

USE THIS FORM: 1) IF YOU HAVE NOT PREVIOUSLY COMPLETED A BASELINE FORM, 2) IF YOUR PRIOR BASELINE FORM NEEDS CORRECTIONS, OR 3) IF YOU DID NOT SUBMIT AN ANNUAL FORM FOR EACH OF THE YEARS SUBSEQUENT TO YOUR MOST RECENTLY SUBMITTED CUMULATIVE BASELINE QUESTIONNAIRE.

National Park Service  
Heritage Preservation Assistance Programs  
State, Tribal, and Local Plans and Grants Division

## National Park Service Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire for CLGs

CLG NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ STATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
PERSON WHO CAN ANSWER QUESTIONS  
ABOUT RESPONSES TO THIS THIS FORM: \_\_\_\_\_ TELEPHONE: \_\_\_\_\_  
BASELINE FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR: 2012 E-MAIL: \_\_\_\_\_

Please read **Guidance for Completing the National Park Service Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire for CLGs**. This guidance defines terms, explains what to count, answers frequently-asked questions, etc.; e.g., a) the definition of “cumulative” for each question below and b), the “Baseline Federal Fiscal Year” usually is the year before the most recently completed Federal Fiscal Year.

### 1. CLG Inventory Program

What is the net cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties in your CLG inventory as of September 30<sup>th</sup> of the Baseline Year? \_\_\_\_\_

### 2. Local Register (i.e., Local Landmarks and Historic Districts) Program

a. During the Baseline Year, did your local government have the legal authority to create local landmarks/local historic districts (or a similar list of designations created by local law)? Yes • No •

b. If the answer to question 2a is “No,” please leave question 2b’s blank empty and proceed to question 3a. If the answer is “Yes,” what is the net cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties (i.e., contributing properties). In local historic districts/landmarks as of September 30<sup>th</sup> of the Baseline Year? \_\_\_\_\_

### 3. Local Tax Incentives Program

a. During the Baseline Year, did your local community have a tax incentives program/process under local law that could be used to benefit (directly or indirectly) historic properties? Yes • No •

b. If the answer to question 3a is “No,” please leave question 3b’s blank empty and proceed to question 4a. If the answer is “Yes,” what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties whose owners have taken advantage of those incentives as of September 30<sup>th</sup> of the Baseline Year? \_\_\_\_\_

(Continued on next page)

CLG NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

STATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**(Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire -- Continued from the previous page)**

**4. Local “Bricks and Mortar” Grants/Loans Program**

- a. During the Baseline Year, did your community have a local government-funded grants/loans program that could be used for rehabilitating/restoring/preserving historic properties? Yes • No •
- b. If the answer to question 4a is “No,” please leave question 4b’s blank empty and proceed to question 5a. If the answer is “Yes,” what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties assisted by these Grants/loans as of September 30<sup>th</sup> of the Baseline Year? \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Local Design Review/Regulatory Compliance Program**

- a. During the Baseline Year, did your local government have a historic preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance requiring Commission/staff review of 1) local government activities and/or 2) changes to or impacts on properties within a local historic district)? Yes • No •
- b. If the answer to question 5a is “No,” please leave question 5b’s blank empty and proceed to question 6a. If the answer is “Yes,” what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties that your local government has reviewed under that process as of September 30<sup>th</sup> of the Baseline Year? \_\_\_\_\_

**6. Local Property Acquisition Program**

- a. During the Baseline Year, aside from eminent domain, did your local government have a program that could be used to acquire (or help others to acquire) historic properties in whole or in part through purchase, donation, or other means? Yes • No •
- b. If the answer to question 6a is “No,” please leave question 6b’s blank empty. You have finished the questionnaire. If the answer is “Yes,” what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties with a property interest acquisition assisted or carried out by your local government as of 30<sup>th</sup> of the Baseline Year? \_\_\_\_\_

**Notes/Comments:**

---

Thank you for filling out this form. For maximum benefit, please send it, no later than May 23, 2014, to:

State, Tribal, and Local Plans & Grants Division    Attention: John Renaud  
Heritage Preservation Assistance Programs  
National Park Service  
1201 Eye Street NW (Organization Code 2256),  
Washington, DC 20005.

Alternatively, feel free to send the report to John Renaud by fax at 202-371-1794 or at [John.Renaud@nps.gov](mailto:John.Renaud@nps.gov) by e-mail. If you want an electronic (Word) or other available version of this format and accompanying guidance, please contact John by e-mail. There is also an on-line data entry option that is available for State CLG Program Coordinators and a Google forms option that is available to you. If you have any questions, please contact John by telephone at 202-354-2066, by fax, or by e-mail.

Because of its long-term uses, it will never be too late to provide this report’s information. For information collection burden language, see the guidance for completing the questionnaire.

National Park Service  
Heritage Preservation Assistance Programs  
State, Tribal, and Local Plans & Grants Division

**GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING  
THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
CUMULATIVE BASELINE QUESTIONNAIRE  
FOR CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (CLGs)**

**1. What is the purpose of this report?**

The data that you provide contribute to establishing and maintaining a cumulative baseline on those achievements of the national historic preservation partnership that CLGs accomplish. The data that we request all relate to key program elements for every CLG; i.e., the designation and protection of historic and prehistoric properties. Except for the CLG inventory (which is a Federal requirement), this report focuses on CLG accomplishments under local laws and programs. We have information from other sources concerning CLG contributions to historic preservation under Federal and State law and programs. The responses to this questionnaire provide critical information and documentation for the Administration's and the Congress' budgetary decision-making process. On a long-term basis, we will post on the web the results from the questionnaire and the annual report (<http://www.nps.gov/history/hpg/local/clg.html> -- click on the "Find a CLG (CLG Database)" button on the right hand column). For data entered on-line, the posting should be almost instantaneous once the system is fully updated for the current year. In this way, we can share information about your program and achievements with your colleagues and with the public. We also expect that this information will be useful to you and to your colleagues in your State Historic Preservation Office. This information can be helpful in explaining to your local and State government decision-makers what you have accomplished for historic preservation during the year. We are seeking this information because it is not available anywhere else on a national basis.

**2. In each year's set of two forms, why is the Baseline Questionnaire designed for the year prior to the year that the Annual Report covers (e.g., the FY 2012 Annual Report form was issued with the FY 2011 Baseline Questionnaire)?**

By issuing the Annual Report and the Baseline Questionnaire for successive years, NPS has ensured that no State or CLG is required to report the same information twice; i.e., as a part of cumulative totals in the Baseline Questionnaire and by itself in the Annual Report. To obtain cumulative figures for the current year, all that an individual has to do is add the numbers from the most recently completed Baseline Questionnaire to the figures from each of the successive Annual Reports.

**3. In the categories that you ask about, we have done nothing (or very little). Do you want us to send you a report with such low numbers? We only just became a CLG. Do you still want us to send you a Baseline Questionnaire?**

Your report is valuable to us no matter how little you have to report. The Baseline Questionnaire only asks six questions seeking numbers. Many CLGs respond to the questions by answering "0" or "1" because 1) one of their programs is just getting started, 2) they had other historic preservation priorities for that reporting year, 3) the level of public demand was low for the program, 4) there was not much left to do in that program area, or 5) because of a myriad of other reasons. We make no judgments of the quality of your historic preservation program based upon the numbers that you supply in your questionnaires. Don't worry about not having much to report for a given year or questionnaire. We think that it is a big deal for any local government to commit in writing to historic preservation by enforcing appropriate laws for the designation and protection of historic and prehistoric properties. We recognize that the categories that we ask about do not cover all of the CLG's activities.

If your local government only recently became a CLG, and thus was not a CLG during the reporting period for the Baseline Questionnaire, you have options. Let's take as an example a local government that became a CLG during FY 2012. You may wait a year to submit the FY 2012 Baseline Questionnaire during its normal schedule, you may submit a partial FY 2011 Baseline Questionnaire, or you may submit a FY 2012 Baseline Questionnaire ahead of schedule. Except for questions 1, 2, and 6, the Baseline Questionnaire asks for data on activities that occurred subsequent to a local government becoming a CLG (see the definition of "Cumulative" in guidance question 8 below). Thus, for most of the Baseline Questionnaire, there is nothing to report until a full year after the local government

becomes a CLG (i.e., FY 2012 in our example). If despite this situation, you wish to submit a partial questionnaire (for FY 2011 in our example), please feel free to do so, but please understand that we will ask for a complete Baseline Questionnaire for the following year. If you choose to submit a complete Baseline Questionnaire ahead of schedule (i.e., for FY 2012 in our example), please change the “Baseline Year” dates on the form or otherwise make clear what you are doing. Otherwise, we might inappropriately include your (FY 2012) cumulative data with the Baseline Questionnaires for the wrong year (e.g., FY 2011).

**4. Who can use the on-line data entry option for submitting this report?**

Right now, other than National Park Service staff, only each State’s CLG Program Coordinator has the option of using the on-line data entry option for this reporting. We will reexamine this policy within the next few years. There is a data security issue at play. With NPS’ limited staffing available for this purpose, it is a lot easier to assign and administer passwords for 50 State CLG Coordinators than it would be to handle passwords for more than 1,800 CLGs. As the technology gets better and we gain more experience with the use of the system, we will reexamine the issue of on-line data entry. Any State CLG Coordinator or official CLG contact can use the Google forms option because that information does not go automatically into our secure database.

**5. The on-line form has a different appearance than the hard-copy form which looks different than the Google Forms version. Why is that?**

The differences are due to creating an on-line data entry option and how that system works. A hard copy or e-mail version of the form needs instructions on where to send the completed form; guidance that is clearly not needed for the on-line version or the Google forms version. The fringe benefit of these revisions is that a CLG no longer needs to send in a new Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire merely to report a change in its local government historic preservation-related program area offerings. To preserve the ability to add a narrative note, on all versions of the form we have included a narrative box. The Google forms version is ready to go. As soon as NPS officially launches this year’s request for information, NPS will notify State CLG Coordinators and announce its availability on the NPS CLG website.

**6. Do we have to use the form that NPS has provided?**

For the on-line version and the Google forms version of the form, the answer is “Yes.” For the hard copy, down-loaded, or e-mailed version of the form, the answer is “No.” We care more about the content of the data that you provide than we care about the format in which you provide it or the medium by which you transmit it to us. As long as NPS can clearly tell which data relate to which question on the form and you provide information corresponding to every blank on the form, we are satisfied. E-mail messages, spread sheets, State report pages, etc. are all acceptable.

If you do choose to report to NPS using a different format, please be explicit about which parts of your format (e.g., in your State-required report) match with each of the NPS form’s questions. Also, please ensure that the guidance for completing the alternative form is consistent with the guidance in this document.

**7. Will I have to fill out the Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire every year?**

No. Once you have provided us with the cumulative baseline figures, we will update the cumulative figures based on the information on each year’s annual report that you send us. After you complete the baseline questionnaire, you only will need to revise it 1) if you discover an error in a previous questionnaire/report, 2) if (subsequent to your last completed Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire) you miss an annual report, or 3) if changes in your historic preservation program authorities mean that an answer needs revision.

**8. Are there any definitions or special instructions that I need to know to properly complete this form?**

“**Historic Property**” means a property that, regardless of government action (i.e., whether it is listed or not), meets the eligibility criteria for listing in your local register (i.e., as a local landmark or local historic district) or for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. A historic property can include archeological as well as above-ground resources. Other properties are outside the purview of this questionnaire. In some communities, this term is equivalent to “historic resource,” “historic landmark,” or some other similar term.

“**Designation**” as used in this document means that the local government has officially identified the property as historic. Most CLGs have two levels of designation. That is, one level of designation is an evaluation of significance that carries no consequences. CLGs often refer to this as “the inventory” or “the survey.” The other level of designation carries consequences such as eligibility for benefits or some level of protection such as being subject to design review

for proposed changes. CLGs often refer to this level of designation as “the local register,” “the landmarks list,” “local historic districts,” etc.

**“Protection”** as used in this document means that because of government action, a historic property retains those elements that make the property historic.

**“Program”** means the legal authorization/authority (created by legislation or by administrative action) to conduct a series of activities. As long as the authorization/authority exists, the program exists regardless of whether or not the authorization/authority has been exercised during the reporting period. A good example in many communities is the authority to create/amend historic districts. Often, the legal authority to create/amend local historic districts exists but has not been used in a number of years.

The **“Federal Fiscal Year”** extends from October 1<sup>st</sup> of one year through September 30<sup>th</sup> of the following year. For example, FY 2012 lasted from October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012.

**“Baseline Year”** as used in this document usually means the fiscal year immediately before to the most recently-completed fiscal year. For example, in January 2013, the Baseline Year normally would be FY 2011 because FY 2011 was the year before the most recently-completed fiscal year (FY 2012) which ended on September 30, 2012. “Baseline Year” can also refer to any year for which the respondent chooses to provide cumulative data to NPS. This usually happens when there are missing Annual Reports or errors have been discovered in prior Baseline Questionnaires or Annual Reports.

**“Cumulative”** means, depending upon the question either a) since your local government historic preservation program began or b) since the community became a CLG. For the CLG inventory question (question 1), the local register question (question 2b), and the acquisition question (question 6b), “cumulative” includes the time before your local government became a CLG. For the CLG inventory question and the local register question, this also means the net cumulative number of properties in the category as of September 30 of the baseline year. For example, the local register figure would be the sum of all contributing properties ever added to the register minus the sum of all properties ever removed from the register because of demolition, etc. The cumulative baseline is a snapshot of what is in your CLG inventory and local register as of September 30. Properties formerly but not currently on the CLG inventory or your local register are useful to know about for historical reasons but not as a historic preservation baseline. For the local tax incentives question (question 3b), the local grants/loans program question (question 4b), and the local design review/regulatory laws question (question 5b), include only those properties protected since your government became a CLG. This baseline questionnaire and the accompanying annual report aim to gather data on CLG accomplishments. Prior successes, though important for historic preservation, are not a part of CLG accomplishments or workload.

For questions 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, and 6a, please mark or circle the “Yes” or “No” box as appropriate. If the program existed at any time during the reporting period (i.e., the Federal fiscal year ending September 30<sup>th</sup>), please answer “Yes,” even if the program no longer existed by September 30<sup>th</sup>.

Sometimes in the Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire, a “No” answer means that the CLG has never offered (since certification) the local historic preservation program type in question. In this kind of situation, for questions 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, and 6b, if the subject matter does not apply to your local government’s historic preservation programs/legal authorities/processes (i.e., you answered “No” to the “did you have the program” question), leave the related “historic properties” question’s blank empty. For example, you should leave the blank empty for question 3b if your government did not have a local government tax incentives program that could benefit historic properties and thus you answered “No” to question 3a. Generally, for every local program question to which you entered a “No” in question 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, or 6a, we would expect to see an empty blank in question 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, or 6b. Conversely, if you entered a “Yes” for any “did you have a program” question, we would expect to see a number in the corresponding “how many properties” question.

For the “how many properties” questions, do not use a check, an “X”, or words such as “same as last year,” “several,” or “unknown.” If your local government offered the program during the reporting period, please insert “0” if the subject matter applies, but there was no activity during the last completed Federal fiscal year. If you are not sure what the correct answer is, please make your best estimate.

If, since your local government’s certification, it once offered a program but no longer does so and the information on the cumulative number of historic properties protected by that program is readily available, then, 1) answer “No” to the “do you offer the program” question (e.g., question 3a), 2) provide a number in the “how many properties protected”

question blank (e.g., question 3b), and 3) enter a note in the “Notes/Comments” box explaining the situation (e.g., “the Tax Abatement ordinance sunset in 2006”).

If you wish to, please feel free to use the “Notes/Comments” section to explain your answers, paradoxes, or anomalies. For example, it would be very unusual for a CLG to have a design review program or a local tax incentives program or a “bricks and mortar” local grants/loans program without also having a local register program (i.e., the legal authority to create/amend a local landmark/local historic district). In most communities, a local designation is a prerequisite for a historic property to be eligible for/subject to the other local programs.

Similarly, it would be very unusual for a CLG’s accomplishments to produce identical, large numbers as the answer for multiple questions. Finally, if a very large number is the answer to a question, it would be a good idea to explain the accomplishment in the “Notes/Comments” section. Thus, NPS will feel confident that the large number is not a typo and, more importantly, such information might merit explicit mention in a State/NPS narrative report. Also, feel free to use the “Notes/Comments” section to identify noteworthy accomplishments even if they are not large.

From a cumulative baseline perspective, it is impossible to have more historic properties locally registered than are present on the CLG inventory. There are other relationships between questions. For example, generally speaking, it would not make sense to show a “0” for the CLG inventory and a number larger than “0” for any of the “protection” questions.

**9. How do I report on historic properties whose protection is not carried out or monitored by my office/the Commission?**

You don’t have to. For the purposes of this questionnaire, report only on those historic properties whose designation or protection has involved your local government’s historic preservation office/commission in some way; e.g., through review, approval, project administration, covenant or easement oversight, etc. or for which your office has the data.

**10. How should I count local historic districts?**

Do not count a district as a single property. Count the total number of buildings, structures, sites, or objects that contribute to the significance of the district. If you do not know the number of contributing properties, please provide your best estimate of the number. NPS takes this position because historic preservation decisions tend to affect individual properties within a district rather than the district as a whole.

**11. We don’t use the same terminology that appears on the form and in this guidance. Do we have to change how we refer to things?**

That decision is between you and your State Historic Preservation Office. A national report needs to use national terms that follow Federal statutes and policy. For your own purposes, you should use terms that make sense to you. All we ask is that you know how your terms relate to the national terms because we won’t understand the relationship. Therefore, for this questionnaire please make the conversion from your terminology to the national terminology.

**12. What is the difference between a “CLG inventory” and a “local register”?**

As a CLG, under Federal law, you already have a CLG inventory, but you might not have a local register. You have a “local register” only if your State’s CLG procedures require it and/or your local government has created a registration/designation process under local law. Your community may have given your local register some other name that means a list of locally registered historic properties. Another way of putting it is that your “local register” is the sum of all contributing properties in all of your local landmarks and in all of your local historic districts. In most situations, you can think of historic properties that are listed on your local register as a subset of the historic properties that are included in your CLG inventory. Because of the consequences under local law that usually attend being added to the local register, normally a CLG will have more historic properties in its CLG inventory than it has on its local register. The annual additions to each will vary.

If your CLG has a design review program, it most likely also has a “local register” program. (i.e., the legal authority to create/modify local historic districts/landmarks), even if no local designation has taken place for a while.

A CLG inventory encompasses everything that you know about the historic resources within the jurisdiction of the local government regardless of how you got the information. It doesn’t matter, for example, if the inventory information was gathered as a part of a State or federally-funded survey. For question 1 on the form, we are interested in the number of

CLG inventory properties that are historic properties. Under Federal law, there are no legal consequences when you add property to your CLG inventory. Your local register (or whatever name you give it), on the other hand, usually has consequences under local law. In fact, if your State's CLG procedures require a local registration/designation ordinance, there must be local consequences under local law for properties newly added to the local register. Usually, when a historic property is added to a local register, the property becomes subject to some kind of review process and/or becomes eligible for some kind of local benefits. In other words, every historic property that is on the local register is also on the CLG inventory, but not every historic property on the CLG inventory is on the local register.

13. **We don't have anything called a "local inventory" or a "local register," but we do have other lists and overlay zones that identify historic properties. Should I count those? Should I include local government-owned properties?**

Yes, as long as you can count the number of historic properties that those lists or overlays include. Don't worry about the titles given to the information that you have about historic properties. Use the guidance in the answer to question 12 above, to help you determine where in the report to include the number of historic properties. In some cases, you should report the number in both the blanks for question 1 and question 2b on the form and in some cases just in the blank for question 1 about CLG inventories.

With regard to local government-owned properties, you should count them if they are subject to local government historic preservation laws/policies. For the purposes of this questionnaire, ownership of the property does not matter.

14. **From time to time, due to demolition, we have had to remove some properties from both our CLG inventory and our local register. Do you want us to adjust our cumulative figures for the CLG inventory and local register to reflect those losses?**

Yes, if you have that information readily available. The cumulative baseline is a snapshot of what is in your CLG inventory and local register as of September 30. Properties formerly but not currently on the CLG inventory or your local register are useful to know about for historical reasons but not as a historic preservation baseline. In such a situation, it would also be helpful to provide updated cumulative baseline figures in the following year. For example, the impact of properties demolished during FY 2012 would be reflected in adjusted cumulative baseline figures in the FY 2012 Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire

15. **Why do you have separate questions on "designated" and "protected" historic properties throughout this questionnaire? Why not just ask for the number of properties in our CLG inventory? In that way, with one question, you could account for all historic properties that have been designated and protected. All of our locally "listed" properties are included on our CLG inventory. All of our properties that have been "protected" in one way or another are also "designated" properties.**

Reporting separately on "designated" historic properties and "protected" properties better represents the historic preservation work that you do. Each time the local government designates a property or (for example) provides financial assistance to a property, that action adds to the protection inherent in being part of your CLG inventory. We wish to give you full credit.

Also, this is the kind of information that citizens in your CLG and your colleagues in other CLGs or local governments want to know. Folks living in a CLG or thinking about moving there may want to know what kinds of historic preservation opportunities exist. Communities that are considering whether to create new historic preservation programs/legal authorities want to know who else has the programs so that wheels don't have to be re-invented. We will make this information available on the Web and upon request.

16. **Some historic properties are protected more than once (e.g., tax benefits achieved and permits reviewed). Should I count a property only once or each time that it is reviewed, receives a grant, etc.?**

Count a property each time that it is reviewed, receives a grant, etc. This approach gives you credit for all the protection that you give to a historic property, not just the initial instance. Note that for this reporting you do not have to know or provide a list of what happened to each historic property. What you need to know for this questionnaire are total figures for each category; i.e., the total number of properties designated, receiving tax benefits, etc.

17. **There are some State laws that require local government legislative action (e.g., passing an ordinance) for the law to go into effect. This sometimes occurs with regard to Tax Incentives and sometimes with regard other programs. Would this situation count as a local program for the purposes of this report?**

It depends. See the analysis below.

The Situation. There is a State law that provides direct and/or indirect protection to historic properties. The State law a) rewards historic property owners for the historic significance of their properties, b) helps them to correct problems threatening the properties' significance, and/or c) requires the owners to maintain the properties for a specified period of time. The State law requires some degree of local government participation to implement the State legal authority. The State law might also require/authorize some level of participation by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to implement the law.

The Question. The National Park Service (NPS) asks States to report on accomplishments under State law and asks Certified Local Governments (CLGs) (either directly or through the SHPO) to report on accomplishments under local law. Should a State law/program that requires local action for the protection of historic properties be reported in the State Report, the CLG Report, or both?

Purposes and Principles. Some of the purposes for and principles behind the State and CLG reports will help answer the question.

- a. Both the State and the CLG reports are designed to help measure the success of the national historic preservation partnership. As official partners, both States and CLGs carry out historic preservation activities that are not paid for by Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) and matching funds. We want to give full credit to the historic preservation work that our partners do and avoid (where possible) the under-reporting of accomplishments.
- b. The partnership work carried out outside of the HPF grant program is not reported on a national basis anywhere else. Therefore, the answer to the question must be one that does not lose the ability to get credit for the protection made possible by such a hybrid State law.
- c. NPS asks only for information that is (or should be) readily available. No record-keeping should be done solely for the purposes of these two NPS reports.
- d. Although the unit of measure for both the State and the CLG reports is the number of historic properties, what we are really counting is the number of times a historic property is protected. For example, if during the reporting period a historic property both is awarded a Certificate of Appropriateness and a local tax incentive, that situation counts as "two" (one in the Design Review category and one in the local tax incentives category). Thus, if the answer to the question is to count the properties protected in both the State and CLG reports, that would not be double counting.
- e. Often in historic preservation, there is not a clear division of responsibility for the result of an owner of a historic property receiving a local benefit/protection under a State authorization/mandate. For example, to obtain a local protection, a sign-off on eligibility could be required from both the SHPO and the CLG Commission.
- f. Nationwide (and sometime within a single State) there can be a great deal of variability in the role of the State and the local historic preservation offices in the implementation of such a State hybrid law. It would be overly cumbersome and nearly impossible for NPS to try to describe and provide an answer to every possible fact pattern. Consequently, it makes sense to provide the range of possible answers and the criteria that should be applied in arriving at the appropriate answer for the particular situation.

The Answer. In the case of a hybrid law -- that is, a State law requiring some measure of local government participation to confer a historic preservation benefit -- depending upon the situation, it could be appropriate to report the resultant number of historic properties protected just in the CLG Report, just in the State Report, or in both reports. Apply the criteria below to help determine the appropriate response in a given situation.

The Criteria.

- 1) Whose tax coffers are affected? For example, in a tax incentive situation, if the owner of a historic property receives only a local tax benefit, then it could be appropriate to report the protection in the CLG report.
- 2) Does the local government have any options in whether or not (or how) to take advantage of the State law? For example, if local government participation is mandatory and thus is acting solely as an agent of the State government, it could be reasonable to treat the program as a State program.



- 3) Which level of government is best able to keep track of the number of historic properties that take advantage of the property tax incentive? If only the SHPO or only the CLG has easy access to the information, that is where the program should be reported. One of the principles behind the NPS reports is that we are asking only for information that is (or should be) readily available. No record-keeping should be done solely for the purposes of these two NPS reports. The flip side of this criterion is that SHPO and/or CLG possession of the data is a good rationale to include the data in the State and/or CLG Report. We don't want to miss out on the data altogether.
- 4) Which level of government has to review the application to determine the property's eligibility to take advantage of the historic preservation benefit? A reasonable argument could be made that whichever level of government's historic preservation office makes the final decision regarding a historic property's eligibility for the benefit should get credit for the protection. On the other hand, if both the State and CLG historic preservation bodies are involved in the process, an equally good argument could be made that the final protection/benefit would not take place without the participation of both the State and the CLG and therefore the number of historic properties protected should be reported in both the State and the CLG reports.
- 5) Other criteria? Depending upon the particular situation, there may be other criteria that would aid in the decision of whether to report the number of historic properties protected in the State Report, the CLG Report, or both.
- 6) How does your State CLG Program Coordinator recommend solving this issue? Please check with her/him. Within every State, similar program questions should be resolved in a parallel fashion.

**18. For some of our local programs, the main purpose is not historic preservation, but the programs protect historic properties as an incidental consequence. Housing programs are a good example. Should I count those?**

Yes. As long as historic properties are protected and your office is involved or has the data, count those programs and the properties that they protect.

**19. Our historic preservation financial assistance programs (grants, loans, etc.) are not funded every year. Should I report that we have the program, or not?**

It is helpful to think of this question in terms of legal authorization for funding being separate from the actual provision of funds.

Answer "Yes" to question 4a, if the ordinance authorizing the financial assistance was still in effect during some portion of the Baseline Year. If the authorizing ordinance was no longer in effect, but the protective agreements resulting from the financial assistance were still in effect after certification as a CLG, answer "No," but include those properties in answering question 4b.

If no authorizing ordinance was involved in the financial assistance program, answer "Yes" to question 4a if the financial assistance program was either in effect during the baseline year or any protective agreements resulting from the program were still in effect during the Baseline Year. If no authorizing ordinance was involved in the financial assistance program, answer "No" to question 4a but enter property numbers for question 4b in the following circumstances. Follow this approach if the financial assistance program was not in effect for the Baseline Year but either was in effect since certification as a CLG or any protective agreements resulting from the program were still in effect after certification. Please use the "Notes/Comments" section to explain any situation that merits entering "No" for question 4a and a number for question 4b.

For the purposes of the local historic preservation grants/loans blank, count a historic property if rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, etc. work (a.k.a. "bricks and mortar") is involved. Report elsewhere (e.g., under Acquisition) those properties that your local grants or loans assisted in other ways (e.g., to help a nonprofit organization purchase a preservation easement).

**20. We administer some grants from the State and the staff of the State Historic Preservation Office helps us with some of our locally-funded programs. Similarly, in some Federal assistance programs, the Federal funds are legally transformed into local government funds. How should I treat these situations in responding to question 4 on grants and loans?**

Count only historic properties protected through grants supported by funds coming from local government sources. Do not count: 1) grants from Federal (or matching) funds administered by State or local agencies or 2) State government grants. For example, don't count historic properties that you protect through Historic Preservation Fund CLG subgrants.

These are counted elsewhere on State or Federal Government forms. However, if the funds are local, count the benefiting properties in this questionnaire even if you receive technical assistance from other sources.

Count in this report those few Federal (or State) programs that award funds to local governments and for which, as a matter of Federal (or State) law, those funds legally become transformed from Federal (or State) to local funds. This is a rare situation. The best known Federal example is the Community Development Block Grant program.

21. **Many of the historic preservation accomplishments in our community are achieved through the financial support of the private sector or through non-profit organizations such as the National Main Street program. Should we include these achievements in our reporting on the number of historic properties that we protect through grants or loans?**

No. Although we recognize that a large percentage of current historic preservation would not take place without the financial support of non-profit organizations and the private sector, this questionnaire is focusing on the achievements of local government historic preservation programs. However, action by one of these organizations does not prevent the counting of a property/protection if it simultaneously receives a local government benefit. One example would be a simultaneous Main Street and local historic district designation.

22. **What should I count in the “Local Design Review/Regulatory Compliance Program” blanks? What does “review and compliance” mean?**

For the purposes of the “Local Design Review/Regulatory Compliance Program” blanks, include only those activities for which local laws have provided protection in a regulatory setting; e.g., through a review, permitting, or certificate of appropriateness process. This type of program is often referred to as "review and compliance." “Review and compliance” refers to the review of permits, plans, applications, etc. to help ensure compliance with local regulatory laws related to the protection of historic properties. In many communities, there is a review of proposed changes to locally-designated landmarks and properties within locally-designated historic districts. In some communities, the CLG Commission also reviews local government activities that might have an effect on historic properties. This is sometimes called a “local Section 106” after the parallel provision (for Federal agency undertakings) in the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended.

Do not count (in this blank) historic properties that local laws have protected through financial incentives (e.g., tax laws) or financial assistance (e.g., bricks and mortar grant programs). Report that information elsewhere on the form.

23. **Sometimes we approve requests for demolition or make other decisions that do not result in the protection of properties. These reviews are a legitimate part of our workload. Should we count these for question 5b?**

No. If it is easy for you to separate out those reviews/recommendations that are likely to result in a historic property's destruction or loss of significance, don't include them in this cumulative baseline questionnaire. We are trying to get an estimate of the number of historic property reviews where preservation is a likely result. If it is difficult to separate your regulatory reviews by result, don't worry -- just give us the total figures.

24. **What does “Acquisition” include? What about eminent domain? Doesn't every general-purpose unit of government have this power?**

“Acquisition” refers to any legally-binding, title-related interest in the historic property that the local government has obtained (or has helped others to obtain) thereby making the property subject to your local historic preservation laws and policies. The interest in the property's title could be anything ranging from fee simple absolute (i.e., complete title) to an easement (e.g., façade or preservation easements). With the exception of eminent domain, the method of acquisition is not important here. Do not consider eminent domain in your answer to question 6a. Because every general-purpose local government (with few exceptions) has the power of eminent domain, to include it in answering question 6a would obscure the presence or absence of other kinds of acquisition programs. For answering question 6b, include in your count any historic property that comes into local government ownership (even through eminent domain) as long as local government ownership makes the historic property subject to local government historic preservation laws/policies.

25. **Where do I report on publications, brochures, public education, site interpretation, historic preservation plans, historic plaques and markers, and other historic preservation accomplishments?**

These are not part of the Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire. While important, for purposes of this questionnaire we have limited the questions to products that more directly affect individual historic properties. This reduces the burden in

gathering and reporting this data. However, you may include your other accomplishments as part of your periodic reporting to your State Historic Preservation Office (in some States this is required) or, if you wish, report directly to us by use of the "Notes/Comments" section.

26. **The questions that you ask relate primarily to CLG workload. Wouldn't it be better to ask how many of our historic properties are still in good condition? In the final analysis, preserving our irreplaceable resources is the true test of our success as historic preservationists.**

If funding and staffing were no object, we would want both workload information and data on the condition of historic resources. One of the aims of the Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire is to make use of readily available information rather than to create a new workload in gathering and tracking data. Especially for larger CLGs, data on the condition of historic and prehistoric properties often are not readily available. Another purpose of this questionnaire is to gauge the contribution that CLGs make to historic preservation. In assessing a property's condition, without asking the property owner it is difficult to distinguish which parts (if any) of a property's good condition are due to local, State, and/or Federal historic preservation program efforts. CLG workload data on the other hand usually are readily available, readily assignable to CLG efforts, and can be used to draw reasonable inferences about the condition of historic properties.

27. **What should I do if my office missed a report or if, in retrospect, we discover that we made a mistake in an earlier report?**

Because of the long-term uses for this information, it will never be too late to provide the Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire's information. We hope that you take advantage of opportunities to update the information that we have about your program. You have a choice as to how to accomplish this. You may either provide/correct the earlier report or you may prepare a new cumulative baseline report for a more recent year. For example, if your local government became a CLG during FY 2008 but your office had not responded to any of the subsequent requests for information as of the end of FY 2012, you would have had the following options. Your first option would have been to prepare and send us a FY 2008 cumulative baseline response plus an annual report for FY 2009, FY 2010, FY 2011 and FY 2012. You could have used the current year's forms by changing the dates. Your second option would have been to provide questionnaire answers and baseline data through FY 2011 plus a FY 2012 annual report. Other combinations of baseline questionnaires and annual reports are also possible.

.....

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement.** We (National Park Service) collect this information as part of the process for reviewing the procedures and programs of State, tribal, and local governments participating in the national historic preservation program and the Historic Preservation Fund grant program. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit. We use the information to evaluate those programs and procedures for consistency with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) and compliance with Governmentwide grant requirements. We provide no assurance of confidentiality with the exception of some location information concerning some properties included in government historic preservation property inventories. Pursuant to Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, release of information is tightly controlled when such release could have the potential of damaging those qualities that make a property historic.

A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The Office of Management and Budget has reviewed and approved these information collection requirements and assigned OMB Control Number 1024-0038. We estimate that it will take you 6 hours to complete the Cumulative Baseline Questionnaire for CLGs, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW. (2600), Washington, DC 20240.