

Public Summary

- Historic preservation benefits Montana – culturally, educationally, functionally, and economically. State Preservation Plans guide preservation efforts at the state and local level and are required under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, for the use of federally appropriated funds to assist those efforts.
- This Montana Plan for 2003 – 2007, *Working Together to PRESERVE MONTANA*, is a revision or update of the previous 1997 Plan. It was developed with input, both direct and indirect, from a broad base of interested parties and stakeholders, including the public, historic preservation professionals, government officials, tribal representatives, state and local preservation organizations, avocationalists, and educational specialists.
- Montana has a rich and varied set of heritage properties (i.e., historic, prehistoric, and traditional cultural places) that represent different themes in Montana history. Over 40,000 historic and prehistoric sites, buildings, structures, and districts have been identified and recorded in the state, with nearly 1,000 of these listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Many more are known or expected to exist as less than 5% of Montana has been inventoried to date. A significant number of Montana's heritage properties are at risk due to such factors as incompatible commercial and resource development, urban sprawl, neglect, mismanagement, changing population needs, lack of public awareness, and limited financial resources.
- Significant issues and challenges face Montana preservation over the next five years. They include finding ways to: address the availability of necessary financial resources; enhance the local ability to preserve historic/cultural resources; increase public awareness of culture/preservation issues; and facilitate tribal participation in historic preservation.
- The vision for historic preservation in Montana, and thereby the mission of the State Historic Preservation Office, over the next five years is: ***Working together with all Montanans to preserve the state's significant historic, prehistoric and traditional cultural places.*** Five goals to guide preservation in achieving this vision are to:
 - I. *Foster a preservation ethic for Montana's heritage properties.*
 - II. *Identify, evaluate, and recognize Montana's heritage properties.*
 - III. *Create and support a statewide source for information about Montana heritage properties and historic preservation.*
 - IV. *Encourage the involvement of Montana's tribes in historic preservation.*
 - V. *Work effectively with all agencies, organizations, and individuals for good stewardship and sensitive treatment of Montana's heritage properties.*

I. Introduction

Why Preserve? The Benefits of Historic Preservation

The benefits of preserving Montana's historic and prehistoric resources are deep and far reaching. It is indeed universally true that historic and prehistoric sites provide us with a way of understanding our roots and our sense of place. Historic places furnish historians and archaeologists invaluable research opportunities that compliment oral histories, documents, periodical literature and other archival and library materials. At the same time, they offer students of all ages tangible links to earlier generations of people over the entire range of human existence in this area. They bring to life events in our past and enhance our educational curriculums. They help us understand the fabric of our communities and how we can better plan for our cities and towns in the future. They offer special, meaningful places where we can honor and celebrate our culture - quietly and in more festive ways. They provide a special dimension and uniqueness to our streetscapes and landscapes and help to define who we are. Montana is often referred to as "The Last Best Place." Inherent in that monogram is the notion that we value our heritage and the *places* we call home. Heritage places, first and foremost, build an identity for us as Montanans and educate us to that identity.

In addition to their intrinsic educational and cultural value, historic sites also serve the community in traditional as well as new functional ways. While many old buildings readily continue to provide necessary spaces for commercial, residential, educational, social and industrial activities, others may be adapted as necessary to meet new community needs without destroyed fundamental historic fabric. Often, rehabilitating older buildings is more cost efficient than new construction, especially when the developer can take advantage of financial incentives available under state and federal programs and laws. Historic bridges and abandoned railroad corridors have found new life as recreational trails under the "Rails-to-Trails" program. The USDA Forest Service historic cabin rental program successfully meets both demands for public use and the need for dollars to repair and maintain these significant structures.

The preservation of historic sites also enhances economic development opportunities. Numerous studies have shown that historic preservation adds value to both local commercial and residential developments. Nowhere is this more certain than in our historic downtowns. Nationally, the National Trust for Historic Preservation's successful Main Street Program has generated 226,900 net new jobs, 56,300 net new businesses, and stimulated 88,700 building rehabilitation projects, bringing \$16.1 billion in new investment to economically distressed historic commercial downtown centers. Statewide tourism, which has been the single largest growth industry for Montana in recent years, has risen from some 4.5 million in the mid-eighties to 9.6 million non-resident visitors in 2001. This population alone accounted for 1.7 billion dollars in sales in 2001 (*Montana Tourism & Recreation Strategic Plan 2003-2007*). Importantly, history and culture are widely recognized as the number one tourist attraction with 65% of all U.S. travelers including heritage/cultural experiences on their vacations. Through historic preservation,

Montana, with its unique, interesting and authentic historical places, can expect to hold its competitive edge in this key economic development sector.

Historic preservation benefits Montana in many ways. It makes sense – culturally, educationally, functionally, and economically.

The Montana Historic Preservation Plan

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, calls for the granting of federal funds to States for the purpose of implementing the national policy and programs for historic preservation at the state level within the context of an appropriate statewide plan. More particularly, the Act calls upon each State Historic Preservation Office to "prepare and implement a comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan" and to "cooperate with the Secretary [of the Interior], the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other Federal and State agencies, local governments, and organizations and individuals to ensure that historic properties are taken into consideration at all levels of planning and development." The Act also states that "No grant may be made under this Act unless the application is in accordance with the comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan which has been approved by the Secretary..." As such, the State Plan serves as an important tool to set priorities for the investment of human and financial resources in historic preservation. Specifically, it is designed "to be used by the State Historic Preservation Office and others throughout the State for guiding effective decision-making on a general level, for coordinating statewide preservation activities, and for communicating statewide preservation policy, goals, and values to the preservation constituency, decision-makers, and interested and affected parties across the State" (*National Park Service Historic Preservation Fund Grants Manual, Chapter 6, Section G*).

The planning cycle for Montana's previous State Plan, *Working Together: The Montana Historic Preservation Plan*, was 1997-2002, which means that it is now due for revision. The present plan, *Working Together to PRESERVE MONTANA: The Montana Historic Preservation Plan* will apply to the next five years, 2003-2007. Aside from its title, this plan also draws substantively upon its predecessor for guidance and content. This is in no way to say that the previous plan was unfulfilled, but rather to acknowledge that many of the assessments, issues, and strategies for historic preservation in Montana established five years ago remain equally valid today.

As stipulated in guidelines provided by the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, this revised Montana State Plan is a concise, summary document, containing the following sections:

- A summary of how the Plan was revised, including sources of information and ideas;
- A summary assessment of the full range of historic and cultural resources in Montana and the current state of knowledge about these resources;

- An outline and discussion of important issues which must be addressed in preserving these resources;
- A vision, articulated as goals and objectives, for historic preservation in Montana as a whole and for use as direction in the Montana State Historic Preservation Office;
- A statement of the Plan's time frame or planning cycle; and
- A bibliography of special studies and other supporting documents which were used in preparing the Plan and will assist in its implementation.

Additional supporting documentation is provided in two appendices. Further information may be obtained by contacting the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, Helena.

II. Development of the 2003-2007 Montana Historic Preservation Plan

The current planning process can be said to have begun when the previous effort concluded with the adoption and release of *Working Together: The Montana Historic Preservation Plan* in 1997. Direct focused solicitation of public participation in the preparation of the current document nonetheless began in earnest in Spring of 2001 and continued through Fall of 2002. Development occurred and was facilitated over time through a feedback process that includes comments on the pre-existing Plan, annual review of its implementation, solicitation of input through questionnaires, revision, and open discussion. It continues into the next cycle with a return to comments and feedback on the current revised plan.

Plan feedback. The process of developing the current Montana State Plan began with the completion and approval of the previous State Plan in 1997. Although the special "preservation plan task group" envisioned in the 1997 Plan to review and organize comments on a periodic basis failed to materialize as a formal entity, feedback on the Plan – both negative and positive - was nonetheless welcomed by SHPO staff and regularly discussed. Each copy of the distributed 1997 Plan was accompanied by an invitation to provide SHPO with comment. Some of these comments made their way into the 1997 Plan itself (*Working Together, Appendix B*). These comments, provided sporadically over a number of years, were important in formulating a strategy for replacing or revising the Plan in 2002.

Annual application. Annually between 1997 and 2002, SHPO staff also reviewed the goals and objectives of the 1997 State Plan as part of its application for federal funding through the Historic Preservation Fund. As required by National Park Service guidelines, annual workplans of activities developed for the various SHPO programs must establish their foundation in the goals and objectives identified in the State Plan. Beginning in 2000, a report (written outside of the framework of the required National Park Service year-end report) of the SHPO's success in accomplishing these proposed activities was made available to interested parties for comment. These included the Governor-appointed 9-member Montana Historic Preservation Review Board, charged with providing SHPO advice and guidance in historic preservation planning. Among SHPO staff, this annual review of goals and objectives established in the 1997 Plan proved to be an excellent opportunity for evaluation, leading to the realization and decision to modify these goals in the present Plan to make them more applicable and responsive to issues and programs.

Questionnaires. In March of 2001, SHPO circulated a preservation planning questionnaire to approximately 220 individuals listed in the *Montana Historic Preservation Services Directory*. These individuals, broadly classifiable as historic preservation professionals or primary contacts for assistance in historic preservation projects within the state, were provided the questionnaire in conjunction with a revised 2001 edition of the *Directory* and a stamped self-addressed reply envelope. The 27%

reply to Questionnaire #1 is considered an excellent baseline for evaluation, the results and discussion of which are provided here in Appendix A.

A second preservation planning questionnaire, Questionnaire #2 (Appendix B), was also developed to gain input from a broader audience, specifically individuals less familiar with SHPO and its programs. This questionnaire premiered at the annual meeting of the Montana Archaeological Society in April of 2001. It subsequently was distributed with the annual 2001 Montana Historic Preservation Poster to over 780 addresses in May of 2001, was enclosed with SHPO correspondence throughout the summer, and concluded as an insert in the registration packets of those attending the Montana Historical Society's annual History Conference in October of 2001. Despite a lower response rate, Questionnaire #2 succeeded in gaining written input from a different audience than that of Questionnaire #1 and also assists in evaluating its conclusions.

Both Questionnaires #1 and #2 were designed to take advantage of and build directly from the preservation planning efforts undertaken five years ago. Individuals were presented with some of the same questions asked in 1995/1996 in order to gauge how much has changed with regards to issues, needs and assessments of resource condition. Respondents were also asked specifically to rate the priority or importance of the nine Goals identified and adopted in *Working Together*, the 1997-2002 Plan. This comparative approach was especially informative and helpful for developing the current Plan.

Goal Revisions. With consideration of the feedback and experience gained through implementation of the 1997 Plan combined with input from the 2001 questionnaires, SHPO staff concluded in its FY2001 Year-End Report to the National Park Service that the Montana Historic Preservation Plan merited updating and revision, rather than a major reformulation. Specifically, SHPO staff recognized continuing concern with many of the same preservation issues identified five years ago yet overall satisfaction with the state preservation program, suggesting the need to adjust, rather than reinvent, Montana's preservation goals and objectives to make them more current and perhaps more effective.

Consequently SHPO staff formulated a revised set of goals and objectives for use in 2003-2007. Other state's Plans were consulted to assist in this effort. The result, a set of five concise goals each with measurable objectives, was introduced to the public through the mailing of the 2002 Montana Historic Preservation Poster in May and subsequently at conferences and in SHPO correspondence during the year. Comments were welcomed in the form of telephone calls, email, or written correspondence. They were largely received verbally. These comments indicated general support for both the scope and nature of the revised goals and objectives, and in particular appreciation for their increased clarity. Some further refinements were made in the proposed goals and objectives as a result of these comments.

Discussions. Open two-way communication with the public and interested parties was stressed throughout the current planning process by making reference to the developing Plan in conversations, meetings and other forums. Special efforts in this regard were

made to engage the 15 local preservation officers of the Montana Certified Local Government (CLG) program and with the tribes. Montana's community preservation officers are recognized as experts in local public opinion regarding historic preservation matters, and especially those issues existing outside the narrow confines of federal and state preservation law. Thus, conversations between CLG representatives and SHPO form the basis of many significant insights into public needs and concerns. Likewise, recognizing that tribal response to questionnaires and written correspondence have traditionally been limited, SHPO strived in this effort to solicit input verbally and in a culturally meaningful manner whenever possible. A greater awareness of tribal perspectives was thereby achieved, reflecting in the goals of this revised plan

SHPO also met individually in discussions with the State Preservation Review Board, the Board of the non-profit statewide Montana Preservation Alliance (MPA), and with the Montana Archaeological Society (MAS), Committee for Conservation Archaeology. All three groups provided support for the revised goals and objectives, including formal endorsement by the MAS.

Revised Plan Review. With acceptance of *Working Together to PRESERVE MONTANA, 2003-2007* by the National Park Service, the planning process does not end, but rather returns to the beginning to repeat itself in comments received on this product. In this planning cycle and in keeping with the revised goals, SHPO intends to post the Plan on its website under www.montanahistoricalsociety.org and, pending funds, to produce a pamphlet that will draw attention to the Plan for a much broader distribution than in the past. The 4-6 page brochure - illustrated with photographs, charts and graphs - will draw from the conclusions of the Plan while also outlining its adopted goals and objectives and how these are reflected in SHPO and other programs. This format should find a larger audience and engender greater awareness and use as well as response to Montana's State Plan for historic preservation. It promises to yield significantly more input useful for implementing the Plan as well as for the development of its successor.

III. Montana's Heritage Properties: An Overview and Assessment

Montana Heritage Themes and Associated Resources

There are many – some would say limitless – ways to divide up the continuum of Montana's past into subject matters and the tangible resources that reflect these. The following list of heritage themes and associated resource types is taken, with revision and some addition, from the 1997 State Plan, *Working Together*. Two themes added to those in the 1997 Plan are *State and Local Government* and *Post World War II*. While it would be possible to construct more additional themes, those presented here serve the purpose of illustrating the range of properties in Montana and their historical significance.

The Land ~ Montana, the fourth largest state in the Union, boasts a landscape that is both diverse and dramatic, shaped by eons of mountain building and erosion and sculpted by glaciers, wind and rivers. It hosts the headwaters for the Missouri and Columbia river drainages and is rich in hard rock minerals, timber, grass lands, wildlife, oil & gas and coal. However, the landscape has not only been shaped by geologic forces, but by the people who have lived in and visited Montana for thousands of years. Though never densely populated, the state is rich in cultural environments associated with the history of human habitation and interaction with the landscape.

Associated resources. These typically large-scale resources include a variety of rural and urban cultural landscapes such as those associated with Indian sacred sites, e.g. the Sweet Grass Hills in north-central Montana; the mining landscape, e.g. Butte and Anaconda; and agricultural landscapes such as the Big Hole in Beaverhead County, the areas south of Billings and along the Hi-Line. They also include specific geological formations such as the Missouri River landmarks noted by Lewis and Clark during their epic journey of discovery in the beginning of the 19th Century.

Early Peoples ~ Human habitation in the region is thought to have begun about 12,000 years ago. Present scientific theories, constantly being revised with new evidence, place Montana directly in the path of one or more of the earliest migrations of humans into the New World from Eurasia. These earliest peoples and those that followed came to and lived in Montana, in search of and sustained by its rich wildlife, plant life and mineral resources. For the most part they followed the natural seasons and rhythms of life. Based upon archaeology, social and behavioral change were marked in centuries or even millennia with many cultural elements persisting over generations. These include the hunting of buffalo, the gathering of wild plants, the manufacture of stone and bone implements, and a settlement pattern based upon regular movement within a defined and familiar territory. Unlike most regions of North America, domesticated agriculture did not replace hunting and gathering as a way of life for Montana's prehistoric inhabitants. Various cultures existed across Montana in all environments over these millennia, some persisting and contributing more than others to the Indian tribes that existed here at the time of contact with Euro-Americans when written documents began (historic period).

Associated resources. These include prehistoric archaeological sites (12,000 B.P. to A.D. 200) of all types, including stone circle sites (tipi rings) located in many regions

of the State, but especially in the northern glaciated prairie-plains of the Hi-Line; open campsites with assemblages of stone and bone tools; rock art (pictographs and petroglyphs) such as those at Pictograph Cave east of Billings; numerous buffalo jumps and other kill sites like the Madison Buffalo Jump south of Three Forks, Wahnapi Chugn in Havre and Ulm Pishkun outside Great Falls; rock cairns and alignments; and chert and other toolstone quarries where stone tools were made.

Western American Expansion ~ The purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France by the United States in 1803 reflected the expansionist policy of the American people in the American West. It was this expansion, initiated with the Lewis and Clark Corps of Discovery expedition between 1804-1806 that resulted in the ultimate clash with Native cultures that irrevocably changed these and the way in which people lived and interacted with the landscape in Montana. Western American expansion was marked by a series of Euro-American expeditions surveying the people, resources, and travel routes in the "new" land. This period in Montana was also characterized by steamboat travel, the fur trade, missionaries like Pierre-Jean DeSmet, and the earliest ranching and gold mining discoveries.

Associated resource types. Resources, some known and some yet discovered and documented, include sites and portages along the routes of various expeditions beginning with those of Lewis and Clark (1805-1806); connections made to and from the Oregon Trail; resources associated with early cattle operations such as the Grant-Kohrs Ranch NHL in Deer Lodge; the first reported gold discovery made at Gold Creek; historic archaeological sites of fur trapping and trading activity such as Fort McKenzie, Fort Connaught, Fort Manuel Lisa, Salish House, and early Fort Benton; Jesuit missions like St. Mary's and St. Ignatius; and the Mullan Military Road across the Continental Divide; as well as others.

Montana Territory ~ Following 60 years of Euro-American exploration and immigration, Montana was declared a territory of the United States on May 26, 1864. The majority of the non-Indian settlement in Montana at this time occurred in the southwestern part of the state. This was largely due to the discoveries of great mineral wealth – first gold, then silver and copper - in the region. Nine counties were established by the First Territorial Legislature including four in the southwest. Post-Civil war sympathies and politics played a major role in early territorial government and community life. The first schools in Montana were built in 1863 in Bannack and Virginia City, towns that also served as the Territory's first and second capitals, respectively. In 1878, eleven years prior to Montana's statehood, the Montana Collegiate Institute opened in Deer Lodge. Helena and Butte/Anaconda rose as major mining communities and rivals into the 1880s with mining magnates William A. Clark and Marcus Daly dominating the politics leading up to statehood in 1889. Steamboat travel on the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers along with overland wagon and stagecoach roads supplied the territory with goods and people. Hardy, open-range stockmen – with sheep or cattle - ruled in the non-urban landscape. But it was the coming of the railroads in the 1880s that truly fostered widespread settlement of the region. Nonetheless, southwest Montana continued to maintain the largest segment of the state's population and was the center of political influence well into the twentieth century.

Associated resources. The territorial capitals, Bannack and Virginia City, and later Helena; the mining centers of Butte and Phillipsburg; urban mining support facilities such as mills, logging camps, charcoal and lime kilns; college buildings in Deer Lodge and other institutional buildings in the Deer Lodge Valley; the Bozeman trail; Fort Benton and other steamboat landings; early roads and stagecoach stops; the Northern Pacific and Great Northern railroads, and historic archaeological sites of the Montana Territorial Period are all examples of sites associated with this period and theme.

American Indian Culture (1800 to the present) ~ After millennia of evolving cultural tradition, the life of American Indian Peoples in Montana changed quickly and dramatically with the arrival of Euro-Americans in Montana at the dawn of the nineteenth century. Change had already begun before Lewis and Clark appeared on the scene, with the acquisition of horses and guns through trade and warfare with neighboring tribes who had already encountered the new European culture. At the time of contact, Montana exhibited a wealth of Indian culture, where semi-migratory tribes occupied expansive home territories, meeting and sharing traditions and innovations, while all the while creating changing rivalries and alliances with other tribes. Through the actions of the newest arrivals to Montana, and the government that represented them, this thriving Indian population was rapidly reduced through war, disease, forced relocation and the decimation of the bison on the Great Plains. The Great Sioux Wars of 1876-77 on the eastern plains and the Nez Perce retreat through western and central Montana in 1877 symbolize the fate of Indian resistance. Today, Montana's Indian communities (Assiniboine, Blackfeet, Crow, Chippewa-Cree, Northern Cheyenne, Kootenai, Salish, Sioux and others) live on seven reservations in the northwest, northern plains and southeastern regions of the state and about 40% live in off-reservation settings in a variety of Montana's cities and towns. Historically, the loss of traditional social institutions coupled with misguided federal policy has limited tribal reservation development; poverty continues to plague most Indian communities. The reservations themselves, subject to allotments under the Dawes Act of 1887, are checkerboards of land owned by the tribes, individual Indians, non-Indians, and state and federal agencies.

Associated resources. These include: traditional cultural and spiritual sites, including vision quest sites; scarred (cambium-peeled) trees in western Montana; historic Indian trails; wickiups and cribbed-log structures; St Mary's and St Ignatius missions; treaty localities such as Council Grove near Missoula and Council Island at the confluence of the Missouri and Judith Rivers; battlefields at the Big Hole, the Bear's Paw and the Little Big Horn (formerly, "Custer Battlefield"); Fort Assiniboine; the Nez Perce National Historic Trail; current and former Indian Agency locations such as the Blackfoot "Old Agency" north of Choteau; Chief Plenty Coups State Park; tribal historic community halls; Indian allotment homesteads; and many other distinctly Indian properties.

"Oro y Plata:" Hard Rock Mining in Montana ~ There are a number of legends regarding the discovery of gold in Montana. It is possible that early missionaries may have learned of the presence of gold from the Indians. Lewis and Clark and John Mullan make vague references to gold in their reports. The first record of a gold strike in Montana was in 1852 on Gold Creek (formerly Benetsee Creek) in the northeast corner of

Granite County. Subsequent larger strikes at Bannack and Virginia City were highly productive, but, like many "boom and bust" scenarios that followed, generally transitory. They were, however, extremely significant in that they opened up the territory, especially the western half to further exploration and settlement. Discoveries of gold and later silver established the town of Helena, which went on to win the fight to become the State Capitol in 1889. Copper mining at Butte made it the largest copper provider in the U.S. by 1887. Many ancillary facilities contributed to the mining industry, including smelting and refining facilities constructed in Anaconda, East Helena and Great Falls to process ore. Hard rock mining activity, particularly in the larger urban industrial centers, also provided an important catalyst for calling attention to the plight of American workers. The role that labor organizations played in the mining industry in Montana is nationally significant. Through the first half of the 20th century, the Anaconda Mining Company, its subsidiaries and partners, including the Montana Power Company, dominated the state's mining economy and in doing so, much of its politics. At the same time, smaller operations associated with other mining districts have always played a role in historic hard rock mining across much of the western part of the State for the extraction of a variety of metals for industrial, commercial and military (strategic) uses. Hard rock mining activities continue to be an important, if cyclical, part of the Montana economy to the present day.

Associated Resources. There are literally thousands of sites in the west half of Montana associated with hard rock mining activity. These not only include the mines and mills themselves, but the communities that housed the miners and a myriad of support services, cultural and social institutions. Virginia City, arguably the best-preserved Gold Rush town in the west, and Bannack, a ghost town managed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, are both designated as National Historic Landmarks. Butte also boasts being the largest National Historic Landmark in the nation, with themes of both mining and, more recently, labor history. Other properties include a variety of abandoned (i.e. historic archaeological) mining sites and districts in the Beaverhead-Deerlodge, Helena and Gallatin National Forests, mining towns such as Phillipsburg and Anaconda, and numerous buildings associated with Montana's mining magnates, including the Montana Club in Helena, Butte's Copper King Mansion and the Marcus Daly Mansion in Hamilton.

Timber ~ Of the state's 93 million land acres, more than 22 million are forested. In 1899 alone, Montanans harvested 255 thousand feet of lumber. In the late 19th century, the majority of timber related activity was driven by the needs of the growing mining industry. The first recorded commercial sawmill was erected at Bannack in July of 1862. Following the early mining rush, the timber industry waned for some time. However, the industry was revived with the discovery of copper and the coming of railroads. The smelting process required massive amounts of lumber for fuel. The demand for railroad ties was enormous as well, not only for railroad construction but for the miles of mining rail systems underground. By 1910, the Anaconda Copper Mining Company controlled over a million acres of timberland. As communities grew in the late 19th Century and early 20th Century, the demand for construction timber also increased. With the exception of large timber resources in the far western and northwest regions of the state, however, the majority of timber harvested elsewhere in Montana was primarily for local

use. After waning in the 1930s Depression, a second timber "boom" occurred during and especially after World War II, with the nationwide demand for construction materials. Historically, the forest products industry has been a vital, if sometimes environmentally controversial, part of the Montana economy. The role of the Forest Reserves and later the U.S.D.A. Forest Service in managing public forest land has been especially important.

Associated Resources. These range from company mill towns such as Bonner and Libby to timber management and research sites such as that in the Forestry school at the University of Montana. Specific site types reflecting the timber industry are historic sawmills, lumber yards, teepee burners, and retail wood supply outlets. Many historic timber-extractive and management resources exist on public forest land including historic trails, logging camps, logging railroads, lookouts, cabins and other Forest Service facilities. The Alta Guard Station near Hamilton is the oldest building in Montana constructed by a federal land managing agency (Forest Reserves), dating to 1899.

Agriculture and Homesteading ~ By the end of the 1870's, thousands of head of cattle and sheep had been driven into Montana. This resulted in a problem of overstocking that was exacerbated by a drought in the 1880's and a particularly bad winter in 1886-87. These events led to the end of the "open range" in many western and southwestern regions as ranchers began to build fences and provide hay to the animals in the winter in the west. Larger cattle companies shifted to central and eastern Montana where large open ranges remained. In addition, ranchers increasingly made use of rail transportation to ship cattle to markets. The state produced more than \$4 million worth of wool in 1900 and by 1910 there were more than 490 thousand beef cattle on Montana ranges worth more than \$27 million. The Homestead Acts of 1862 and 1909 and the Desert Land Act of 1877 provided land to settlers east of the mountains for a nominal fee and the promise to reside on the land and cultivate it for a period of five years. These programs reflected the desire of the Federal government to keep land ownership in the hands of many rather than under the control of a few large land barons. However, the arid and harsh climate doomed these small homesteads to failure. Those that were able to weather the difficult times generally acquired larger tracts of land to make their farms more profitable. Many others left the state and their homesteads behind.

Associated Resources ~ In total, agriculture is Montana's number one industry today and sites depicting its history are critical to understanding this mainstay of Montana's economy. The agricultural landscape is perhaps the most dominant in Montana. Montana's ranches and farms often host early structures from earlier eras, and they can be publicly seen at the Grant Kohrs Ranch NHS in Deer Lodge or by appointment at the Kleffner Ranch near Helena. Cowboy and ranching lore are commemorated at such events as the bucking horse sale in Miles City and annual cattle drives near Roundup and Billings. Coarse-laid stone sheepherder monuments stand on hilltops in open valleys. Grain elevators, barns, and homesteads (abandoned and still in use) all across eastern and central Montana are dramatic reminders of the homesteader families who settled there. Homesteader towns like Shelby, Chester, Geraldine, and Joliet continue to serve as centers for service and commerce on the rural farming landscape. Beaver slides, developed by ranchers in the Big Hole Valley to stack hay, are

still in use in large areas of Southwest Montana and are uniquely characteristic of the agricultural landscape in that region of the state.

Coal and Oil/Gas ~ Coal-bearing areas are widely scattered across central and eastern Montana, occupying 35% of the state's total area. The five most outstanding seams are located in the Bull Mountain, Red Lodge, Great Falls, Eastern Lignite and Eastern Sub-bituminous regions. Early coal mining began during the 1860s gold rushes, but significant development came with the railroads. Coal was needed to operate the steam powered railroad locomotives, for residential heating and later to generate electricity at large coal fire facilities. Underground coal mining dominated the Red Lodge-Bear Creek area while at Colstrip, the Northern Pacific Railroad first opened the 28 ft. wide Rosebud coal seam of the Fort Union Formation by strip-mining in the early 1920's. The coal industry slumped, like many others, in the 1930s but revived during WW II. Montana's worst coal mining disaster occurred in 1943 when seventy miners died at the Smith Mine near Red Lodge. In the early 1960's, it was estimated that there was 222 billion tons of minable coal in Montana, leading all states in coal reserves. While the first significant oil field was opened in 1915 at Elk Basin in Carbon County, until 1951 most of Montana's commercial oil and gas fields were located in a strip 100 to 150 miles wide, paralleling the Rocky Mountain Front. New technologies developed in the late 1940s enabled deeper drilling to reach oil in other locations across the state, especially the Williston Basin in northeast Montana. This second oil and gas boom established Billings as the center of Montana's petroleum industry and its emerging status as the states major concentration of population.

Associated Resources. The communities of Colstrip, Red Lodge, Roundup, Forsyth, Miles City, and other sites in Carbon, Rosebud, Big Horn, Powder River, Mussellshell, Treasure and Yellowstone Counties provide sites associated with coal mining. The American Federation of Miners cemetery near Roundup demonstrates the ethnic diversity of the people who came to work in the coal mines of eastern Montana. Sites east of the Rocky Mountain Front including areas around Sunburst, Oilmont, Shelby, Choteau and Cutbank depict the oil industry in the first half of the 20th Century. Glendive, Sidney, Wibaux, and Billings host oil-related properties after 1950.

The Federal Government in Montana ~ The involvement of the Federal Government in Montana has been extremely significant. It can be said to have begun in 1805-1806 with the Lewis and Clark expedition ordered by President Jefferson that covered more miles in Montana than any other state. The U.S. military continued to play a pivotal role in the American settlement of Montana with the control and removal of tribes to reservations in the nineteenth century and with developments in the 20th century in conjunction with World Wars I and II as well as the Cold war that followed. Federal government involvement in the management of Montana land is even more pervasive. Riding a wave of conservation, Yellowstone was declared the first National Park in 1872, and in 1890, President Benjamin Harrison organized a commission to investigate the need for the protection of public lands. This led to the passage of a series of Acts over the next century which set aside large sections of land for public use and enjoyment and for the protection of watershed and animal habitat. Today, almost 30% of Montana's lands are in federal ownership. In many counties, public land holdings amount to 70% of the total

land mass of which 90% is managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. In addition to public land management, the Federal government initiated a number of historic large scale projects that have had a lasting effect on Montana. Between 1904 and 1906, the Bureau of Reclamation began construction on several regional irrigation projects, including the Huntley Project east of Billings and the Milk River Project in northern Montana. In 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt established the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) as part of his New Deal. Directed by the Forest Service and the U.S. Army, the CCC employed 25,000 young men in Montana. The construction of the Fort Peck Dam on the Missouri River during the mid 1930's was one of the largest of the Depression era public works programs. The U.S. Department of Agriculture established the cooperative extension through Montana State College (Montana State University, Bozeman) and the Agricultural Experiment Stations Act of 1955 authorized the appropriation of federal funds to support the development of those stations across the state - many of which remain active today though their historic buildings are at risk under a policy of progress through demolition.

Associated Resources. These include: numerous 19th century frontier military forts, posts and battlefields as well as the state's 20th century bases, airfields, and other national defense facilities, including missile silos; U.S. Forest Service facilities including the first forest ranger cabin in the United States, located at Alta in the Bitterroot National Forest; Bureau of Reclamation irrigation projects at Huntley, Lower Yellowstone, Milk River and Sun River; the Fort Peck Dam and other dam sites; CCC constructed roads, bridges and buildings; various agriculture extension stations, most now managed by Montana State University; United States Postal Service offices; federal courthouses and many other federal institutions built during the second half of the 19th and first half of the 20th, including the Old Territorial Prison at Deer Lodge and the Rocky Mountain Laboratory in Hamilton.

State and Local Government ~ On November 8, 1889, President Harrison formally proclaimed Montana the 41st state of the Union, ending twenty-five years as a Territory. In a still disputed vote led by mining interests, Helena was established as the State Capitol, with construction of the Capitol building beginning in the late 1890s. Other early primary state institutions were equally vied for and distributed along political lines including the state's university (Missoula), agricultural college (Bozeman), and normal school (Dillon), as well as the school for the deaf (Boulder), and mental hospital (Warm Springs). In the years that followed statehood, the state has contributed greatly to the built environment all across Montana in the form of state institutions, parks, fish hatcheries and other facilities. The New Deal Era of the 1930s saw not only the influx of federal projects but also the support of and ballooning of the state's bureaucracy. In the early years of statehood, Montana was made up of a couple dozen counties, including several very large counties in the eastern part of the state. "County-splitting" fever during the boom years of homesteading between 1910-1925 resulted in a doubling of that number, leading ultimately to the present total of 56. Establishment of county seats in each of these local governments resulted in significant public constructions in these towns, not the least of which are courthouses, some of which date back to the Territorial Period. While not characterized by especially dense concentrations of populations, city

governments and public works also have greatly influenced the look of Montana's urban communities.

Associated Resources. Included are: the recently restored State Capitol in Helena; state universities and colleges; other state institutions; fish hatcheries; state park visitor facilities; wildlife management areas; county courthouses; jails; fire-stations; schools, libraries; and more.

Transportation ~ The earliest non-Indian visitors to Montana - the fur trappers and explorers - made use of existing Indian and animal trails. Freight transportation routes were largely focused on waterways, dominated by steamboat travel up the Missouri River to Fort Benton. However, once gold was discovered in the 1850's and 60's and immigration to Montana increased, overland travel and later railroads dealt fatal blows to the river transportation industry. With the celebrated completion of the Northern Pacific railroad at Gold Creek in 1883 and the entry soon after of the Great Northern Railway into Great Falls in 1887, it marked the end of extensive river transportation. Efforts to discover inland waterways to link America were abandoned and survey efforts were directed to the building of roads and rail beds to connect local communities to each other and to the rest of the nation. The Burlington and the Milwaukee railroads followed the earlier tracks. The need for better wagon roads from the United States to Montana Territory also increased as more immigrants moved westward. At first the settlers traveled by pack trains, then switched to wagon trains, each wagon capable of carrying from five to sixteen thousand pounds. When gold was discovered in Montana, settlers from the south left the Oregon Trail and turned north to Montana ultimately establishing the Bozeman and Bridger Trails leading to Virginia City and Bannack. Lt. John Mullan established the first really improved road through difficult terrain over the Rocky Mountains in 1858-1860. From Minnesota, expeditions were conducted by Captain James Fisk to develop travel routes through Fort Benton to Bannack by way of Johnny Grant's ranch in the Deer Lodge Valley. Automobile travel in the first half of the 20th century revolutionized road and bridge building, establishing the historic network of routes and transportation structures that still exist today.

Associated Resources. The Montana Department of Transportation has taken the lead in identifying hundreds of historic transportation related sites including bridges, roads, as well as railroads and associated facilities throughout the State. Resources include: train depots; substations; abandoned and active railroad corridors and grades; the Bozeman Trail/Road; various sites along the Mullan Road; ferry crossings; stage stations; and historic automobile highways such as Highway 2 and the Going to the Sun Road NHL in Glacier National Park. Livingston, Laurel, Havre, and Whitefish are examples of communities which were supported by large scale railroad repair and switching facilities.

Community Building ~ The cultures and traditions of the immigrants who came to Montana in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were manifested in the communities they created. Major communities were developed in association with resource extraction - timber, mining and agriculture - and at access points to transportation systems. Many of these communities, especially those associated with the "boom and bust" economy of mining, started and failed becoming ghost towns, while just as many others matured into stable multi-service centers. Typically, permanent human

settlement occurred along the rivers and valley bottoms. These same sites often coincided with transportation corridors -- trails, freight roads and railroads -- to permit the easy transport of goods and people to and from each community. Small town Montana Main Streets were often located along or perpendicular to rail lines and boast large grain elevators adjacent to rail stations. Buildings -- first constructed hastily in wood and then later replaced by brick and stone - housed a variety of fraternal organizations, women's protective societies, churches, banks, stores and other services. Successful entrepreneurs soon built extravagant homes while workers lived in more modest dwellings, some of which were constructed by the companies that employed them. Successful retail establishments, located in commercial districts, served a variety of workers and their families who lived in town and also supported area ranchers and farmers who came to town to purchase supplies and ship their goods. Evolved communities added cultural amenities including libraries, music halls and theatres.

Associated Resources. Many of Montana's community Main Streets, neighborhoods and industrial areas still appear as they have throughout the 20th Century. Lewistown, Helena, Livingston, Red Lodge, Glendive, Missoula, Hamilton, Bozeman and other Montana communities host intact, thriving urban historic residential and commercial districts. Butte features a mixture of industrial, residential and commercial buildings - including remnants of its notorious red light district - in close proximity to each other reflecting the mining town's distinct pattern of development over a period of 100 years. Masonic Temples, magnificent religious buildings including synagogue buildings in Butte and Helena, the Helena Cathedral and the Catholic Church at Laurin, and Hutterite colonies in north-central Montana commemorate the state's cultural diversity reflected in community architecture. The Moss, Conrad, Daly and Clark Mansions and the "Castle" at White Sulphur Springs provide good examples of the wealth that was amassed in the State and displayed in residential building.

Tourism and Recreation ~ While short-term human visitors have come to Montana for thousands of years, the tourism industry as we know it today dates primarily from the late nineteenth century with the creation of Yellowstone Park in 1872. Although the majority of the Park is in Wyoming, visitors generally arrived there historically from the Montana entrances creating growth in the railroad hub communities of Livingston and West Yellowstone. The addition of Glacier Park in 1910 added to the attractiveness of Montana as a destination for national and international travelers. The railroads played a key role in the development of Montana's tourism industry with both the Northern Pacific and the Milwaukee Road promoting Yellowstone Park and other Montana sights as a destination for their passengers. The railroads built elaborate hotels and lodging facilities in the National Parks, along rail lines near the entrances to the Parks and in gateway communities. Turn-of-the-century resorts and spas developed at hot springs in southwestern Montana, including at Boulder and Hot Springs and the no longer extant Broadwater Hotel & Natatorium in Helena. From 1900 to 1910, tourists spent an average of \$500,000 a year in Montana. Beginning in 1910, tourism took another turn with the advent of the automobile. New roadside motels, campgrounds and restaurants were built to accommodate the new motorized public, and the old downtown hotels and railroad resorts began to suffer. By 1915 the authorities in Yellowstone were permitting automobiles to enter at West Yellowstone, Montana. Dude ranches flourished in this period with

over a hundred in operation by 1930. The Depression and World War II notwithstanding, the tourism "industry" has gained steadily in Montana catering to out-of-state (as well as in-state) hunters, fishermen, hikers, skiers and sightseers – including heritage tourists – alike. Presently, nearly 8 million visitors come to Montana every year making tourism the state's second largest industry.

Associated Resources. These include: grand stylized lodges built by the railroad in association with National Parks; Glacier National Park's unique system of back country chalets; hot springs resorts; scenic roads and their associated landscapes; early motor courts, gas stations and drive-in businesses; facilities associated with sites and attractions such as the visitor facilities at Lewis and Clark Caverns; dude ranches; hunting and fishing lodges; local arts and crafts businesses; and historic hotels such as the Grand Union in Fort Benton, the Graves Hotel in Harlowton and the Finlen in Butte.

Post World War II ~ In the ten years or so following WW II, Montana prospered as did most of the nation. Montana wheat and beef were in high demand and at generally high prices in these post-war boom years, supporting the economies of large Montana farms and ranches. Beginning in the early 1950s, the Anaconda Mining Company's switch to open-pit mining at the Berkeley Pit began to transform Butte – physically, politically, and psychologically. At the same time in western Montana, the lumber industry grew dramatically in response to nationwide construction. In 1957 Hoeriver Boxes and Waldorf Paper Products Companies opened a large pulp mill outside of Missoula creating hundreds of new jobs. The discovery of and technology to access the deep oil field in the Wiliston Basin in northeast Montana launched the state's second oil & gas boom and the rise of Billings as a petroleum and population center. The Yellowstone Pipeline linking Billings with Spokane was completed in 1954. Montana Power Company rose to prominence in Montana affairs with its development of hydroelectric facilities, coal mines, and transmission lines. Federal and state government also contributed to Montana's growth after WW II with significant developments involving public lands, institutions, and national defense. Not all Montanans benefited from this period of prosperity; Montana's Indian population, for example, continued to be subjected to poverty and poor policy decisions. All told, however, it was a period of growth and building during which the state's population increased 10% and in 1950 its per capita income actually stood 8% above the national average.

Associated Resources. Applying the "50 year rule," the inventory of Montana's historic resources of the recent past has just begun. It will undoubtedly begin with buildings, structures, sites, districts and objects associated with the industrial, business and residential growth following WW II. In addition, properties of exceptional significance but less than 50 years old have already begun to be considered, including "Mission 66" architecture in Montana's National Parks and Cold War military nuclear deterrents such as the still active defense system surrounding Great Falls that figured prominently in the Cuban Missile Crisis.

State of the State Inventory

According to records managed by SHPO in partnership with the University of Montana, Department of Anthropology, there are 40,417 recorded cultural resource properties in

Montana as of this writing. Approximately 40% of these are historic period properties (including historic archaeological sites), while 60% are prehistoric properties, reflecting in part the origins of the state inventory in the Smithsonian Institution River Basin prehistoric archaeological surveys of the 1950s. Each year over the past 10 years, approximately 1,000 to 1,500 new properties are added to the state inventory, with the number of historic sites catching up to that of prehistoric.

Each recorded property represents a site, structure, or building and some are districts comprised of many individual buildings, such as community historic residential districts with 500 or more houses. Consequently, the number of recorded individual cultural resource entities is actually greater by perhaps an order of 20% or more, i.e. approximately 50,000 cultural resources statewide. Nonetheless, many known historic, prehistoric, and traditional cultural properties are still not included in this total – including some very famous historic buildings or historic and prehistoric archaeological sites – simply by virtue of the fact that an inventory form has never been completed and registered in the system.

Among recorded prehistoric site types in Montana, archaeological lithic scatters predominate (11,713), followed by stone circle/tipi ring sites (4,968) and rock cairns (2,761). Lithic scatters are a generic archaeological site form referring to a concentration of intentionally chipped stone pieces, mostly detritus produced from the process of manufacturing, using and maintaining stone tools. Ubiquitous to Montana, most lithic scatters require professional archaeological analysis and sometimes subsurface testing to determine their age (if possible) and whether they represent former habitations, places where raw materials were acquired, or some other form of special use locality. The age and function of many lithic scatters, nonetheless, remains indeterminable using current scientific techniques. Tipi rings are most common east of the Continental Divide and are especially prevalent on the glaciated prairie-plains of northern Montana. They represent former habitation locations. While some may be as old as 3,000 or even 4,000 years, most are thought to be less than 2,000 years old. Much has been written about the research significance of these stone circle sites and, while they continue to be a lively source of professional debate, they also represent the most widely recognized prehistoric site by the general public. Cairns, some simple piles of rocks and others careful constructions, are also common across Montana. Their age and meaning are very difficult to determine in most cases. Possible functions of prehistoric cairns include event, location and trail markers, caches, and traps; a very few cairns have been associated with burials. Among other well-known types of prehistoric or possibly early historic Indian sites in Montana, there are 231 buffalo jumps, 120 bedrock quarries, and 596 rock art sites currently recorded in the statewide inventory. Some rare prehistoric site types in Montana include pithouses, sites that can be definitively associated with fishing, and medicine wheels. Also relatively rare, less than a hundred recorded prehistoric sites have been associated with the earliest period of human occupation, between 12,000 – 7,500 years ago.

Given their relative recentness and familiarity, historic period properties in the state inventory are more readily recognized as to age and purpose than prehistoric sites.

Recorded properties range from CCC camps to ferry landings to historic mining remnants to schools and grain elevators. They include standing in-use buildings and structures as well as historic archaeological sites, and some properties that are both. The three most common recorded historic property types are: mining sites (2862), many of which are abandoned, i.e. historical archaeological sites; railroad, stage and other transportation-related properties, including bridges (2099); and rural homesteads/farmsteads (1247), many that also exist now only as historic archaeological sites. Records also exist for over 200 historic districts and approximately 1000 individually documented historic residences. Most historic-age properties in the state inventory are associated with long continuous periods of use; only twenty-five have been identified as predominantly pre-1860 and about three hundred are associated directly with Montana's Territorial Period (1860-1889). The large majority of recorded historic sites were constructed after Montana achieved statehood in 1889, with the most often cited decade being 1930-1939.

A subset of the state inventory, 993 Montana properties have been listed in the ***National Register of Historic Places***, including 32 recognized as National Historic Landmarks. About one hundred of these listed properties are historic districts comprised of anywhere from 10 to 700 contributing buildings and structures - for example the recently listed (2002) University Residential Historic District in Missoula with over 650 contributing houses. Adding contributing buildings and structures, there are probably closer to 4,000 or 5,000 individual cultural resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Only a handful of these National Register listed properties are prehistoric sites, including two National Historic Landmarks: the Hagan Site, a rare earth lodge village in Dawson County and Pictograph Cave outside Billings, arguably the first scientifically excavated prehistoric archaeological site in Montana. This is not a statement of the significance of prehistoric sites; rather it probably reflects the lack of tangible benefits afforded the listing of archaeological sites (especially prehistoric, but also historic period) and concerns for their safety in anonymity. At least two Montana properties have been listed in the past five years as traditional cultural places important to Indian communities: Annashisee Iisaxpuatahcheeaashisee (Bighorn River Medicine Wheel) in Big Horn County and Sleeping Buffalo Rock in Phillips County. The remainder of Montana's National Register listed properties are historic period, primarily Euroamerican sites. Ranging from the Eureka Community Hall in Lincoln County to the Bell Street Bridge in Glendive, Dawson County, these listed historic properties span the state, its history, and the various heritage themes described above.

Beyond those officially nominated and accepted for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, an additional 598 properties in the Montana state inventory have been formally determined eligible for listing by the Keeper of the Register (National Park Service) and 3163 determined eligible through consensus between SHPO and a federal or state agency. Although lacking for the most part the level of documentation required of nominated properties, these eligible sites are treated as if they were listed in the National Register for the purposes of compliance with federal and state preservation laws. Also, unlike those actually in the Register, these properties only found eligible include many prehistoric sites in addition to historic and traditional cultural places. Together, the approximately 4,750 properties found eligible or listed constitute 12% of the state

inventory and represent an excellent cross-section and characterization of what constitute Montana's significant prehistoric, historic, historic archaeological, and traditional cultural places.

It is difficult to say how many other historic and prehistoric properties – both known and unknown – remain to be added to the statewide inventory. However, to the extent that this is reflected by the amount of survey (i.e., intensive reconnaissance) to identify properties that has occurred, the answer is probably a lot. Survey records housed at the SHPO document 3,915,542 acres of intensive inventory – a lot to be sure, but just scratching the surface when measured against the 92,983,695 acres of land in Montana! Of course much of this un-inventoried land surface may have a low probability of containing cultural resources. Yet the fact remains that relatively little (4.2%) of the state can be said to have been looked at with an eye towards identifying and recording the state's heritage properties.

Moreover, the rate of survey is such that it will be a long time before many properties are recorded. Again according to SHPO records, between 75,000 to 100,000 acres of new survey have occurred in each of the last five years since 1997. As previously recognized in 1997, most of this survey continues to be undertaken in response to regulatory requirements associated with actions that are permitted or required by federal and state agencies - like timber sales, land exchanges, and oil & gas development (e.g., Section 106 compliance). The U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management easily account for the most survey reconnaissance in the state, both in the number of inventories and total acreage. Each of these agencies has conducted over 1 million total acres of documented survey (i.e., half of all recorded inventory statewide). Thus, reaction to projects rather than a conscious initiative to discover and record cultural resource properties continues to be the norm in Montana, resulting in many known properties or known areas of high probability for properties remaining undocumented, especially on private and undeveloped land. Counteracting this trend in recent times have been a certain number of "Section 110" inventories by federal land managing agencies made possible in part because of "streamlined" review and compliance procedures that have freed up limited time and dollars. In 2001-2002, SHPO was also able to reinstate its program of funding targeted community surveys (in Missoula and Great Falls) following an increase in appropriated federal funds for the states in FY2001 and FY2002. As of this writing, however, this increase in federal funding is not expected to continue.

Resource Condition/Resources at Risk

In 1997, the condition of resources in the state was described as "fair to poor with some notable exceptions" (*Working Together*, 1997, pg. 18). The exceptions noted were buildings and some other structures for which funds were available for maintenance or restoration through concession income, community revitalization grants and loans, or as a result of federal management. In the case of most historic properties, however, conditions were viewed as generally negative or at least threatening, citing a number of detrimental factors in particular: deterioration, vandalism, changing land use, lack of local monetary support, loss of oral history, and the sheer number of potential resources

in need, for example in the case of pre-1940s houses. The story for prehistoric sites was considered more difficult to ascertain but the threats nonetheless the same or similar: residential development in rural areas, recreational use of open space, vandalism, and impacts from both natural resource extraction and land reclamation. In addition, it was pointed out that the anonymity of archaeological sites (both prehistoric and historic) makes it difficult to rally support for their protection.

Five years later, in 2002, the diagnosis for cultural resources in the state has arguably not changed significantly – with again some notable exceptions:

Success Stories. Some important developments in historic preservation have occurred since 1997 that have had a positive impact not only on specific properties, but, through example, for Montana's cultural resources in general. Not least among these was the state purchase of numerous historic properties and their associated artifact collections in Virginia and Nevada Cities, saving them from auction and almost certain loss to out-of-state buyers. At the time that the last State Plan was being drafted in 1996, the future of Virginia City - described by many as the best preserved Gold Rush town in the West - and Nevada City – an assembled collection of over 80 historic buildings salvaged from across the state beginning in the 1940s by Charles Bovey – was uncertain and of great concern to many who commented in the planning process. Through strong public encouragement and Legislative action in 1997, the Bovey buildings in Virginia and Nevada Cities and all their contents were purchased by the state and the Montana Heritage Commission established to manage these properties *and others that may be acquired in the future*. Though under-funded, the Montana Heritage Commission in partnership with the local community and the Montana Historical Society has made great strides in the preservation of both Virginia and Nevada Cities for the benefit of all Montanans.

Equally important as a symbol for state historic preservation, the restoration of the State Capitol in Helena - with significant contributions from the private sector - was completed in 2001, just in time for its 2002 centennial re-dedication. Also, Anschutz Mining Corporation, in an example of corporate responsibility and acknowledgement in the face of international public pressure, released its BLM oil and gas leases in the Weatherman Draw. Weatherman Draw, aka Valley of the Shields, is home to hundreds of fragile pictographs of outstanding archaeological and Indian traditional cultural significance. Glacier National Park began long-awaited renovation of Many Glacier Hotel and has developed a plan for rehabilitation of Going-to-the-Sun Road that is sensitive to its nationally significant cultural landscape. Anticipation of the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial in 2004-2005 has spawned a host of visible preservation projects with cooperative national, federal, state, and local support. These include combined efforts to redefine Traveler's Rest NHL in Lolo, the establishment of the USDA Forest Service administered Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center in Great Falls, ongoing plans by the Bureau of Land Management to build visitor centers at Pompeys Pillar and Fort Benton NHLs, and U.S. Forest Service preparations of Lolo Trail and Lemhi Pass for increased visitor use. At the state level, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks has initiated development planning for several Lewis and Clark related state parks and the Montana

Lewis & Clark Bicentennial Commission exists to coordinate and provide financial assistance to local community efforts. These local Lewis and Clark "chapter" efforts have resulted in new interpretive signage and programs as well as the identification and recognition of new sites, such as Yorks Islands and Crimson Bluffs outside Townsend in Broadwater County, the latter recently acquired for preservation by the Bureau of Land Management.

Other less high profile, but no less innovative, efforts in historic preservation also have occurred over the past five years. The U.S. Forest Service's Region 1 Cabin Rental Program has reached a stage of maturity and now includes 97 historic buildings – mostly log structures – that are fully accessible to the public, often interpreted within their historic context, and most importantly, generating their own revenue to pay for continued maintenance and upkeep. The Helena National Forest reclaimed mining waste at Charter Oak Mine and Mill without removal of its intact historically significant buildings and structures, saving these instead for public interpretation and education. Both the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have stepped up monitoring of historic, historic archaeological and prehistoric sites on public lands as part of programmatic approaches to cultural resource compliance. The City of Butte, with support from the NPS National Historic Landmark program and SHPO, initiated a revision of the Butte NHL to add the history of the labor movement to its already nationally recognized significant mining history. The Friends of the Little Bighorn battlefield received a 2002 grant from the NPS American Battlefield Protection program to research and nominate battlefields of the Great Sioux War (1876-1877) to the National Register. The City of Great Falls, driven by support from Preservation Cascade, first saved the historic Tenth Street Bridge from demolition and are now actively restoring this nationally significant structure as a pedestrian walkway over the Missouri River. The Montana Department of Transportation has successfully rehabilitated rather than replaced several other historic bridges and has listed a variety of its properties in the National Register of Historic Places. In 2002 the Town of Ekalaka applied for and received support from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program to conduct professional survey and evaluation prior to making decisions regarding the use of these funds for the demolition of historic homes and buildings. And, a dozen owners of historic buildings listed in the National Register of Historic Places matched funds made newly available in 2001 and 2002 from the SHPO to undertake "bricks-n-mortar" repairs, restorations and renovations of their properties across the state.

Ongoing Risks. These and other success stories notwithstanding, the risks to and needs of many Montana historic, prehistoric, and traditional cultural properties have not abated. When asked in planning questionnaires for this Plan about kinds of properties meriting special attention over the next five years, a majority of respondents identified rural agricultural buildings, downtown buildings/Mainstreets, railroad features, roads and trails, National Park and Forest Service buildings, schools, and prehistoric archaeological sites, especially rock art sites that also have traditional cultural value to the tribes (Appendices A and B). While these property types figured prominently, the actual list of sites of concern is much longer with everything from tipi rings to log cabins to Post Offices mentioned. In 2001, the non-profit statewide Montana Preservation Alliance

(MPA) also released a list of the six most endangered places that included: Pompeys Pillar; Remnants of Montana's Agricultural Heritage; Many Glacier Hotel; the Broadway Apartment Building in Lewistown; Valley of the Shields Rock Art; and the Broadwater School. More recently in 2002, the MPA endangered list adds: County Churches, the Red Bluff Stage Stop, Religious School Buildings, the Story Mansion in Bozeman, and County Courthouses statewide. Montana properties have also been regularly featured nationwide on the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) 11 Most Endangered Historic Places, for example: Historic Structures of Glacier National Park (1996); Flathead Indian Reservation (1997); Travelers Rest NHL (1999); and two properties in 2002: Pompeys Pillar and Missouri River Cultural & Sacred Sites (Fort Peck Reservoir). The risks that face these resources are as varied as the properties themselves and characterize those of Montana's cultural resources in general: inappropriate commercial or resource development, urban sprawl, neglected maintenance and repair, mismanagement, changing population needs, lack of public awareness, and – of course – limited financial resources and/or incentives for historic preservation at all levels: federal, tribal, state, local and private.

Thus, the progress in preserving Montana's significant historic, prehistoric, and traditional cultural places is real, but so is the ongoing need to do more. Once these heritage properties are lost, they are lost forever.

A Word About Historic Contexts

In addition to the heritage themes outlined above, *Working Together*, Montana's 1997 State Plan, also proposed a draft contextual framework for classifying the state's cultural resources according to universal human needs of food, safety and expression (*Working Together*, Appendix C). This contextual framework, inspired largely in response to criticisms from a few cultural resource professionals and their clients, failed almost immediately. Few individuals or organizations, including SHPO, have made reference or contributed to the contextual framework since 1997. Its failure can be attributed to a variety of factors, most likely including a lack of interest, a lack of resources (financial and human), and a lack of practical application. The anthropological emphasis of the proposed draft contextual framework was likely foreign to many historians. And at least some who commented on the framework in 1997 noted at that time that it might be an unnecessary layer in the regulatory process or might introduce a level of artificiality (*Working Together*, Appendix B).

Historic contexts nonetheless remain an important element of planning in the identification, recordation, evaluation and treatment of historic, historic archaeological, prehistoric, and traditional cultural properties in Montana. Contexts are designed to be both instructive and utilitarian, that is they can be used to show why historic places were created as well as serve as references for preservation research and planning. At their most fundamental level, as defined in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* (Federal Register, Vol. 48, No. 190), historic contexts represent historical topics (themes such as those outlined above) within space (location; geography) and time (age; chronology). Familiar to most

researchers, they are simply the setting within which the story of history is understood and told. But when applied in cultural resource management, where they may carry an extra burden of legal and financial consequences, contexts often become more controversial. At their best, contexts provide the background with which to determine which of the myriad of properties in Montana are important and therefore worthy of our best preservation efforts. At their worst, they become arbitrary boxes to force individual sites, buildings, and other cultural properties to conform to a set, preconceived concept of significance – where they must not only prove their value (innocence) but may also be dismissed (found guilty) if the context has not yet been developed fully.

If Montana does not have a fixed historic contextual framework – and the themes presented above could be considered that – it is not without a framework for contextual development. Great strides have been made over the past ten years to develop and provide historic contexts through *information management*. Beginning in 1990, and enhanced significantly in the past five years, Montana SHPO has worked diligently in partnership with the University of Montana and other organizations and agencies to develop a system of statewide information organization and retrieval that provides a dynamic basis for the contextual analysis and evaluation of Montana's cultural properties. This system is based on the three primary sources of existing knowledge and research of properties in the state: the Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS), the Cultural Resource Annotated Bibliography System (CRABS), and the Property Eligibility and Effect Registry (PEER). Briefly these can be described as follows:

- ***Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS)***: the statewide inventory of recorded properties, presently encompassing 40,000-plus historic, prehistoric, traditional cultural, as well as paleontological localities, each with an inventory form describing site type, location, age and other information.
- ***Cultural Resource Annotated Bibliography System (CRABS)***: the statewide library of reports describing efforts to identify, research and evaluate Montana's cultural resource properties, currently comprising 25,000 mostly unpublished studies and documents, referenced by location (Township/Range/Section), properties recorded, and keywords for themes, property types and subject matter.
- ***Property Eligibility and Effect Registry (PEER)***: A record of findings of eligibility and effect to cultural resource properties developed in consensus between SHPO and federal or state agencies, also including Montana's approximately 1000 buildings, structures, sites, and districts listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Together, these sources form an integrated history of the past 50 years of searching for and studying Montana's cultural resource properties in their historic context that exists to be used in both written form and as a database. This *State Antiquities Database* allows for the fast and integrated retrieval of the information using such queries as location, type of property, age, as well as themes or research topics in the form of "keywords."

Both comprehensive and continuously updated, the Montana State Antiquities Database is a clearinghouse of information that provides the framework for historic context of the state's cultural resource properties, incorporating all three of the primary contextual elements of theme, space, and time. The knowledge embodied by this information management system of the kinds of properties that exist in Montana, where they are located, and if and why they have been found significant yields the context for determining which properties merit further consideration and/or preservation. Recognizing the importance and the need for this historic context, the enhanced management and sharing of Montana's cultural resource information is one of the five Goals identified in the current State Plan.

IV. Issues and Challenges in Montana Historic Preservation

Planning for the preservation of Montana's heritage resources is particularly critical at this juncture. Amidst a background of national and state economic uncertainty, Montana continues to undergo a transition from an economy primarily based on natural resource extraction to one that is increasingly dependent on service-based industries. Tourism, for example is now Montana's second largest industry after agriculture, out-stepping mining and timber. According to the *Montana Tourism & Recreation Strategic Plan 2003-2007*, Montana's heritage tourists in particular are "high revenue" tourists that spend the most money in the local economy. Meanwhile, the state budget for the next biennium must deal with a shortfall of between 200 and 300 million dollars and the prospect of program eliminations. Residential development, particularly in the west and southwest parts of the state, continues to see marked increases, while population in eastern Montana remains stable or is declining. Montana's cities in general are experiencing growth and are eclipsing federal and state government as the centers for the state's economic development. At the same time that state services are being cut back, local governments across the state must address infrastructure needs associated with shifting growth.

Within this milieu, interest statewide in the preservation and interpretation of our historic and prehistoric resources continues to be strong. As Montana experiences changes and uncertainty in its economy and life style, there is a perceived need to preserve our sense of place and the resources that help us to relate to and understand our past. New residents are interested in learning more about their adopted home and are often eager to contribute to local preservation efforts. Communities see tourism opportunities associated with cultural sites and are increasingly willing to incorporate historic preservation in area economic development plans. Local government officials, Chambers of Commerce, public land managers, economic development specialists and educators also see the value of working cooperatively with historic preservation advocates to bring more financial and human resources to a variety of planning and educational efforts.

The preservation community has often been at odds with other public and private activities that have seemingly discounted the value of heritage resources. Often, preservation concerns have been addressed as an afterthought or a luxury rather than as an integral part of the decision making process. Key to the success of preservation in the State of Montana in the future will be a greater understanding of the issues facing historic preservation and the recognition and incorporation of historic preservation concerns in wide-ranging public policy decisions. The formulation of public policy in the areas of land use planning, economic development, natural resource conservation, the provision of affordable housing, and other issues will benefit from the consideration of cultural resource properties and vice versa.

Based on public opinion, the primary issues and challenges facing historic preservation in Montana today are not unlike those identified five years ago. Three of the top four issues deemed most significant in surveys conducted in 2001 are the same as those previously identified in 1996: *availability of financial resources; local ability to preserve historical/cultural resources; and public awareness of culture/preservation issues* (see

Appendix A). To these widely recognized and highly ranked issues can be added a fourth based on comments received and input taken over the past five years: *tribal participation in historic preservation*. While additional issues exist, these four are highlighted below.

Financial Resources

SHPO easily receives ten inquiries per week, sometimes more, about the availability of funds to facilitate historic preservation. The majority of these come from private individuals who, in turn, are the most often disappointed to learn that neither historic preservation grants or incentives cater to homeowners. At the same time, potential eligible recipients – incoming producing properties, non-profit organizations, and public agencies – face increasing restrictions and/or competition for limited financial resources and are often forced to choose between using funds for historic preservation or for some other worthy purpose.

The lack of financial resources affects preservation at all levels. Federal agency heritage programs, largely funded and driven by undertakings, have little opportunity to initiate historic preservation projects on federal lands proactively. Local governments, many of which rely directly or indirectly on federal or state support, struggle with public needs and services seemingly more basic than historic preservation. At the state level, Montana's \$200 - 300 million budget shortfall for 2004-2005 almost ensures that no new programs will be developed and existing programs, including those related to historic preservation, will likely see cuts between 10 – 20%. Already one of the lowest state funded preservation offices in the nation, Montana SHPO will have fewer state dollars in contribution over the foreseeable future, necessitating putting more of its federal appropriation into funding core in-house programs and away from assistance to local preservation projects. In 2001, for example, SHPO was able to reinstate its re-grant program for "bricks-n-mortar" and community surveys on the basis of an increase in the federal allocation of the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) to the states. This was continued in 2002 despite a 50% cutback in the increase. Now, with current projections of a further decline in the HPF distribution to the states, coupled with state budget cuts, cancellation of this program is almost certain.

Considered both an issue as well as a solution to other issues, base funding for historic preservation continues to be a primary challenge in Montana. Reliance on special funded projects, volunteerism, and philanthropy, while creating opportunities that would otherwise not exist, will not in and of itself address this issue.

Opportunity: The 57th Montana State Legislature passed into law effective January 1, 2002 a state tax credit for qualified rehabilitation of significant historic properties placed into preservation easements held by a non-profit organization for at least 29 years. Montana must identify organizations willing and able to hold these easements.

Opportunity: The recently enacted federal 2002 Farm Bill includes provisions for historic preservation such as funds for inventory, barn rehabilitation grants and for the protection of archaeological sites, although no dollars have yet to be appropriated.

Local Ability to Preserve

Multiple factors likely contribute to the recognition of the local ability to preserve historic/cultural resources as an important issue in Montana preservation. Not least among these is the knowledge that financial resources for historic preservation at the local level, generated directly or received through state and federal programs, are severely constrained (see above). Funding aside, however, other local considerations include pressures that compete with historic preservation such as urban sprawl, the general lack of available expertise, and the ineffectiveness of regulation in controlling local and private developments.

Despite the relatively small size and overall moderate growth rate of its towns and cities, Montana has not been immune to urban sprawl. The development of commercial and residential districts on the outskirts of the state's urban centers has, as elsewhere in the nation, resulted in the deterioration of historic central business districts and city residential neighborhoods. Downtown revitalization efforts have been successful in a number of communities, but nonetheless struggle to compete with the public's thirst for national retail and restaurant chains that refuse to accommodate historic Mainstreet space. Meanwhile, subdivisions spread into surrounding agricultural landscapes and neighboring small communities are claimed and refashioned into satellite bedroom communities. The rural counterpart to sprawl, perhaps, is the ongoing loss of working ranches to out-of-state buyers more interested in land than land use. While often sensitive to wildlife and the scenic environment, historic properties on these ranches have not fared as well nor have the small communities reliant on the business that these ranches once supported.

Local communities and private preservation-minded individuals alike struggle in the face of these and other pressures. Even when an interest to preserve exists, knowledge is limited, help short-handed, and legal recourse generally non-existent. SHPO responds to numerous phone calls and can provide literature but seldom has the means or opportunity to make on-site visits. Local preservation organizations are small and generally focused on a single resource. The Montana Preservation Alliance, the statewide non-profit, has until recently not had the infrastructure to organize and take on more than one or two issues at a time. The fifteen communities (including some counties) participating in the federally funded and SHPO administered Certified Local Government (CLG) program fare better than others with resources and assistance provided through local preservation officers. Among these, however, design review procedures are still limited. State law also provides for the county review of the impact of subdivision development but with few notable exceptions, especially Gallatin and Madison counties, these typically do not include formal consideration of impacts to historic and prehistoric sites. Current policy for state permitting under the Montana Environmental Policy Act offers little more oversight of local projects with no requirements to collect new information or involve cultural resource professionals in the assessments of impact.

Opportunity: The Montana Preservation Alliance has hired a full-time staff person for the first time in 2002.

Public Awareness

Public awareness of culture/historic preservation issues was cited as the most significant factor affecting historic preservation in 1996 and also ranked second in 2001. Further, when asked which SHPO program merited additional funding - should such funding become available - respondents identified *Heritage Education and Outreach* second only to Matching Grants for Surveys and Bricks n' Mortar Projects, a financial resource. As noted in the 1997 Plan: "There is a strong relationship with public awareness and the commitment of dollars to preservation activities. As public awareness increases regarding the importance of preservation, it is likely that public policy decisions will increasingly favor the commitment of resources in support of historic resources" (*Working Together*, pg. 19). The following, from the 1997 Plan, also still applies:

"Public awareness of the value of our historic resources has been increasing over time. The incorporation of historic sites in state and local tourism promotion efforts is a good example of how public perceptions have changed. Increasingly, cities and towns are considering historic properties in land use planning issues. For example, communities often create special historic zones that encourage revitalization, mixed uses and architectural design standards for designated neighborhoods and commercial districts. Generally, Montanans are aware of the importance of documenting and preserving local history. Yet, public policy decisions regarding community and economic development, public infrastructure, housing and general land use are still often made without consideration of impacts on heritage properties. Local historical societies, preservation professionals and state preservation officials are often not consulted in the planning stages of project development. Rather preservationists often find themselves in a last ditch effort to save a site. The risk is that the preservation community, by being involved so late, can be characterized as obstructionist and anti-progressive. Educational programs which increase awareness among the public and their elected officials would be very beneficial in addressing this problem." (*Working Together*, 1997)

We must also confront the perception that preserving historic properties is too expensive or restrictive when measured against benefits. Property owners seeking advice and assistance might feel overwhelmed by what they view as unnecessary paperwork, extravagant expense or complicated processes. In some cases, they may be right. Information about more inexpensive construction materials which can be substituted to achieve the same goal, for example, would likely result in property owners being more willing to undertake restoration projects. Landowners who can continue to use their land while preserving archaeological and historical sites will likely be more cooperative.

Opportunity: The Montana SHPO has upgraded its website to include additional online information and resources: www.his.state.mt.us

Opportunity: 2002 promises to be the "Year of the Barn," with complementing initiatives including the Smithsonian/National Trust for Historic Preservation *Barn Again!* traveling exhibit, a Montana Barn Preservation poster, and a program for adding and recognizing barns in the state inventory.

Tribal Involvement

Although not identified as a discrete issue in the 1997 Plan, the importance of tribal involvement in historic preservation in Montana was nonetheless recognized both in that Plan and the comments it received (i.e., *Working Together*, Appendix B). Events since 1997 have only served to reinforce this perception. Not least among these is the establishment and staffing of the NPS-approved Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (CSKT) on the Flathead Indian Reservation in portions of Lake, Flathead, Missoula, and Sanders counties in western Montana. Empowered to assume most of the duties and responsibilities of SHPO within the boundaries of the reservation, the CSKT THPO has also formalized tribal consultation for off-reservation resources of concern to these tribes, for example with regards to developments at Travelers Rest NHL near Lolo. The first of its kind in Montana, the CSKT THPO sets an example for development of future Montana THPOs, as is presently pending for both the Northern Cheyenne and Rocky Boys reservations.

Tribal lands within Montana's seven reservations make up nearly 6% of the state, equal in size to those owned by the state. While a significant factor in its own right, tribal concerns are not limited to these reservations. They often extend to tribal territories or alternatively to specific places or resource types. Different tribes approach tribal consultation and involvement in different ways – as with any entity, there is no single "Indian viewpoint." Important places may include rock art sites, fasting places, graves, medicinal plant gathering areas, the location of specific events (e.g. the Baker Massacre site), or much larger landscapes such as the Sweet Grass Hills or the Badger-Two Medicine drainages, the latter of which is being considered for formal nomination to the National Register of Historic Places by the Forest Service. Many of these traditional cultural properties, both large and small, are known only to the tribes and therefore known only through involvement of the tribes in the preservation planning process.

Montana's tribes played a primary role in passage of the Montana Human Skeletal Remains and Burial Act (1991) and more recently the Montana Repatriation Act (2001), the first state repatriation law of its kind. The discovery and disposition of human remains and associated funerary objects is a primary issue for all Montana tribes. Other issues include vandalism, the impacts of archaeological excavation, and poor land management practices. Discussions with tribal cultural representatives indicate that enforcement of existing law and public education are two important preservation efforts they want SHPO to lead. Many individuals – from elders to tribal college professors to tribal resource employees – also expressed interest in more field training and awareness of archaeological methods and techniques. Recognizing that prehistoric archaeological sites are Indian history, they not only want to monitor archaeologists but also be better able to monitor other tribal programs that they feel bypass preservation law and tribal culture committees. In general, our discussions indicate that tribes want to be involved in historic preservation. The challenge is to facilitate their participation.

Opportunity: Two additional reservations, Rocky Boys (Chippewa-Cree) and Northern Cheyenne, have THPO applications pending in 2002.

Other Issues

Other issues ranked significant by a majority of respondents to questionnaires (7 or higher on a scale of 1 to 10) include: *shifts in land use and settlement patterns; loss of culture/traditions due to passing generations; vandalism and/or neglect of historic resources; and the legal framework for protection of cultural resources on private land.*

Issues that ranked the lowest, both in 1996 and in 2001, included: information age communication changes; housing affordability and accessibility; baby-boomer attitudes about historic preservation; and shifts from industry/agriculture to a service based economy. While no issues came close to being ranked "insignificant" (value = 1), these four issues, adjusting for score inflation, could be considered weak or, at best, neutral.

V. A Vision for Montana Preservation 2003-2007: Goals and Objectives

Vision

The vision for historic preservation in Montana, and thereby the mission of the State Historic Preservation Office, over the next five years (2003 – 2007) is:

Working together with all Montanans to preserve our state's significant historic, prehistoric and traditional cultural places.

Principles, Policies and Practices

The following principles, policies, and practices derive from discussions and experience gained during the present planning process. Together, they can form the basis for strategic efforts in preservation in Montana.

Working together: In a state as large as Montana with a population so small, it is imperative that historic preservation be undertaken in an environment of cooperation. Working together is not only beneficial; it is a necessity. People and resources, including information, must be pooled and shared. Issues cannot be allowed to become polarized: development can be made responsive to historic preservation and preservation, in turn, can accommodate development. Working together occurs across all levels from national to local and private to public. As many significant historic resources are owned privately or held in trust for all Americans, historic preservation is best, if not only, achieved through cooperation.

Actions speak louder than words: Individual Montanans enjoy a high level of access to decision-makers and are accustomed to having their say. Consequently, a premium is placed upon tangible results, rather than simply discourse, as the true measure of success. In historic preservation it is insufficient to appeal to the higher values of preservation if those values cannot be or are not realized pragmatically. Historic preservation in Montana must be demonstrable in order to succeed and prosper.

Good information leads to good decision-making: Historic preservation relies on up-to-date, comprehensive information in all its steps from identification and evaluation to mitigation and treatment. The importance of obtaining the necessary data, both new and existing, to making an appropriate decision cannot be overstated. Moreover, as this information about resources and how to address them is constantly growing and evolving, it is equally vital that a system for organizing and retrieving information is in place at the state level. Ideally, all interested parties should have access to the same information.

All preservation is not local: Appealing as it may be to think that local contexts, needs and decisions determine historic preservation – and sometimes they do – such a view

does not give sufficient acknowledgement to the role of the state and the nation in serving as a clearinghouse for information and guidance in historic preservation. This State Plan, the state inventory of recorded cultural properties, the National Register of Historic Places, the SHPO library of previous cultural inventory and investigations, as well as guidance interpreted and made accessible through SHPO from the National Park Service, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other national organizations are all important to making sense of and preserving historic properties. Many state and federal agencies, particularly land-managing agencies, are also strongly invested in historic preservation policies and practices, both through purpose and regulation. Historic buildings and archaeological sites in public ownership belong to more than those who live in proximity to them and must be managed accordingly with the greater public interest in mind.

Pro-active comes before Re-active: Historic preservation under fire or in the face of conflict seldom yields the best results. Some crises are inevitable, but these should not be the norm. Agencies and organizations need to incorporate preservation early into the planning and decision-making process before options have been limited. Individuals and businesses must be educated to considering meaningful alternatives that favor preservation. The ongoing proactive inventory and recognition of significant historic properties and the explanation of what they mean is often the best means for ensuring their long-term care and preservation.

Plan to planning: Most comprehensive Plans – even good ones – are under-utilized. Important in the making, they are soon forgotten - relegated to the proverbial shelf. No-one should expect all actions to make reference to something so general as a State Plan; however, properly used, most prioritizing and significant actions should be able to draw upon and be consistent with the information and ideas expressed in the Plan. Equally important, planning (with a little "p") can and should be applied to all preservation efforts. Planning is more than the implementation of the Plan. There are far too many aspects of preservation to include all of them in a Plan and information is also constantly increasing and evolving. Good planning makes reference to the most applicable guidance and the most current data, not only that embodied in a Plan. Much like context development, planning requires active participation, original research, and thought - not merely reference to a pre-set body of work.

Goals & Objectives

The goals and objectives on the following page will provide guidance for historic preservation in Montana over the next five years. They derive from and reflect the input, resource assessments, issues and policies identified in the current planning process and presented in this Plan. While providing direction for the annual actions of the State Historic Preservation Office over the next five years, these goals and objectives are also presented for the state as a whole in achieving a vision for historic preservation of:

Working together with all Montanans to preserve our state's significant historic, prehistoric and traditional cultural places.

Montana Preservation Goals and Objectives 2003 - 2007

Goal I. Foster a preservation ethic for Montana's heritage properties

Objectives:

1. Instill an awareness and appreciation for Montana's heritage and heritage properties.
2. Encourage the integration of historic preservation in planning and policy-making.
3. Promote the cultural, social, and economic benefits of historic preservation.
4. Provide leadership and vision in historic preservation.

Goal II. Identify, evaluate, and recognize Montana's heritage properties

Objectives:

1. Survey or support the survey of un-inventoried properties throughout the state.
2. Guide the development and use of historical contexts for evaluating the significance and integrity of Montana's prehistoric, historic, and cultural sites.
3. Encourage and assist owners to list properties in the National Register of Historic Places.

Goal III. Create and support a statewide comprehensive source for information about Montana's heritage properties and historic preservation

Objectives:

1. Acquire, organize, and share data on the state's prehistoric, historic, and traditional cultural sites.
2. Gather, develop, and disseminate historic preservation guidance and standards.
3. Identify financial and human resources to assist preservation.

Goal IV. Encourage the involvement of Montana's tribes in historic preservation

Objectives:

1. Meet regularly with tribal cultural representatives to discuss issues and concerns.
2. Sponsor or co-sponsor forums that include Native Americans.
3. Facilitate the consideration of tribal perspectives regarding the treatment of heritage properties.

Goal V. Work effectively with all agencies, organizations, and individuals for good stewardship and sensitive treatment of Montana's heritage properties

Objectives:

1. Effectively apply historic preservation programs, strategies, techniques, laws, and information to the preservation of Montana's heritage properties.
2. Solidify existing partnerships and form new consensus for the benefit of historic preservation.
3. Strengthen local and private efforts to preserve.
4. Develop and support special programs for the preservation of resources at risk.

VI. Planning Cycle: 2003 - 2007

The current Plan, *Working Together to PRESERVE MONTANA*, will apply to and be implemented over the next five years, 2003 – 2007. For each year in this cycle, its goals and objectives will form the basis for defining and prioritizing the activities of the State Historic Preservation Office and other organizations choosing to participate in its vision.

Copies of the Plan will be distributed to those involved in the planning process and it will be advertised and be made available to others upon request during its five-year duration. The Plan will also be posted on the Montana Historic Preservation Office website under www.montanahistoricalsociety.org. Pending adequate funding, a 4-6 page brochure - illustrated with photographs, charts and graphs – will also be developed in 2003 (or as soon as possible thereafter) to draw attention to the Plan, its adopted goals and objectives, and how these are being implemented in SHPO programs. This public-friendly format is intended for wide distribution and to facilitate greater awareness of, use, and response to Montana's State Plan for historic preservation.

Feedback on this Plan will be documented and discussed. In consultation with the National Park Service, adjustments may be made as needed over the cycle of the Plan. Comments on the Plan will also initiate the process for revising or replacing the Plan in 2008.

To comment on or receive a copy of this Plan, please write, email, fax or call:

State Historic Preservation Office
Montana Historical Society
P.O. Box 201202
Helena, MT 59620-1202

(406) 444-7717
(406) 444-6575 (FAX)
mbaumler@state.mt.us

VII. Bibliography & Supporting Documents

Federal Preservation Law, Regulations and Guidance

(visit www.cr.nps.gov/linklaws.htm)

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through 2000 (16 USC 470 et seq.)

36 CFR Part 60	National Register of Historic Places
36 CFR Part 61	Procedures for State, Tribal, and Local Government Historic Preservation Programs
36 CFR Part 63	Determinations of Eligibility for Inclusion in the National Register
36 CFR Part 65	National Historic Landmarks Program
36 CFR Part 67	Sec. of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation
36 CFR Part 68	Sec. of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties
36 CFR Part 800	Protection of Historic Properties (ACHP)

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990, as amended (25 USC 3001, et seq.)

43 CFR Part 10 Native Amer. Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: Final Rule

Archeology and Historic Preservation; Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Federal Register, Vol. 48, No 190.

National Park Service, *Federal Historic Preservation Laws*. Washington, D.C. 1993

National Park Service, *Historic Preservation Fund Grants Manual* (October 1997 Release)

National Park Service, *Preservation Briefs* 1 – 42 (Technical Preservation Services; visit www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/index.htm)

National Park Service, *National Register Bulletins*. Technical information on the National Register of Historic Places: survey, evaluation, registration, and preservation of cultural resources. (see list below; visit www.cr.nps.gov/nr)

National Park Service, National Register Bulletins

- 4 Contribution of Moved Buildings to Historic Districts (out-of-print)
- 5 Tax Treatments for Moved Buildings (out-of-print)
- 7 Definition of Boundaries for Historic Units of the National Park System (n.a.)

- 8 Use of Nomination Documentation in the Part I Certification Process (out-of-print)
- 12 Definition of National Register Boundaries for Archeological Properties (see #21)
- 13 How to Apply National Register Criteria to Post Offices
- 14 Guidelines for Counting Contributing and Noncontributing Resources for National Register Documentation (out-of-print, see #16)
- 15 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation
- 16 Guidelines for Completing National Register Historic Places Forms
 - Part A: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form
 - Part B: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form
- 17 Certification of State and Local Statutes and Historic Districts (out-of-print)
- 18 How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes
- 19 Reviewing National Register Nominations
- 20 Nominating Historic Vessels and Shipwrecks to the National Register of Historic Places
- 21 Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties (appendix includes #12)
- 22 Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties That Have Achieved Significance Within the Last Fifty Years
- 23 How to Improve the Quality of Photos for National Register Nominations
- 24 Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning
- 26 Certified Local Governments in the National Historic Preservation Program (n.a.)
- 28 Using the UTM Grid System to Record Historic Sites
- 29 Guidelines for Restricting Information About Historic and Prehistoric Resources
- 30 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes
- 32 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Properties Associated with Significant Persons
- 34 Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Historic Aids to Navigation
- 35 Examples of Documentation: National Register Casebook.
- 36 Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archeological Properties
- 38 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties
- 39 Researching a Historic Property
- 40 Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating and Registering America's Historic Battlefields
- 41 Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Cemeteries and Burial Places
- 42 Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating and Nominating Historic Mining Properties
 - Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Historic Aviation Properties
 - Telling the Stories: Planning Effective Interpretive Programs for Places Listed in the National Register of Historic Places
 - How to Prepare National Historic Landmark Nominations

State Preservation Law, Regulations and Guidance

Montana State Antiquities Act of 1973, as amended through 1995 (MCA 22.3.421-442)
SHPO Administrative Rules 10.121.901-916
DNRC Administrative Rules 36.2.801-813
FWP Administrative Rules 12.8.501-510

Montana Human Skeletal Remains and Burial Protection Act of 1991 (MCA 22.3.801-811)

Montana Repatriation Act of 2001

Montana Heritage Preservation and Development Commission (MCA 22.3.1002-1004)

State Historic Preservation Office, *Working Together: The Montana Historic Preservation Plan 1997-2002*. January, 1997.

State Historic Preservation Office, *Montana Historic Preservation Services Directory 2002*.

State Historic Preservation Office, *Consulting with the Montana SHPO: Guidelines and Procedures for Cultural Resource Review and Consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act and the Montana State Antiquities Act*. Montana SHPO Planning Bulletin No. 21. September, 2000.

Rennie, Patrick J., *Guidelines for Conducting Cultural/Paleontologic Resources Inventory Work on Montana State Lands*. Montana DNRC, 2002.

State Historic Preservation Office, *Montana Historic Property Record Form and Instructions*.

State Historic Preservation Office, *Montana Archaeology Education Resource Catalog: A Guide for the Teaching of Archaeology and Prehistory in Montana Schools*. (Revised February, 2002).

Montana Heritage Properties and Context

Montana National Register of Historic Places files. State Historic Preservation Office.

Montana Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS). State Historic Preservation Office/University of Montana, Department of Anthropology, Site Records Office.

Montana Cultural Resource Annotated Bibliography System (CRABS). State Historic Preservation Office.

Books/Series/Periodicals:

Frison, George C., 1991 (second edition), *Prehistoric Hunters of the High Plains*. Academic Press, San Diego.

Malone, Michael P., Richard B. Roeder, William L. Lang, 1991 (revised edition), *Montana: A History of Two Centuries*. University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Van West, Carroll, 1986, *A Traveler's Companion to Montana History*. Montana Historical Society Press, Helena.

Cheney, Roberta Carkeek, 1984 (revised edition), *Names on the Face of Montana*. Mountain Press Publishing Company, Missoula.

Montana Mainstreets Series. Montana Historical Society Press, Helena.

Volume 1: A Guide to Historic Virginia City by Marilyn Grant, 1998

Volume 2: A Guide to Historic Glendive, 1998

Volume 3: A Guide to Historic Lewistown by Ellen and Ken Sievert, 1999

Volume 4: A Guide to Historic Hamilton by Chere Jiusto, 2000

Volume 5: A Guide to Historic Kalispell by Kathryn L. McKay, 2001

Volume 6: A Guide to Historic Missoula by Allan J. Mathews, 2002

Montana: the Magazine of Western History. Montana Historical Society (1951-present)

Archaeology in Montana. Montana Archaeological Society. (1958-present)

Overviews:

(see also various National Register Multiple Property Documents on file at Montana State Historic Preservation Office)

Axline, Jon A. *Monuments Above the Water: Montana's Historic Highway Bridges, 1860 – 1956*. Montana Department of Transportation, Helena, 1993.

Beck, Barb S. *Historical Overview of the Helena and Deerlodge National Forests*. USDA/Forest Service: Helena and Deerlodge Forests, 1989.

(Broadwater, Deer Lodge, Gallatin, Granite, Jefferson, Lewis & Clark, Madison, Meagher, Powell, Silver Bow counties)

Beckes, Michael R. and James D. Keyser. *The Prehistory of Custer National Forest: An Overview*. USDA/Forest Service: Custer National Forest, 1983.

(Carbon, Carter, Prairie, Rosebud counties)

Caywood, Janene M., et al. *Cultural Resource Overview, Bitterroot National Forest*, 1981.

Deaver, Sherri and Ken. *An Archaeological Overview of Butte District Prehistory*. BLM: Butte District, 1986. (BLM Cultural Resources Series, No. 2).

(Beaverhead, Broadwater, Cascade, Deerlodge, Flathead, Gallatin, Granite, Jefferson, Lake, Lewis & Clark, Lincoln, Madison, Meagher, Mineral, Missoula, Park, Pondera, Powell, Ravalli, Sanders, Silver Bow, Teton counties)

Deaver, Sherri and Ken. *Prehistoric Cultural Resource Overview of Southeast Montana*. BLM, Miles City District, 1988.

(Big Horn, Carter, Custer, Dawson, Fallon, Garfield, McCone, Powder River, Prairie, Richland, Rosebud, Treasure, Wibaux counties)

Fulbright, Zane L. *More Than Speculation: An Overview of Mining Activity on the Lewis & Clark National Forest*. USDA/Forest Service, 1996.

Knight, George C. *Overview: Ecological and Cultural Prehistory of the Helena and Deerlodge National Forests, Montana*. USDA/Forest Service: Helena and Deerlodge Forests, 1989.

(Broadwater, Deer Lodge, Gallatin, Granite, Jefferson, Lewis & Clark, Madison, Meagher, Powell, Silver Bow counties)

Knudson, Ruthann *Upper Missouri National Wild and Scenic River Cultural Resource Management Plan. Volume I: Overview and Plan*. BLM, Lewistown District, 1992. (BLM Cultural Resource Series, No. 3)

(Blaine, Choteau, Fergus, Phillips counties)

McLeod, C. Milo and Douglas Melton. *The Prehistory of the Lolo and Bitterroot National Forests: An Overview*. USDA/Forest Service: Lolo and Bitterroot National Forests, 1986.

(Granite, Mineral, Missoula, Powell, Ravalli, Sanders counties)

Ruebelmann, George N. *An Overview of the Archaeology and Prehistory of the Lewistown BLM District, Montana*. BLM, Lewistown District, 1983. (*Archaeology in Montana*, Volume 24, Number 3).

(Big Horn, Blaine, Carbon, Choteau, Daniels, Fergus, Golden Valley, Glacier, Hill, Judith Basin, Liberty, Musselshell, Petroleum, Phillips, Roosevelt, Sheridan, Sweetgrass, Stillwater, Toole, Valley, Wheatland, Yellowstone counties)

Tetra-Tech. *Patterns on the Land: A Survey of Homesteading and Prehistoric Land Use, Bull Mountains, Montana*, 1991

Warhank, Josef J. (compiler). *A Plan for the Management of Historic Mines in Montana: Placer & Hardrock*, 1999 (draft)

Wilmoth, Stan. *Contextual Overview for Fort Peck*. Prepared for Bureau of Reclamation, Montana Area Office, MT, 2001.

(Daniels, Roosevelt, Sheridan, Valley counties)

Wyss, Marilyn J. *Roads to Romance: The Origin and Development of the Road and Trail System in Montana*. Montana Department of Transportation, 1992.

Historic Preservation Websites

Montana State Historic Preservation Office	www.his.state.mt.us
Montana Preservation Alliance	www.preservemontana.org
National Park Service: Cultural Resources	www.cr.nps.gov
NPS National Register of Historic Places	www.cr.nps.gov/nr
NPS National Historic Landmark Program	www.cr.nps.gov/nhl
NPS Archeology and Ethnography	www.cr.nps.gov/aad
NPS HABS/HAER	www.cr.nps.gov/habshaer
NPS NAGPRA	www.cr.nps.gov/nagpra
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	www.achp.gov
National Trust for Historic Preservation	www.nationaltrust.org
Preservation Books	www.nthpbooks.org
NPS National Center for Preservation Technology	www.ncptt.nps.gov
NPS Heritage Preservation Services	www2.cr.nps.gov
NPS Preservation Tax Act/Incentives:	www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/tax
NPS Caring for Your Historic Building	www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/care
NPS Preservation Planning and Strategies	www2.cr.nps.gov/pad

Appendix A
Montana Historic Preservation Planning
Questionnaire #1
2001

Results
&
Discussion

Montana 2001 Historic Preservation Planning Questionnaire #1 Discussion

The Montana Historic Preservation Planning Questionnaire #1 was distributed in early Spring 2001 to approximately 220 individuals listed in the Montana Historic Preservation Services Directory. These persons can be broadly classified as “historic preservation professionals.” Questionnaire #1 was accompanied by a revised 2001 edition of the Directory and a stamped self-addressed return envelope. Sixty (60) responses were returned, or 27 percent (see below, Question 7 for a breakdown of respondents).

The seven questions in the 2001 Questionnaire #1 were designed to build upon the existing Montana state plan: Working Together: The Montana Historic Preservation Plan (Montana SHPO 1997). By asking the same or similar questions, we hoped to evaluate how much has changed in the past 5 years and to assess to what extent the state plan would require revision or replacement. Question 1, for example, repeated the first question in a 1996 questionnaire (Working Together: Appendix A: Questionnaire #2) by asking respondents to scale the significance of the same list of issues in historic preservation. Question 2 asked respondents to rate the priority of the nine goals also identified for comment in the 1996 questionnaire and ultimately adopted in Working Together. The remaining questions (3-6), though not duplicates, followed several lines of inquiry used in an earlier questionnaire from 1995/1996. Questions 3 and 4 asked respondents to rank the importance of 10 primary MT SHPO programs, rate their effectiveness, and tell us which should receive priority for new funding; Question 5 requested a list of kinds of properties meriting special attention; and Question 6 asked to identify guidance that would be most beneficial. Question 7 asked individuals to tell us what their primary working role in historic preservation is.

The tabulated results for each of the questions in the 2001 Questionnaire #1 are attached, based upon the 60 responses received. Notes are included for explanation as needed and to describe varying sample sizes. While the numbers and words largely speak for themselves, responses to each of the questions are also highlighted and discussed briefly here.

Issues in Historic Preservation (Question 1).

Comparing the results of the rating of 18 potential issues affecting historic preservation in 1996 with 2001 indicates that little has changed in this respect. Three of the top four issues deemed most significant in 2001 are the same as those identified 5 years ago. These are (by order of significance in 2001):

- 1) availability of financial resources*
- 2) local ability to preserve historical/cultural resources*
- 3) public awareness of culture/preservation issues.*

The fourth most significant issue recognized in 2001 is:

4) *effect of suburban sprawl on Main Streets.*

This issue ranked fifth in 1996. Included in the top four in 1996 but not in 2001 is: *vandalism and/or deterioration of historic resources*. This issue ranked sixth in 2001.

Similarly, the same four issues ranked the lowest in both 1996 and 2001. These were: *information age communication changes*; *housing affordability and availability*; *baby-boomer attitudes about historic preservation*; and *shifts from industry/agriculture to service based economy*. While no issues came close to being ranked “insignificant” (value = 1) in either 1996 or 2001, these four issues, adjusting for score inflation, could be considered weak, or at best, neutral.

Overall, the important issues affecting historic preservation in 2001 appear to be the same as those in 1996. While space for write-in issues was not provided in 2001, none were written on the returned questionnaires.

Goals for Historic Preservation (Question 2).

People were asked to rate the priority of the nine goals adopted in the 1997 Montana State Historic Preservation Plan, Working Together, on a scale of 1 to 10. All goals ranked on average above 6.0. The highest priority in 2001 ($x = 9.11$) was given to Goal #1: *Conserve Montana’s cultural resources*, which was also adopted as the overall mission of the Montana State Historic Preservation Office in the 1997 Plan.

The lowest priority in 2001 ($x = 6.24$), was accorded to Goal #9: *Create recreation links among Montana’s natural and cultural sites*. When asked in 1996 how respondents felt about the same nine “goals and strategies,” most agreed with all them, but “about 20% felt that the goal related to recreational linkages was not appropriate” (Working Together, Appendix A.). Based on this information, Goal #9 should be given careful consideration in a Plan revision.

Interestingly, respondents rated Goal #8: *Study issues and develop plans for preservation*, second lowest ($x = 6.89$). This suggests that Montana historic preservation professionals do not consider the planning process a high priority activity in 2001, possibly because the planning conducted five years ago is felt sufficient to guide preservation in 2001.

Respondents were also given an opportunity to write-in up to three additional goals. A list of these is provided in the results. Many of these are focused activities more than goals (e.g., *conduct regular statewide meetings*; *focus on street-scapes*; *promote tax credit program*, and so forth) while others could arguably be subsumed under the existing nine goals (e.g., *make historic preservation more politically appealing* = Goal #2?; *utilize the media to raise public awareness* = Goal #4?; etc.). These write-ins should nonetheless be considered information for formulating specific objectives or tasks and for the potential development of new or revised goals. Of the write-in suggestions, several appeared three or more times and, as such, deserve special consideration. These include:

- . *Involve tribes/reservations/THPOs (n = 4)*
- . *Create on-line databases and information management systems (n = 3)*
- . *Make historic preservation more politically appealing (n = 3)*

Montana SHPO Programs (Question 3).

Question 3 asked respondents to rank the importance of the core service programs of the Montana SHPO (to the individual and to the state) and to also rate SHPO's effectiveness in providing that service. The question caused confusion among at least half of the respondents whose scores could not be counted. This was probably a result of introducing a sequential ranking system (1 to 10) with 1 as the highest and 10 the lowest; whereas previous questions (and the part of this question about effectiveness) allowed values to be used more than once with 10 being highest and 1 lowest. The confusion was evident both in the lack of responses and error in the form of response. Depending on the part of the question, between 22 and 36 responses were deemed usable, although it is still possible that some unintended reverse sequencing has obscured the data.

With respect to order of importance to the individual, the top three SHPO programs are:

- 1) *Survey and Inventory*
- 2) *Technical Assistance and Advice*
- 3) *Review and Compliance*

But with respect to perceived importance statewide, the top three SHPO programs are:

- 1) *Planning*
- 2) *Survey and Inventory*
- 3) *Technical Assistance and Advice*

Apparently, many historic preservation professionals recognized *Planning* (including goals, contexts and public input) as important on a statewide basis but not to them individually (ranked 5th). As individuals, SHPO's *Review and Compliance* functions (e.g., Section 106) were important. *Review and Compliance* ranked only 7th in statewide importance.

In terms of the effectiveness of SHPO core programs, all ten services were rated 6.0 or higher. *Technical Assistance and Advice*, ranked high in importance both to individuals and to the state (see above), was also rated the most effective program area (7.7). Respondents to surveys in 1995/1996 also rated SHPO as a "good provider of training and technical assistance" (*Working Together*, pg. 6). This program area was followed closely by *National Register of Historic Places* (7.6), *Survey and Inventory* (7.4), *Review and Compliance* (7.3), and *Administration* (7.2). The only program ranked as important to individuals or to the state that did not receive a similarly high effectiveness rating is *Planning* (6.3). The lowest effectiveness rating was accorded to *Matching Grants for*

Survey & Bricks n' Mortar (6.0), a clear recognition that the Montana SHPO had not offered such sub-grants for the past 10 years.

Investment of New Funds (Question 4).

Survey respondents were asked how they would invest an additional \$100,000 in funding in the core programs defined in Question 3. Most respondents replied with a single program; a few indicated two or three programs. *Matching Grants for Survey and Bricks n' Mortar* received the most votes (24), followed by *Heritage Education and Outreach* (16), *Survey and Inventory - recording and databases* (14), and *Technical Assistance and Advice* (11). Other core program areas received 5 votes or less.

The top two programs recommended for investment of new funding both received relatively low current effectiveness ratings (see Question 3). Additional funding may be seen as a way for SHPO to improve the effectiveness of these programs, as is most certainly the case for matching grants. It is interesting, however, that these two program areas also received only moderate or even low relative ranks of importance to individuals and statewide preservation. *Matching Grants* was ranked 7th in importance to individuals, and 9th statewide; *Heritage Education and Outreach* 6th and 5th. It is possible that the respondent's ranking of relative importance of these programs is influenced by their level of current activity.

Heritage Properties Meriting Special Attention (Question 5).

In 1995/1996, SHPO questionnaires asked the public about specific heritage properties in their region which were deserving of preservation and care (Working Together, pg. 5). A long list of individual properties was returned, indicating that respondents were well-informed. Notable for types of heritage properties in 1995/1996 were ghost towns, historic neighborhoods, and archaeological sites. The historic gold-mining town of Virginia City, which at the time was being considered for state acquisition, was the single-most frequent specific property response.

The 2001 Questionnaire s asked only about *kinds* of heritage properties, and invited respondents to list up to three types. Responses included a total of 138 property types, or an average of 2.3 per respondent. Categorized broadly, historic site types were mentioned most often (n = 85), followed by archaeological sites (n = 30), traditional cultural sites (n = 17), and landscapes (n = 6). (Note that rock art sites were counted as both archaeological and traditional cultural sites).

Property types mentioned more than ten times include *Rural Agricultural Buildings* (barns, grain elevators, homesteads) (16), *Downtown Buildings/Mainstreets* (14), *Railroad Features/Depots* (12), *Archaeological Sites-general* (12) and *Rock Art Sites* (10). The top three are in fact secondary groupings defined in part by individual though closely related property type responses. It might be possible to define other such groupings from the data, for example: post offices + courthouses = government/public

buildings. However, the primary groupings defined here are the most readily defined interpretations of the data.

Helpful Guidance (Question 6).

An unexpected range of guidance was identified by respondents as beneficial. As with Question 5, some simple groupings of closely related requests could be made and other groupings may be possible. The two most frequently identified types of guidance as being of most benefit to respondents are *answers to specific technical questions* and information about *sources of grants or other financial assistance*. Both were mentioned seven times.

No directly corresponding question was asked during surveys in 1995 and 1996. However, when asked in 1995/1996 what type of “preservation activities are the ones most needed to help protect historic places,” the majority responses were education programs, economic related preservation information, leadership training, and technical training (Working Together, pg. 6). These were, however, also given as examples in the question when posed. When asked in 1996 to rank seven pre-defined categories of activities as to which would benefit individuals the most from a cooperative effort, respondents ranked *managing cultural resources* the highest, followed by *technical assistance in preserving and developing resources* and *technical assistance in fund raising* (Working Together: Appendix A).

Who are You? (Question 7).

The 60 respondents out of approximately 220 individuals polled (27% response rate) appear to include a good cross-section representation of historic preservation professionals in Montana. The respondents identified their primary role in historic preservation as: government cultural resource/preservation specialists (19), cultural resource consultants (12), architects (15), other individuals in government (6), museums/historical society staff (3), university faculty (2) and other (2). There was also a single Native American respondent.

Notably under-represented among respondents are Native American tribal culture contacts listed in the Montana Historic Preservation Services Directory. Input from the tribes will need to be obtained in another survey or by other means, as is also the case for the general and/or interested public not polled with this questionnaire.

MFB assisted by MC
11/2001

Montana 2001 Historic Preservation Questionnaire #1 Results

1. Issues affecting Montana historic preservation efforts: The following issues were identified by public and professionals during the writing of the 1997 Montana Historic Preservation Plan, *Working Together*. Please rate the significance of their effect on a scale of 1 to 10. You may give the same rating to a number of issues.

Significance rating
(from 1 = insignificant
to 10 = very significant)

	2001	1996
1. Shifts from industry/agriculture to service based economy.....	5.53-	4.55-
2. Shifts in land use and settlement patterns	7.15	6.92
3. Availability of financial resources	8.23 ¹	8.06 ²
4. Impact of increased visitation on cultural/historical sites	6.77	6.95
5. Suburban sprawl's effect on Main Streets	7.48 ⁴	6.99
6. Local ability to preserve historic/cultural resources	7.72 ²	7.92 ⁴
7. Housing affordability and availability	5.16-	4.36-
8. Loss of culture/traditions due to passing generations	7.05	5.92
9. Baby-boomer attitudes about preservation	5.36-	4.36-
10. Information age communication changes	4.94-	5.60-
11. Transportation changes from rail/rural roads to airports/highways	5.55	5.70
12. Fluctuating public policy and philanthropic interests	6.04	6.74
13. Vandalism and/or deterioration of historic resources	7.05	7.93 ³
14. Public awareness of culture/preservation issues	7.55 ³	8.23 ¹
15. Decline of volunteerism	5.66	***
16. Lack of consensus in historic preservation community	5.36	***
17. Legal framework for protection of cultural resources on public land ...	6.37	***
18. Legal framework for protection of cultural resources on private land ..	7.00	***

Notes:

2001 : N = 53 to 56

1996 : N = 27 (Results from *Working Together*, Appendix A: Questionnaire #2)

- ¹ : Top four significance ratings
- : Bottom four significance ratings
- *** : 1996 write-ins

Montana 2001 Historic Preservation Questionnaire #1 Results

2. Goals for historic preservation in the next 5 years: Please read the following nine goals adopted in the 1997 Montana Preservation Plan, *Working Together*. You may add up to 3 more goals. Then rate each goal on a scale of priority from 1 to 10. You may give the same rating to a number of goals.

Priority rating
(from 1 = low priority
to 10 = high priority)

1. Conserve Montana's cultural resources	9.11	Mission (1)
2. Incorporate preservation into public decision making	8.23	(2)
3. Strengthen historic preservation at the local level	8.08	(3)
4. Educate the public about Montana history and historical places	7.62	(5)
5. Encourage cooperation between government agencies in preservation..	7.66	(4)
6. Identify sources for technical and financial preservation assistance	7.52	(6)
7. Study issues and develop plans for preservation	6.89	(8)
8. Promote cultural resources as a tool for economic development	7.15	(7)
9. Create recreation links among Montana's natural and cultural sites	6.24	(9)

Write-ins (10, 11, 12)

- (4) Involve tribes/reservations/THPOs
- (3) Create on-line database/manage information
- (3) Make historic preservation more politically appealing
- (2) Promote preservation success-stories
- (2) Provide incentives for adaptive reuse

- . Conduct regular statewide meetings
- . Promote land-use planning
- . Prevent demolition without intelligent, complete studies
- . Encourage cooperation between government and private sector
- . Stabilize threatened structures
- . Conduct travelling heritage education presentations
- . Promote tax credit program
- . Lobby for homeowner tax credit
- . Develop predictive models for heritage property locations for planning
- . Establish historic contexts and significance criteria
- . Promote the state historic preservation plan
- . Create opportunities for public participation
- . Legitimize sources of technical assistance
- . Identify and prioritize at-risk sites
- . Conserve paleontological resources
- . Utilize media to raise public awareness
- . Focus on street-scapes
- . Conserve all historic properties – significant or not.
- . Enforce local preservation goals

Notes:

N = 51 to 53

(#) 2001 Rank of goals based on priority ratings. Goal 1 adopted as Mission statement (1996)

Montana 2001 Historic Preservation Questionnaire #1 Results

3. State Historic Preservation Office Programs: Please *rank* in order (1, 2, 3 ... 10) the following ten SHPO Programs by their relative importance to you and their relative importance to statewide preservation, with “1” being the most important and “10” the least important. Then *rate* the current effectiveness of each program on a scale of 1 to 10, where 10 is “doing great” and 1 is “doing poorly.” You may give the same effectiveness rating to a number of programs.

	Order of importance (1, 2, 3, ... 10)		Effectiveness (from 1 = doing poorly to 10 = doing great)
	To you	Statewide	
Administration (<i>oversight, staff, policy, budget</i>)	8 (5.9)	6 (5.4)	7.2 (5)
Planning (<i>state plan, goals, contexts, public input</i>)	5 (5.2)	1 (4.5)	6.3 (9)
Survey and Inventory (<i>recording and databases</i>)	1 (3.8)	2 (4.8)	7.4 (3)
National Register of Historic Places (<i>inc. signs</i>)	4 (4.9)	4 (5.0)	7.6 (2)
Review and Compliance (<i>inc. Section 106</i>)	3 (4.6)	7 (5.9)	7.3 (4)
Tax Credit Review for Rehabilitation	10 (7.7)	10 (6.6)	6.7 (7)
Certified Local Govts (<i>local preservation offices</i>)	9 (6.3)	8 (6.0)	6.9 (6)
Matching grants for survey & bricks n’ mortar	7 (5.9)	9 (6.3)	6.0 (10)
Technical assistance and advice	2 (4.4)	3 (4.9)	7.7 (1)
Heritage education and outreach	6 (5.8)	5 (5.1)	6.5 (8)

Notes:

. Some questionnaires not tabulated due to confusion, e.g. importance ordering ranked like effectiveness where more than one number was used twice.

Importance to You: N = 30 to 31

Importance statewide: N = 22 to 23

Effectiveness: N = 26 to 36

. Importance (1 to 10) calculated for each program by totaling rank order values and dividing by number of responses; calculation provided in (.). Rank importance 1,2,3... based on order of calculated averages. 1 = most important; 10 = least important

. Effectiveness (10 to 1) calculated by total of values divided by number of responses: 10 = doing great; 1 = doing poorly; order of program effectiveness provided in (.): 1 = most effective; 10 = least effective.

4. If the Montana State Historic Preservation Office had an additional \$100,000 to invest, which of the above programs would you suggest putting the money into?

1. Matching grants (n=24)
2. Heritage education/outreach (n=16)
3. Survey & inventory (n = 14)
4. Technical Assistance (n =11)

Certified Local Governments (5); Planning (4); National Register (3); Compliance (3)
Tax Credit (2); Admin (1)

Notes:

Total N = 83. Majority of responses indicated a single program; some responses included 2 or 3 programs.

Montana 2001 Historic Preservation Questionnaire #1 Results

5. List up to three *kinds* of Montana heritage properties (eg. types of historic structures like post offices, traditional cultural places like rock art, or archaeological sites like tipi rings) that you feel merit special attention in the next 5 years:

Historic Sites (N = 85)

- 16 Rural Agriculture Buildings (barns, grain elevators, homesteads)
- 14 Downtown Buildings/Mainstreets
- 12 Railroad Features/Depots
- 7 Roads/Trails
- 6 NPS/USFS Structures; Lookouts
- 5 School Buildings
- 4 Historic Neighborhoods/Residences
- 3 Ghost Towns/Mining Sites
- 2 "Historic Structures"
- Sheep Camps
- Modernist Buildings (1940s-1960s)
- Post Offices
- Traditional Buildings
- Historic Theatres
- Women's Clubhouses
- Log Cabins (private)
- Irrigation Systems
- Churches
- Bridges
- Abandoned private structures
- Warehouses
- Military History sites
- Courthouses
- Reservation Period Sites
- National Historic Monuments

Archaeological Sites (N = 30)

- 12 Archaeological Sites
- 10 Rock-Art Sites (*see also Traditional Cultural Sites*)
- 3 Archaeological Districts/Settlement Patterns
- Tipi Rings
- Historic Archaeological Sites
- Paleontology
- Stratified Archaeological Sites
- Easily accessible Archaeological Sites

Traditional Cultural Sites (N = 17)

- 10 Rock Art (*see also Archaeological Sites*)
- 4 Religious Sites/TCPs
- 2 Traditional Cultural Lands
- Multi-cultural places

Landscapes (N = 6)

Notes: Rock Art sites counted twice

Montana 2001 Historic Preservation Questionnaire #1 Results

6. What type of guidance in historic preservation would be most beneficial to you?

Answers to specific technical questions	7
Sources of grants/financial aid	7
Historic contexts with registration requirements	3
Tax Credit/Rehabilitation grant information	3
Course on Section 106/National Register eligibility	2
Training for survey volunteers/historic inventory	2
Preservation technical briefs	2

Description/history of existing properties
Local preservation planning
How to deal with private structures on public land
On-line access to information databases
Public awareness pieces/preservation news
How to evaluate 1950s residences
Preservation workshop/retreat
Cooperation between state agencies
How to protect cultural resources
Legalities of ownership
Annual SHPO-Contractors Meeting
Tribal coordination and issues
NPS technical experts
Cell tower compliance procedures
Writing historic structures reports

7. What is your primary role in historic preservation?

<u> </u> * <u> </u>	Interested public
<u> </u> 1 <u> </u>	Tribal representative/Native American
<u> 19 </u>	Local/State/Federal government cultural resource/preservation specialist
<u> </u> 6 <u> </u>	Other local/state/federal government agency role
<u> 12 </u>	Cultural resource/environmental consultant
<u> </u> 3 <u> </u>	Museum/historical society
<u> </u> * <u> </u>	Business that consults with SHPO
<u> 15 </u>	Architect/Historic building restoration
<u> </u> 2 <u> </u>	University
<u> </u> 2 <u> </u>	Other (Conservation easements; unknown)

Notes:

Total respondents = 60

Categories of Architect and University added based on respondent's address.

Thank you!

Appendix B
Montana Historic Preservation Planning
Questionnaire #2
2001

Results
&
Discussion

Montana 2001 Historic Preservation Planning Questionnaire #2 Discussion

The Montana Historic Preservation Planning Questionnaire #2 was designed to complement Questionnaire #1 both in content and by targeting a broader non-professional audience of potential interested parties. These included educators, politicians, owners of historic properties, members of local historical societies, avocational historians and archaeologists, those who have had contact with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and more generally those who can be described as "friends of Montana history." Questionnaire #2 was first made available in April 2001, at the annual meeting of the Montana Archaeological Society. It was subsequently widely distributed in May 2001, in conjunction with the mailing of the 2001 Montana Historic Preservation poster to approximately 780 addresses. It was included in SHPO correspondence throughout the summer of 2001 and finally distributed in the registration packets of those attending the Montana History Conference in October 2001.

Despite the relatively limited response (N = 21), Questionnaire #2 succeeded in providing feedback from a different audience, including information that can be compared and contrasted with that obtained from Questionnaire #1. Three of the five questions asked on Questionnaire #2 (a sixth question identified the affiliation of the respondent), repeated inquiries on Questionnaire #1. Question 2 of both questionnaires, for example, asked respondents to rate the importance of the nine goals adopted in the 1997 Montana Historic Preservation Plan. Questions 3 and 4 of Questionnaire #2 repeated Questions 6 and 5 of Questionnaire #1, respectively, in asking respondents about what types of guidance would be most beneficial and what kinds of Montana heritage properties merit special attention. The two new questions on Questionnaire #2 were designed for open-ended responses. Question 1 asked respondents to identify the most important issue affecting the preservation of Montana's heritage properties and what could be done to address this issue. Question 5 invited any advice or comments to consider in statewide historic preservation planning.

The tabulated results for each of the questions in the 2001 Questionnaire #2 are attached. These are briefly discussed here.

Issues in Historic Preservation (Question 1)

While not prompted with a list of possible issues, all but one of the respondents to Questionnaire #2 identified primary issues that were also rated among the top four issues in Questionnaire #1. *Funding* was the top issue in both questionnaires, identified by 7 of the 18 responses in Questionnaire #2 and given a rating of 8.23 out of 10 in Questionnaire #1. *Sprawl and/or the loss of historic Mainstreets* was a close second to funding as a primary issue identified in Questionnaire #2 (N = 6). This issue ranked fourth in significance on Questionnaire #1. In addition to these two primary issues, the *viability of local museums* and *private ownership* were identified by two respondents each in Questionnaire #2. These two issues may reasonably be equated with the second

most significant issue recognized in Questionnaire #1: "local ability to preserve historical/cultural resources." A single individual identified *natural resource extraction* as the most important issue affecting historic preservation in Montana – an issue that was not prompted for in Questionnaire #1.

Interestingly, *public education* figures most prominently among the solutions offered to the issues in historic preservation identified in Questionnaire #2. "Public awareness of cultural/preservation issues" was rated as the third most significant issue by respondents to Questionnaire #1. *Funding* also appears in Questionnaire #2 as both an issue and a solution. Other solutions suggested to preservation issues include changing laws, providing support and encouragement, and documentation.

Goals for Historic Preservation (Question 2)

As with Questionnaire #1, people were asked to rate (on a scale of 1-10) the importance of the nine goals adopted in the 1997 Montana Historic Preservation Plan, Working Together. For Questionnaire #2, all goals rated an average score above 6.8. Not surprisingly, given responses to Question 1 above, the highest importance was awarded by this group of respondents to Goal 6: *Identify sources for technical and financial preservation assistance*. This goal, while arguably scored high by historic preservation professionals, ranked only sixth in priority in Questionnaire #1. Interestingly, the other primary difference between the results of the two questionnaires is the ranking of Goal 3: *Strengthen historic preservation at the local level*. Contrary to conventional wisdom perhaps, the respondents to Questionnaire #2 (representing predominantly "non-historic professionals") ranked this goal only sixth, whereas those responding to Questionnaire #1 (predominantly historic preservation professionals) placed it third in priority.

The remaining ranking of goals is generally similar between the two questionnaires. In both cases, the same three 1997 goals ranked lowest relative to others: *study issues and develop plans for preservation* (Goal 7); *promote cultural resources as a tool for economic development* (Goal 8); and *create recreation links among Montana's natural and cultural sites* (Goal 9).

Among the eight write-in goals provided in Questionnaire #2, several could be subsumed under the existing 1997 goals while others are relatively narrow. Two individuals identified *land use planning* and *"smart" growth* as a potential goal.

Helpful Guidance (Question 3)

Guidance on *sources for financial assistance*, *on-site preservation training in techniques*, and *general how-to guidance*, each received more than one mention by respondents to Questionnaire #2. This closely conforms to the results of Questionnaire #1 (Question 6).

Heritage Property Types Meriting Special Attention (Question 4)

As in Questionnaire #1, responses to this question ranged from very general (*National Historic Monuments*) to very specific (*Virginia City*). Historic properties were mentioned most often (N = 31), followed by archaeological sites (N = 10), and traditional cultural properties (N = 9). Among historic sites, *Downtown Buildings/Mainstreets*, *railroad buildings*, *houses/mansions*, *schools*, and *rural agricultural buildings* were each mentioned more than once, as was *Virginia City*, a National Historic Landmark. *Rock Art sites* (pictographs and petroglyphs) were also frequently identified and can be considered both as archaeological and traditional cultural properties. These results closely follow those of Questionnaire #1.

Advice and Comments (Question 5)

This open-ended question expectedly generated a variety of responses. Among them was encouragement for more *historic preservation lobbying* and for more *outreach and education* (including press, signage, on-site visits, and public meetings). One individual also advised on the importance of working together with public agencies as the managers of many heritage properties while another advocated for the establishment of a Mainstreet program in Montana. Other observations included that not all historic sites should be developed for tourism and that more oral history about properties needed to be gathered before it was lost. Finally, given the strong theme surrounding funding as both an issue and a solution for historic preservation, one individual also wisely pointed out that "*more money is not the answer if the money is not used appropriately.*"

Who are You? (Question 6)

The 21 respondents to Questionnaire #2 included 10 individuals associated with museums or local historical societies, 3 with education, 2 architects, 2 government cultural resource specialists, one consultant, one local government employee, and two members of the general interested public. This is a markedly different population than that sampled by Questionnaire #1. Also, while possible, it is unlikely that individuals responded to both questionnaires.

MFB
9/2002

Montana 2001 Historic Preservation Questionnaire #2 Results

1. Issues in historic preservation. What do you think is the most important issue affecting the preservation of historic properties, archaeological sites and/or traditional cultural places in Montana today? What do you think could be done to address this issue? (N = 18)

(7) Funding

- . Establish state fund through bed tax or coal trust (4)
- . Write in support of local grant applications (2)
- . Develop network of support among historic sites

(6) Sprawl/Loss of Historic Downtowns

- . Education – public and legislative awareness (4)
- . Growth/Land Use laws (2)
- . Transportation alternatives
- . Preservation grants
- . Document before loss

(2) Private Ownership

- . Educate private landowners about importance of resources
- . Must keep land private with public access

(2) Local Museum Viability

- . Change IRS rules
- . Encourage volunteerism
- . Funding

(1) Resource Extraction

- . Education – public awareness

2. Goals for historic preservation in the next 5 years: Please read the following nine goals adopted in the 1997 Montana Preservation Plan, *Working Together*. There is space to add up to 3 more goals. Then rate each goal on a scale of importance from 1 to 10, where 1 is not very important and 10 is very important. You may give the same rating to a number of goals.

(N = 17)

Importance
(from 1 = low
up to 10 = high)

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Conserve Montana's cultural resources | ___ 8.00 (2) |
| 2. Incorporate preservation into public decision making | ___ 7.71 (4) |
| 3. Strengthen historic preservation at the local level | ___ 7.29 (6) |
| 4. Educate the public about Montana history and historical places | ___ 7.88 (3) |
| 5. Encourage cooperation between government agencies in preservation.. | ___ 7.59 (5) |
| 6. Identify sources for technical and financial preservation assistance | ___ 8.24 (1) |
| 7. Study issues and develop plans for preservation | ___ 7.24 (7) |
| 8. Promote cultural resources as a tool for economic development | ___ 6.88 (9) |
| 9. Create recreation links among Montana's natural and cultural sites | ___ 7.06 (8) |

Write-ins (10, 11, 12)

(2) Growth control and land use planning

- (1) Economic assistance to private owners; Develop school curriculum;
Develop inter-state cooperation through regional themes; Educate legislature
Develop more signage/tourism promotion; Advocate transportation reform

3. What type of guidance in historic preservation would be most beneficial to you?

- (4) Sources for financial assistance
- (2) On-site preservation training in techniques
- (2) How-to guidance
 - On-site visits from SHPO staff
 - List of priority structures
 - Application of preservation standards for treatment to MT buildings
 - Legal framework for historic preservation
 - Newspaper stories
 - National Register workshop

4. Please list up to three *kinds* of Montana heritage properties (types of historic structures like post offices, traditional cultural places like rock art, or archaeological sites like tipi rings) that you feel merit special attention in the next 5 years:

Historic Sites (N = 31)

- 6 Downtown Buildings/Mainstreets
- 3 Railroad depots/features
- 3 Historic Mansions (e.g. Daly Mansion)
- 3 Historic Houses
- 3 Schools
- 3 Virginia City
- 2 Rural Agricultural Buildings (e.g. grain elevators)
- Fairgrounds
- Historic Landscapes
- Historic Boats
- Historic Churches
- Stagecoach Depots
- Courthouses
- Community Halls
- National Historic Monuments (e.g. Pompeys Pillar)

Archaeological Sites (N = 10)

- 5 Rock Art Sites
- Paleo-Indian Sites
- Tipi Rings
- Lewis & Clark Sites
- Pre-Lewis & Clark Anglo Inscriptions
- Paleontological Sites

Traditional Cultural Sites (N = 9)

- 5 Rock Art Sites
- 2 Traditional Cultural Landscapes
- 2 Religious Sites

Note: Rock Art sites counted as both archaeological and traditional cultural properties

5. Do you have any additional advice or comments for us to consider in statewide historic preservation planning?

- . Make more visits to local museums/sites
- . Need better directional signage/maps
- . Talk to legislators and Governor (lobby)
- . Need Mainstreet program
- . More money is not answer if not used appropriately
- . Need to leave some historic sites undeveloped
- . Need more press
- . Form a citizens ad-hoc committee to lobby
- . Keep agencies involved – they are the public managers
- . Do more oral history about historic properties
- . Need more public outreach, e.g. public meetings, illustrate with positive examples, create endangered list, and organize regional efforts.

6. Please tell us about yourself. What is your primary role in historic preservation?

- ☐ 2 Interested public
- ☐ Tribal representative/Native American
- ☐ 2 Local/State/Federal government cultural resource/preservation specialist
- ☐ 1 Other local/state/federal government agency role
- ☐ Elected public official
- ☐ 1 Cultural resource/environmental consulting firm
- ☐ 10 Museum/historical society
- ☐ 2 Architect
- ☐ 3 Teacher/educator
- ☐ Student
- ☐ Business that consults with SHPO
- ☐ Other _____

Thank you!

Optional

Your name: _____

Your organization: _____

Your address: _____

Return to: Montana State Historic Preservation Office, Montana Historical Society, PO Box 201202, Helena, MT 59620-1202. (Questions? Call SHPO at 406-444-7715)