanding:

"Historic preservation is an activity that preserves historic resources, and their ability to communicate their intended meaning and significance. It includes the identification, evaluation, designation, protection and retention of significant architectural, historic and cultural resources in the built and natural environments. Resources can range from small objects, buildings and structures, to sites and districts, to landscapes and streetscapes, to entire view corridors. By protecting the historic character and fabric of the community, preservation enables the people of today and tomorrow to connect with the people and events

that underlie their past. More recently, historic preservation has become associated with healthy living, sustainability, and green building to support the retention of older buildings, create a strong and unique sense of place, and enhance the quality of life in a community.”

4. A 10-year time frame

Nearly all CHPPs in our sample used a 10-year timeframe and broke down goals into activities that can be achieved in the short term (1-3 years), intermediate term (4-6 years), long-term (7-10 years), and ongoing.

5. CHPPs are done before ordinance revisions

Best practices dictate that CHPPs should be done *before* an ordinance is revised. This is because the CHPP establishes a very detailed big picture framework that is subsequently embodied in an ordinance. [Unfortunately, Madison completed its first major revision of its ordinance in 40 years in 2014-2015 and only now is doing its CHPP. Therefore, Madison must expect to make substantive revisions to its new ordinance. In fact, Legacy Architects, Madison’s CHPP consultant, has already proposed several dozen changes to the 2015 ordinance.]

6. CHPPs are an integral component of a city’s 10-year master planning process.

[Hold for insert on the state requirement that cities prepare master plans every 10 years and how the CHPP is a key component of this process.]

7. A useful reference document

A well-done CHPP should also function as a convenient reference document for city officials and citizens. This is because the CHPP provides a clear and comprehensive framework for just about everything done to advance historic preservation and is a convenient repository of user-friendly graphics, appendixes, and a bibliography. It tells readers what has been done, where the city needs to go and why, and how it should get there.

QUALITY 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Busy people require concise, clear, thoughtfully-organized, and comprehensive summaries of long documents such as CHPPs. That’s why almost all in our sample contained an executive summary. But distilling complex CHPPs requires discipline and rigorous thought. The best CHPPs use what journalists call “headline logic,” very brief paragraphs, and bullet points to catch the eye.

QUALITY 3. HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL PERSPECTIVE

CHPP consultants recognize that many who read their reports know very little about historic preservation and so they almost always include a chapter that describes its history and context. And those chapters follow a very predictable path.

A. The national context

Most begin with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and then describe how its sweeping directives provide the direction and power for the modern preservation movement. It is hard to overemphasize the importance of the 1966 act and its consequences, but many CHPP writers devote a long and often tedious chapter to this story. Our recommendation is to summarize this story in just a few paragraphs and to relegate the rest to an appendix.

B. The state context

Next CHPP authors survey pertinent state laws and the role played by the state historic preservation office. Once again, brevity should be the guiding principle with most details relegated to an appendix.

C. The local experience

After describing national legislation and the state planning framework, CHPP consultants provide a detailed description of historic preservation at the *local* level. Typically, they provide key mileposts followed by an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. This lays the groundwork for specific strategies, policies and actions—the master plan that follows.

QUALITY 4. LOCAL HISTORY

Most CHPP authors devote an entire chapter to local history but their methods vary considerably. Authors reason that in order to appreciate local historic preservation, one must first know the basics of local history. The best CHPPs enliven this topic by breaking down history into eras and by supplementing these eras with graphics.

A second popular method is to organize the chapter based on what preservationists call “context statements,” a technical term used by the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation Planning* (1983). Essentially, context statements are conceptual nets used by consultants, historians, and city staff to catch specific types of historic resources. Context statements typically include a broad range of city-specific topics such as railroad transportation, community founders, agricultural implement factories, and open space planning. For each topic historians prepare a synopsis that provides dates, themes, key events, and leaders, and these context statements are then used to systematically search for all properties with associations to it.

A third method is to provide both a summary of local history *and* context statements.

All are valid and useful but each has limits. For example, some who use the local history option drone on and on and on and lose their readers in tedious detail. Some who use the context statement think their job is to inflict a technical seminar on their readers. The best CHPPs follow a very abbreviated “highlight” approach and relegate the rest to an appendix.

QUALITY 5. NEW TRENDS IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION

When historic preservation began to enjoy widespread acceptance in the 60s, 70s, and 80s, it was almost exclusively focused on the identification and preservation of landmarks and the creation of historic districts. Today, the definition and practice of historic preservation has expanded to include many new trends:

A. Broadening the definition

Today, historic preservation goes beyond the built environment to include cultural, social, economic, and political history and landscape features including open space and natural beauty.

B. Focusing on how historic preservation contributes to distinctive city character and sense of place.

Today, most civic leaders recognize that a city's older neighborhoods and its downtown largely define a city's distinctiveness, charm, and sense of place. This is why historic preservation must play an essential role in creating great cities.

C. Increasing attention on the inclusion of under-represented populations

The historic preservation movement has rarely given sufficient attention to ethnic groups including African-Americans, Hispanics, Hmong, women, and members of the LGBTQ community. Today, preservationists are scrambling to make sure that these under-represented populations are appropriately recognized and that their stories are told.

D. Increasing attention to Native Americans and archeology

Today's preservationists tell residents and visitors about the history of Native Americans using archeological digs and contemporary research. [In Madison we have an extraordinary opportunity to tell residents and visitors that we have the greatest concentration of Indian mounds in North America.]

E. Harnessing the power of historic preservation to help cities achieve sustainability, economic development, and housing goals.

1. Sustainability

The environmental crusade of the 1960s focused public attention on a spectrum of long-ignored issues including the need for energy conservation and sustainable lifestyles. However, only in recent decades have sustainability advocates understood the large role that historic preservation can play in achieving this societal goal. They include the recognition that old buildings:

- Are the greenest because they provide "embodied energy"
- Often use less energy than new buildings because of their orientation, cross ventilation, and operable windows
- Do not require expensive new infrastructure
- Can become energy efficient when retrofitted with insulation and when old windows are properly repaired

Similarly, compact old neighborhoods:

- Allow people to walk to work or take the bus and reduce the need for carbon-spewing cars
- Reduce urban sprawl and are therefore a key component of "smart growth"

2. Economic development

Tax base

Rehabilitating historic resources has proved to be a dependable catalyst for increasing the real estate tax base while maintaining a distinctive sense of place.

Job creation

Numerous studies have shown that rehabbing old houses generates more local jobs than building new structures.

Heritage Tourism

Today, civic leaders recognize that heritage tourism is one of the most powerful and dependable generators of economic growth, and so they take appropriate steps to optimize its contribution.

3. Housing

[Hold for insert]

F. Making historic preservation an integral part of city management.

Historically, many cities treated historic preservation as an orphan entitled to polite lip service and little more. Today's preservation movement leaders are finding ways to make this function an integral part of building inspection and permitting, neighborhood planning, urban design, urban forestry, and open space.

G. Expanding the geographic scope of historic preservation.

As cities grow and sprawl, older historic areas are almost always adversely affected by densification pressures and the need for higher capacity roads. This is why historic preservationists are realizing that they must be involved in "suburban" decisions and why the actions of metropolitan governments and planning agencies are so critical. (See also Strategy #9 in Section D below.)

H. Including historic preservation in disaster planning.

Global warming and the extreme weather it generates have caused historic preservationists to add still another responsibility to their portfolio: *heritage disaster management*. The first cities to do this were the hurricane-prone cities of the East Coast and South, but today, cities that have been hit by floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, and fires now do heritage disaster plans. [The 15 inch rain that hit Cross Plains on August 20, 2018 sensitized Madison preservationists to the importance of developing flood plans. If one of these increasingly common extreme rains had fallen over Madison, the isthmus would be transformed into a peninsula and many older neighborhoods would suffer extensive damage.]

QUALITY 6. CHPP METHODOLOGY

CHPP authors typically spend many pages describing their methodology, but the substance boils down to a judicious mix of public engagement and professional expertise. Public engagement typically includes structured public meetings and interviews with stakeholders. Then the consultant blends this information with his/her knowledge of what the cities with the best CHPPs are doing. This is the step where the CHPP is transformed into a state-of-the-art plan for the consultant's client city.

QUALITY 7. STRUCTURE AND SEQUENCING OF THE MASTER PLAN

The heart and soul of all CHPPs is the plan itself and as we scrutinized the 11 in our sample, we quickly discovered that all cover a remarkably similar spectrum of topics, but in differing formats. As we studied this pattern, we concluded that CHPP structure should: satisfy two criteria; be hierarchical; and be sequenced in accord with several principles.

A. Structural criteria

Best practice CHPPs should satisfy two criteria: comprehensive and coherent/clear.

Comprehensive means that the consultant covers *all* of the territory constituting today's expanded definition of the preservationist movement noted in quality #5.

Coherent/clear means that the key topics of the plan must be:

- the fewest number that cover today's expanded territory
- sequenced in accord with compelling principles
- described in jargon-free language

B. The hierarchical structure of CHPPs

Read best practice CHPPs and you will discover that they are replete with directional terms including vision, goals, objectives, strategies, policies, mission, activities, and purpose. Although CHPP authors use these terms in slightly different ways, they all use them consistently and hierarchically. This means that a CHPP author has three choices: (1) adopt an existing typology; (2) adapt one or more existing typologies; or (3) invent an entirely new one. Our analysis persuaded us that the best course of action was to *adapt* concepts from several plans. More specifically, we suggest the following typology:

Vision: *An aspirational statement describing a long-term big picture destination that citizens say they want their city to achieve.*

Example: We want Madison to become a recognized national leader in historic preservation.

Mission: This term is generally reserved for the fundamental purpose of an *organization*, not a plan such as a CHPP. Therefore, we do not believe mission is appropriate in this context.

Purpose of a CHPP: Although CHPP authors use slightly different statements of purpose, all follow a remarkably similar pattern and use many of the same words. Here is our rendition of a best practice statement of purpose:

The purpose of a CHPP is to provide more effective identification, preservation, protection, interpretation, and promotion of the historic resources that define the city's distinctive character by organizing diverse historic preservation efforts into a coherent plan.

Goal and objective: *Interchangeable terms that constitute a specific destination.*

Strategies: *A cluster of logically-related top-of-the-hierarchy goals whose scope and content comprehensively cover the most important components of historic preservation and whose achievement requires multiple policies and actions, and collaboration among disparate groups.*

We suggest that the following principles should govern the use of strategies:

- A CHPP should be composed of the fewest number of relatively short, clear, optimally discrete, logically-related, and coherently sequenced *statements of strategic direction* that cover all of the territory in today's expanded definition of historic preservation and provide the most effective protection for historic resources.

- Totally independent statements of strategic direction are neither possible nor desirable. In fact, all strategy statements overlap to some degree. The goal is to achieve *minimal* conceptual overlap between statements of strategic direction as in slightly overlapping circles.

- Each strategic statement should be broken down into clearly-stated, comprehensively-scoped policies and actions as defined below. Sometimes policies need to be broken down into sub-policies.

Policies: *A logically distinct method to achieve a strategy.*

Actions: *A method for achieving a policy that can be measured, prioritized, and calendarized.*

C. Best sequencing of strategies

Once the typology is settled, CHPP authors must determine how to sequence strategies. Based upon our analysis, we believe the following sequence possesses great merit:

1. Begin with “leadership” because without it no CHPP can succeed.
2. Cluster and sequence the *three fundamental functions* of historic preservation:
 - Identifying, evaluating and designating historical resources
 - Preserving and protecting *designated* historical resources
 - Preserving *undesignated* areas with unique architectural, urban and spatial characteristics that enhance the character of the built environment.
3. Recognize two essential “support” functions:
 - researching, writing, and publishing of local history
 - historic preservation education and outreach
4. Recognize the need to end preservation's all too common “orphan” status in city hall by integrating historic preservation planning into the city's decision-making and administrative processes.
5. Remind civic leaders that historic preservation should play a large but often unrecognized role in helping the city achieve economic development, sustainability, and inclusivity goals.
6. Recognize that metropolitan and even regional policies play significant roles in achieving historic preservation goals.
7. And, finally, focus on the need to provide preservation with the financial resources and incentive programs it requires.

D. Ten strategies that best define a comprehensive historic preservation plan

From our analysis of best practice CHPPs, one fact was clear: CHPP authors found many different ways to structure their reports. However, we also concluded that the structure of this complex genre could be improved by using clarifying criteria, a more compelling hierarchy, and a more logical sequence of key recommendations noted above. Using these tools, we concluded that the best way to satisfy these criteria required 10 strategies. Those ten strategies are outlined below.

Strategy 1. Provide spirited historic preservation leadership

Experienced CHPP consultants assert that the single most historic preservation factor is effective leadership. Take leadership out of the equation and preservation will struggle. Include spirited, committed, and well-informed leaders and preservation programs will flourish. Although CHPPs are routinely commissioned by cities and focus mostly on public sector actions, public *and* private sector roles must be addressed.

Strategy 2. Identify, evaluate, and designate historic resources

All CHPPs rely on specialized surveys to identify historic resources. To be effective, surveys must be done periodically and as time goes by cover an ever-expanding territory. This strategy specifies who should do what type of surveys when, how, and at what cost to keep knowledge of historic resources current. Once the surveys are completed, they must be evaluated to determine whether additional landmarks and historic districts should be designated.

Strategy 3. Preserve and protect *designated* historic resources

Once designated, resources must be effectively preserved and protected and most CHPP authors spend many pages on this key function. This strategy details the policies and actions necessary to achieve this function.

Strategy 4. Preserve and protect *undesigned* areas with unique architectural and contextual qualities that enhance the character of the built environment

What some CHPPs fail to recognize is that as homes and neighborhoods age they become eligible for designation as landmarks and districts. And some neighborhoods, while not eligible as historic districts, may require some level of protection such as a conservation district. Therefore, the purpose of this strategy is to remind civic leaders about the constant need to keep a rolling list of undesigned resources and to protect them appropriately.

Strategy 5. Recognize and encourage researching, writing, and publishing of local history.

We were surprised to discover that none of the eleven CHPPs we analyzed emphasized this strategy prominently, although some mentioned it. That said, this strategy is the foundation and life blood of historic preservation. Read a nomination for a local landmark or a district for the National Register and you will find a bibliography of well-researched articles and books that provide the essential detail and context. This is why we believe this function deserves to be included in our model template.

Strategy 6. Increase the effectiveness of historic preservation education and outreach

All CHPPs emphasize this strategy because historic preservation is so poorly understood, much less supported by the public, property owners, developers, and even city hall staff. This strategy details how these critically-important functions can be achieved.

Strategy 7. Integrate historic preservation planning into the decision-making and administrative processes of the city.

For decades city employees paid little attention to historic preservation; indeed, in the spectrum of city services, it was a veritable orphan. Today that situation is changing as elected officials and civic leaders recognize that historic preservation must be a key component of urban revitalization. That is because this strategy plays such a large role in keeping neighborhoods distinctive, making downtowns popular destinations, and increasing the tax base. Common applications include enforcing codes, promoting compact and walkable neighborhoods, restoring canopy street trees, undergrounding utilities, and installing old-fashioned street lights. These actions underline the importance of making city employees who provide these services an integral part of the preservation team.

Strategy 8. Harness historic preservation to achieve city goals in economic development, land use, tourism, sustainability, and inclusivity

Every best practice CHPP we analyzed recognized that this strategy is one of the most effective and important methods to achieve high priority city goals. Consider heritage and cultural tourism. Well-preserved downtowns and historic neighborhoods are predictable magnets for tourists and when they come, they stay longer and spend more money than business travelers. This means more real estate taxes from restaurants and hotels. A second example emphasized in many of the best CHPPs is inclusivity. Today, most U.S. cities are using historic preservation to achieve social justice goals by landmarking sites and telling stories associated with ethnic groups, women, and the LGBTQ community.

Strategy 9. Address historic preservation needs in a metropolitan context

As noted in Quality #5 above (new trends in historic preservation), today's preservationists know they can no longer focus *only* on the older parts of a city. This is because growth and densification place cruel pressures on old neighborhoods including the need to replace houses with high rises and razing whole corridors for expressways. Although this strategy is one of the newest components of historic preservation, it is an increasingly important one.

Strategy 10. Strengthen and promote financial support and incentives for historic preservation

Where will the money come from to fuel historic preservation? That is the question this strategy must answer. It was no accident that all CHPP authors in our sample devoted substantial space to this critically important question.

QUALITY 8. PRIORITIZED ACTION PLAN

Here CHPP authors translate the master plan into a series of specific prioritized actions. Nearly all use a matrix with the following six columns:

Strategy	Policy	Action	Time frame	Responsible parties	Resources Required/ Funding sources

Nearly all use four categories for the time frame:

- Short term 1 to 3 years
- Intermediate term 4 to 6 years
- Long term 7 to 10 years
- Ongoing

Abbreviations are routinely used for designating “responsible parties.” For example, Landmarks Commission might be abbreviated as LC.

Examples of action plans are provided in Appendix C.

QUALITY 9. EYE AND MIND-APPEALING DESIGN

Another quality shared by best-practice CHPPs is eye and mind-appealing design. These two qualities are yoked together because what is pleasing to the eye is often compelling to the mind. Here is a list of qualities we found in best practice CHPPs:

- Use professional page layout specialists. This assures that every page will have a pleasing mix of text, graphics, sidebars, heads, sub-heads, and white space.

- Use color on almost every page. It is hard to exaggerate the role that color plays in making the reading of a CHPP a page-turning joy.

- Use graphics extensively and thoughtfully. The best CHPPs make *extensive* use of photographs and artists’ drawings to achieve evocative and atmospheric goals and to provide compelling illustrations for the adjoining text. See Appendix D. The best CHPPs also make extensive use of custom-designed maps, charts, graphs, tables, logos, and time-lines. See Appendix E.

- Position graphics on the same page as the text reference.

- Provide captions for all graphics

- Use the landscape format because:

- text can be shown in a more legible three-column format
- graphics can be shown more flexibly in one, two, or three column sizes
- detailed action plans can be formatted in six or more columns

- Consecutively paginate the entire report (rather than chapter and page) and include the chapter title in the header of every page. These techniques provide the best “handrails” for readers.
- Provide a one-page table of contents so the reader can see the entire structure at a glance.
- Relegate many details to appendices to make the text to be more readable.

QUALITY 10. END MATTER

All of the CHPPs we analyzed made effective use of end matter defined as acknowledgements, graphic credits, appendices, end notes, and bibliographies. Here are some additional details about each:

A. Acknowledgements

This is where the CHPP authors acknowledge contributions of many individuals and organizations including:

- City government officials and organizations
 - Mayor
 - Members of the local governing body
 - Members of the historic preservation commission
 - Members of the city plan commission
 - Members of the urban design commission
 - Key persons in the city plan department including the director and the preservation staff.
 - Members of any special bodies created for this plan. (For the Madison CHPP this would include LORC and members of the Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee.)
- Citizens who participated in the process
- Sources of funds used to underwrite the study
- The consultant firm, project team members, and titles
- Name of the report designer
- Participating civic organizations

Some CHPPs place acknowledgements in the front and some in the back. Either way is OK.

B. Graphics credits

Nearly all best-practice CHPPs organized graphics credits by chapter and page.

C. Appendices

Here you see great variability among CHPPs but with common patterns. Some CHPPs position some of appendices in the text. Here are commonly used appendices:

1. List of National Register properties
2. List of local landmarks

3. Maps showing the locations of historic districts (local and national)
4. A copy of the local landmark ordinance
5. A copy of the authorizing resolution
6. A detailed explanation of the process used to prepare the CHPP
7. A map showing the location of tax credit projects
8. List of surveys done with maps showing their locations, years done, and key findings.
9. Benefits of historic preservation

D. End notes

Best practice CHPP authors use end notes to add credibility and precision.

E. Bibliography

A well-designed bibliography allows readers to find what they want quickly by providing useful categories such as:

- Secretary of the Interior documents
- Historic preservation, national
- Historic preservation, state
- Outstanding CHPPs
- Local history sources
- Neighborhood plans and studies
- Economic development and revitalization
- Heritage tourism

Appendix A. Members of the Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation

Franny Ingebritson

Linda Lehnertz

John Martens

Jim Matson

Fred Mohs

David Mollenhoff

Peter Ostlind

Kitty Rankin

Jim Skrentny

Kurt Stege

Gary Tipler

Appendix B. Preliminary List of outstanding CHPPs

City	Plan date	Plan title	Consultants	Recommended by	# of pages
Amherst, MA	2005	<i>Amherst Preservation Plan</i>	•Martha Lyon Landscape Architecture •Giezentanner Associates	MAHP	50
Anchorage, AL	2018	<i>Anchorage's Historic Preservation Plan: A Strategy for Historic Preservation, Neighborhood Revitalization, and Economic Development</i>	Anchorage Planning Department and the Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission	Madison web site	141
Asheville, NC	2015	<i>Historic Preservation Master Plan for Asheville and Buncombe County, North Carolina</i>	•Historic Resources Commission of Asheville and Buncombe County	Madison web site	105
Boulder, CO	2013	<i>A Sense of Place, A Sense of Purpose: A Plan for the City of Boulder's Historic Preservation Program</i>	•Dr. Mary Therese Anstey, History Matters, LLC •City of Boulder Community Planning and Sustainability Department	Madison web site	43
Charleston, SC	2007	<i>Vision/Community/Heritage: A Preservation Plan for Charleston, S.C.</i>	•Page & Turnbull, San Francisco, CA	National Trust	290
Iowa City, IA	2008	<i>Iowa City Historic Preservation Plan</i>	•Svendsen Tyler, Inc. Sarona, WI •Clarion Associates, LLC Denver, CO	MAHP	116
St. Paul, MN	2008	<i>City of St. Paul Comprehensive Plan</i>	•106 Group Minnesota, Virginia, and Washington D.C.	Madison web site MAHP	70
Salem, MA	2015	<i>City of Salem Historic Preservation Plan Update</i>	•Community Opportunities Group, Inc.	Madison web site	177
Salt Lake City, UT	2012	<i>Salt Lake City Community Preservation Plan: A Citywide Guide to Community Preservation Efforts in Salt Lake City</i>	•Salt Lake City Planning Division	Madison web site	206
Topeka, KS	2013	<i>Historic Preservation Plan, City of Topeka</i>	•Heritage Strategies, LLC, Birchrunville, PA	LORC-1 process	120
Washington D.C.	2018	<i>2020: District of Columbia Historic Preservation Plan, Preserving for Progress</i>	•Historic Preservation Office, DC Office of Planning, Washington D.C.	National Trust	94

Appendix C. Examples of CHPP implementation plans

Appendix D. Examples of effective use of photographs and artists' drawings

Appendix E. Examples of effective use of tables, charts, time-lines, etc.