

DRAFT

Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Plan,
2023-2031

*This plan is available for public comment until **September 30, 2024**.*

Please send any comments or questions to Jennifer Doherty, Local Government Programs Coordinator, Massachusetts Historical Commission, at Jennifer.Doherty@sec.state.ma.us.

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS	3
ADVISING ORGANIZATIONS	4
INTRODUCTION	7
PRESERVATION PLANNING IN MASSACHUSETTS	7
METHODOLOGY OF THE 2023-2031 PLAN	7
HISTORIC RESOURCES ACROSS THE COMMONWEALTH	10
HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE COMMONWEALTH	12
FEDERAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACTIVITIES.....	12
THE MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION.....	12
<i>Grants Division</i>	13
<i>Preservation Planning Division</i>	13
<i>Technical Services Division</i>	15
OUR PRESERVATION PARTNERS.....	15
<i>Tribal Organizations</i>	15
<i>National Park Service Units</i>	16
<i>National Heritage Areas</i>	16
<i>Massachusetts Department of Conservation & Recreation</i>	16
<i>Regional Planning Agencies</i>	16
<i>Local Commissions</i>	17
<i>Non-Profit Organizations</i>	18
<i>Education Programs</i>	18
GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS FROM 2018-2022	20
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR 2023-2031	21
VISION STATEMENT	21
BUILDING CAPACITY.....	21
DOCUMENTATION AND PROTECTION.....	23
HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	24
SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCY	26
PUBLIC OUTREACH AND EDUCATION	28
APPENDIX I – MASSACHUSETTS STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN 2018-2022, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	30
BIBLIOGRAPHY	35

Acronyms

ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

CLG – Certified Local Government

COSTEP MA – Coordinated Statewide Emergency Preparedness Massachusetts

EOHLC – Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities

MACRIS – Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System

MBTA – Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority

MEMA – Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency

MGL – Massachusetts General Laws

MHC – Massachusetts Historical Commission

MPPF – Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund

MVP – Municipal Vulnerability Program

NPS – National Park Service

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office/Officer

THPO – Tribal Historic Preservation Office/Officer

A note about fiscal years: the state fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30, while the federal fiscal year runs from October 1 to September 30. As this is a federally-required plan, activities will focus on those in the federal fiscal year. However, where noted some actions may be calculated to the state fiscal year or even calendar year due to the nature of the program.

Advising Organizations

Municipal Government

Certified Local Governments
Community Preservation Committees
Local Historic District Commissions
Local Historic District Study Committees
Local Historical Commissions

Local and Regional Organizations

American Institute of Architects Massachusetts
Boston Main Streets Foundation
Boston Preservation Alliance
Boston Society for Architecture
Cape Cod Modern House Trust
Chinese Historical Society of New England
Dartmouth Heritage Preservation Trust
DOCOMOMO New England Chapter
Essex National Heritage Area
Falmouth Preservation Alliance
Freedom's Way National Heritage Area
Friends of Modern Architecture/Lincoln
Hancock Shaker Village
Historic Boston, Inc.
Historic Deerfield, Inc.
Historic New England
Historic Salem, Inc.
The History Project
John H. Chaffee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor
Museum of African American History
Nantucket Preservation Trust
New England Historic Genealogical Society
New England Museum Association
Newburyport Preservation Trust
Old Sturbridge Village
Pilgrim Hall Museum
Preservation Worcester
Revolutionary Spaces
The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor
Society of Architectural Historians, New England Chapter
Springfield Preservation Trust
Upper Housatonic Valley African American Heritage Trail
Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area
Vernacular Architecture Forum, New England Chapter

Victorian Society
Waterfront Historic Area League

Regional Planning Agencies

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
Cape Cod Commission
Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission
Franklin Regional Council of Governments
Martha's Vineyard Commission
Merrimack Valley Planning Commission
Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Montachusett Regional Planning Commission
Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission
Northern Middlesex Council of Governments
Old Colony Planning Council
Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
Southeastern Regional Planning & Economic Development District

State Agencies

Architectural Access Board
Board of Building Regulations and Standards
Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources
Commission on Indian Affairs
Department of Agricultural Resources
Department of Conservation and Recreation
Department of Energy Resources
Department of Transportation, Cultural Resources Unit
Division of Capital Asset Management & Maintenance
Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities
Massachusetts Cultural Council
Massachusetts Downtown Initiative
Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office
Massachusetts Office of Travel & Tourism
Massachusetts School Building Authority
Massachusetts State Archives
MassDevelopment
MassHousing
Office of Coastal Zone Management

State and National Organizations

African American Trail Project
Built Environment Plus
Coordinated Statewide Emergency Preparedness (COSTEP-MA)
Community Preservation Coalition

Environmental League of Massachusetts
Fire Chiefs Association of Massachusetts
Massachusetts Archaeological Society, Inc.
Massachusetts Association of Community Development Corporations
Massachusetts Association of Planning Directors
Mass Audubon
Massachusetts Building Commissioner and Inspectors Association
Massachusetts Economic Development Council
Massachusetts Federation of Building Officials
Massachusetts Historical Society
Massachusetts Land Trust Coalition
Massachusetts Municipal Association
Massachusetts Smart Growth Alliance
National Trust for Historic Preservation
Northeast Document Conservation Center
Preservation Massachusetts
Revolution 250
Society for Industrial Archaeology
The Trustees
Trust for Public Land
Williamstown + Atlanta Art Conservation Center

Tribal Historic Preservation Offices

Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe
Nipmuc Nation
Stockbridge Munsee Band of Mohican Indians
Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)

National Park Service

Adams National Historical Park
Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park
Cape Cod National Seashore
Lowell National Historical Park
Minute Man National Historical Park
National Parks of Boston
New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park
Salem Maritime National Historic Site
Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site

Education Programs

Boston Architectural College
Boston University
North Bennet Street School
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Introduction

Preservation Planning in Massachusetts

The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) has been planning for the state’s historic and archaeological resources since 1979, and since 1995 has developed a State Historic Preservation Plan every five years. These regular plans are a requirement of the MHC’s role as the federally designated State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and for its annual support from the federal Historic Preservation Fund. Each year, the MHC uses the current State Plan to develop an Annual Work Program, matching goals and objectives in the State Plan with programs and activities for the coming year.

While the MHC prepares and makes active use of the State Plan, it is designed to be used by any stakeholders undertaking historic preservation work in the Commonwealth, including local historical and historic district commissions, municipal planning staff, non-profit organizations, and regional and state agencies. The Plan and its goals and objectives are written so that any preservationist may find a role for themselves in the Plan. The MHC encourages other organizations to incorporate the goals and objectives of this State Plan into their own planning work.

This State Plan is an update to the previous State Plan produced for 2018-2022. For a review of the goals and objectives of that Plan, and what was accomplished by preservationists in Massachusetts during that period, see the chapter, “Goals and Accomplishments from 2018-2022.”

This Plan reviews the state of historic preservation in Massachusetts as it stands today, incorporates feedback received from the public about historic preservation activities in Massachusetts, and develops a new set of goals and objectives to carry Massachusetts preservationists through to 2031. While recent state plans have had a five-year time horizon, this new State Plan will be set to eight years, to correspond with two terms for the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, MHC’s statutory home as a Massachusetts agency.

Methodology of the 2023-2031 Plan

Development of this Plan began in the summer of 2022. Work was completed by the MHC staff with input from our Advising Organizations, local historical and historic district commission members, and other members of the general public.

“Cruising the Commonwealth” Listening Sessions

Staff from the MHC attended three of Preservation Massachusetts’ “Cruising the Commonwealth” listening sessions. Although not focused on this State Plan, these sessions were a chance for MHC and Preservation Massachusetts staff to hear from the public their issues, concerns, and preservation successes. Unfortunately, all three of the sessions only had two or three attendees; however, it was a good opportunity to address direct concerns of the attendees. Two themes discussed in all three sessions were how historic preservationists can make better connections to other groups and organizations in their community, and how the local planning and permitting process can often help or hinder preservation efforts. Session attendees also noted a lack of volunteers locally, and a desire to reach out to a younger audience.

Survey

A public, anonymous survey was released in mid-September 2022, and was open through the end of October. It was sent to MHC's Advising Organizations, local historical and historic district commission, posted on two statewide email listservs (MassHistPres and MassPlanners), and included in email blasts from several partner organizations, such as Preservation Massachusetts and the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission. The MHC decided to move the planning cycle from five to eight years after the survey was completed, so the survey questions reference a five-year timeframe.

The survey included some basic demographic information, such as how the respondent primarily identified (local historical commission member, municipal staff, teacher/academia, etc.), what county they live in, age, gender, household income, and race. The survey then asked respondents to react to nine agree-disagree statements. Four questions followed with the option to select multiple answers covering:

- the kinds of resources respondents are concerned about;
- what they see impacting their historic preservation efforts the most in the coming five years;
- what they would like to know more about in regards to historic preservation;
- and how outside organizations can best support their preservation efforts in the coming five years.

The survey concluded with four open-ended questions about successes and failures since 2018, and why the respondent thought preservation efforts were or were not successful in their community.

Before closing on November 1, 2022, the survey received 392 responses. Most respondents (47.45%) were members of a local historical or historic district commission; no other category of respondents was over 10%. All Massachusetts counties were represented in the survey, with the most respondents from Middlesex County (18.88%), the most populous county, and the least respondents from Nantucket (1.53%), the least populous county. Notably underrepresented was Suffolk County, which includes Boston, with only 4.59% of respondents but 11.35% of the statewide population.

Survey respondents skewed older, wealthier, and whiter than the wider population of Massachusetts.¹

- No respondents were under age 18; 16.07% were 18 to 40; 42.60% were 41 to 65; 37.50% were 66 or older; and 3.83% chose not to identify. Statewide, only 17.4% of residents are 65 or older, showing that our survey respondents were older than the statewide population.
- 53.83% of respondents were female, in line with the statewide percentage of 51.1%. However, only 38.27% of respondents identified as male; 7.91% identified as other or preferred not to identify.
- One quarter (25.51%) of respondents chose not to identify their income. However, with 41.07% of respondents selecting their income as \$100,000 or more, respondents are likely wealthier than the statewide population, where the median household income is \$89,026.

¹ Comparison data from US Census QuickFacts for Massachusetts, accessed April 12, 2023. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/MA>.

- 85.20% of survey respondents were white, above the statewide population of 79.8%. Other races, or those preferring not to identify, had anywhere from one to four respondents, with nine respondents identifying as multiracial or biracial.

For future plans, more effort should be dedicated toward reaching out to those on the fringes of the traditional historic preservation movement – younger residents, non-white populations, and lower-income residents. Preservationists in Massachusetts should make an effort over the next eight years to reach out to these groups, educate them about key preservation activities, and work with them to preserve the sites and landscapes important to them and their communities.

Successes and Failures Since 2018

In December, 2022, the Plan's Advising Organizations and local historical and historic district commissions were invited to submit their preservation successes and failures over the past year. They are woven throughout the Plan, particularly in the review of the goals from the 2018-2022 plan. The failures also helped to inform the goals and objectives of this plan; what are our Advising Organizations and local partners struggling with? One common theme through the failures especially was demolition and loss. Many respondents noted their community's failure to save a building, or the pressure to demolish buildings for economic development.

Historic Resources across the Commonwealth

While Massachusetts is one of the smallest states by land area, it includes a wide range of historic resources across a variety of landscapes, from Atlantic coastal regions in the east to the Berkshire Mountains in the west. Native settlement sites and landscapes, First Period houses, 18th century farm landscapes, 19th century mill villages, and 20th century urban and suburban developments make up some of the different layers of history present across Massachusetts today.

Since the 1960s, the MHC has been supporting efforts by the Commonwealth's 351 cities and towns to document the full range of their historic resources. As of July 1, 2024, there are 233,442 properties entered into the Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System (MACRIS). All 351 municipalities have documented at least one historic resource that is entered in MACRIS, although some certainly have more than others. The Town of Holland only has one entry, East Brookfield has eleven, while Boston has over 18,400 entries.

As with many other topics in the Commonwealth, there is a distinct east-west split in the level of documentation between the more heavily developed eastern half of the state and the more rural western half of the state. Larger western Massachusetts communities like Greenfield and Springfield have made efforts to document many of their historic resources, but the many smaller, more rural communities such as those in Berkshire and Franklin counties often have very limited, older survey work. These surveys often have more of a building focus, and do not document the historic landscapes that are particularly significant to a rural community's history. Or, these communities might have extensive documentation on public works and infrastructure sites completed as part of larger regional or statewide documentation efforts, but they have limited information on their other historic resources, such as buildings, monuments, and landscapes.

Documentation in MACRIS draws primarily from the MHC inventory forms that make up the official *Inventory of Historic Assets of the Commonwealth*, but MACRIS also includes data from National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmark nominations, and from local historic district and local landmark designations. The level of documentation on all of these forms varies based on the kind of form, who completed it, and when. Local historical commission or historical society volunteers completed many of the earliest forms from the 1960s and 1970s. They were often limited in their research to what was available locally at the public library or in other collections. Sources were historic maps, town histories, family biographies, interviews with property owners, and sometimes deed research. These early efforts, many undertaken around the time of the Bicentennial, were often focused on the oldest surviving residential buildings, homes of prominent historic individuals, important local institutions such as the town hall or library, and in larger towns, historic commercial areas in the downtown core.

Beginning in the 1980s, with the development of advanced degrees in historic preservation, and with the availability of federal funding for surveys through the MHC, survey work was increasingly undertaken by professionals. Work continued much as before, with streetscape and area inventory forms incorporated to cover neighborhoods, campuses, and other groups of related buildings. Much of this work in the 1980s often led directly to National Register of Historic Places nominations through the Multiple Resource Area format, usually covering representative individual properties, a community's

historic center, downtown area, and sometimes outlying villages. Thematic National Register nominations were also produced for groups of related resources such as First Period buildings in the eastern part of the state and state hospital campuses.

Survey work continues today, with professional consultants trained in history, architectural history, and archaeology preparing most inventory forms and National Register nominations. Many communities have begun to move more systemically through their town, often with the assistance of a survey plan. Current survey projects are a mix of producing new inventory forms and updating previous documentation work. Previously-documented resources often benefit from a new inventory form that takes into account all areas of a property's history and makes use of resources now easily available through internet-based research that were inaccessible in the later 20th century. There is also an effort to reach beyond the focus of previous surveys to capture more recent buildings, different kinds of resources, and resources associated with groups and themes now recognized as significant in the community's history, but underrepresented in existing surveys. For example, there are now almost 20,000 entries in MACRIS for buildings constructed after 1950.

Historic Preservation in the Commonwealth

A variety of public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals undertake historic preservation efforts in the Commonwealth within the larger historic preservation movement in the United States, from the federal to the local level.

Federal Historic Preservation Activities

The passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966 initiated the modern federal historic preservation framework, establishing the National Register of Historic Places and the federal preservation program. This program is managed by two agencies, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the National Park Service (NPS) in partnership with the SHPOs.

The ACHP is an independent federal agency whose members are appointed by the President. They advise the White House and Congress on preservation issues, guide nationwide preservation policy, and administer the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires that federal agencies consider historic resources in any project they undertake or in which they are involved. The review and consultation process for federally permitted, licensed, or funded projects involves the ACHP, the federal agency, the SHPO, and other consulting parties at the tribal and local levels.

Within the Department of the Interior, the National Park Service oversees the National Register of Historic Places and the Historic Preservation Fund. The National Register is the nation's official listing of buildings, sites, structures, and districts significant to America's history. There are over 98,000 properties listed in the National Register, with almost 4,500 listings in Massachusetts.

Established in 1977, the Historic Preservation Fund collects money from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases and provides matching grants for state and local historic preservation activities. The NPS invites SHPOs and THPOs to apply for funds yearly and distributes funding based on an apportionment formula. The NPS also offers additional funding opportunities through the HPF and from Congress, such as the American Battlefield Protection Program, the National Maritime Heritage Program, Save America's Treasures grants, and History of Equal Rights Grants. These are more targeted, competitive programs for specific kinds of resources, resulting in the preservation of historically significant properties, in educational programs, or in National Register of Historic Places nominations.

The NPS also administers the Certified Local Government (CLG) program. Through this program, communities that have a higher level of preservation activity and knowledge can be certified by the SHPO and NPS. This gives them additional duties in the National Register program, eligibility for funding under the HPF, and additional funding and training opportunities.

The Massachusetts Historical Commission

Established by the state legislature in 1963 under Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 9, Sections 26 through 27C, the MHC is the state agency tasked with identifying, evaluating, and protecting the Commonwealth's historic and archaeological resources. The MHC is also the federally-designated

SHPO, with the MHC's executive director serving as both the state historic preservation officer and state archaeologist. The MHC consists of both a 17-member appointed commission, chaired by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, and its staff that manages day-to-day operations. At its core a regulatory agency, the MHC carries out a number of different programs within its three main divisions.

Grants Division

The MHC is the recipient of federal and state funding managed by the agency's Grants Division. Grants staff administer two yearly grant programs and manage the nearly 700 Preservation Restrictions the MHC holds. The Grants Division also applies for additional funding opportunities available to SHPOs through the National Park Service, such as the Maritime Heritage and Underrepresented Communities grants.

Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund

The MHC receives state funding for its Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund (MPPF) grant program. Established in 1984, the MPPF program provides funding to municipalities and non-profits for work on their State Register of Historic Places-listed buildings. Projects can include both pre-development planning work and physical preservation work. In exchange for funding, the property owner must place a Preservation Restriction on the building, held by the MHC, protecting the building and ensuring that future work protects the building's historic integrity. The MHC currently holds nearly 700 Preservation Restrictions as a result of grants through the MPPF program. During state fiscal years 2018 to 2022, the MHC provided \$5,582,529 in funding to 125 properties through the MPPF program.

Preservation Planning Division

MHC's Preservation Planning Division (PPD) supports a variety of preservation efforts at the local, state, and federal levels. It includes programs such as the management of inventory forms and data; oversight and management of the National Register process; and support for local commissions in their preservation efforts.

Survey, Inventory, and Data Management

Since the 1960s, the MHC has produced standardized inventory forms on which to document historic resources, and PPD staff oversee the formatting, submission, and management of these forms. Once processed, digital versions of the inventory forms are available to the public through the Massachusetts Cultural Resources Information System (MACRIS) and corresponding GIS-based MACRIS Maps websites. MACRIS includes data on 233,442 properties as of July, 2024, including PDFs of corresponding inventory forms and National Register and National Historic Landmark nominations. Inventory forms are primarily produced by survey projects supported with matching funds from the MHC's Survey & Planning Grant program, by locally and privately-funded survey efforts, and by project proponents in relation to the requirements of federal or state historic preservation programs. Over federal fiscal years 2018 to 2022, the MHC received an average of 1,500 inventory forms every year.

The state inventory of archaeological sites now includes 10,687 pre-contact sites and 5,807 historic period sites. Archaeological site forms are mostly generated by consulting archaeologists who conduct archaeological investigations of proposed development projects in compliance with state and federal laws and regulations.

Survey & Planning Grants

Funds from the federal Historic Preservation Fund provide support for MHC's annual Survey & Planning Grant program. This 50/50 reimbursable matching grant program is available to municipalities, public agencies, and non-profits to support preservation planning projects. Typical projects include survey and inventory work, National Register of Historic Places nominations, communitywide preservation plans, survey plans, and design guidelines. Grants are awarded competitively in a yearly cycle subject to available funding and are managed by PPD staff. During federal fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the MHC funded 63 projects in the Survey & Planning Grant program, awarding just over a million dollars (\$1,004,537) that was matched by local funds or staff time.

Through the grant program the MHC awards at least 10% of the funding it receives annually from the Historic Preservation Fund to communities that participate in the Certified Local Government (CLG) program. While the MHC funds both CLG and non-CLG projects through the Survey & Planning Grant program, the availability of this dedicated, 10% pass-through funding source enables many CLG communities to undertake consecutive-year or multi-year projects with Survey & Planning Grant support.

State Register of Historic Places

PPD staff also maintain the Massachusetts State Register of Historic Places, which is a compilation of properties and sites that have received official federal, state or local legal designations. These designations include National Register of Historic Places listings and Determinations of Eligibility by the Keeper of the National Register, National Historic Landmarks, local historic districts, local landmarks, Massachusetts Historic and Archaeological Landmarks, and preservation restrictions. Properties and sites are only included in the State Register when they receive one of these designations. The State Register is published annually with listings through December 31 of the previous year. It currently includes over 88,000 listings, including listings in nearly every community in the Commonwealth.

National Register of Historic Places Program

The National Register nomination process begins at the state level; staff in PPD's National Register program oversee the process. National Register nominations begin with a review of eligibility by MHC staff, or for nominations in CLGs, a review of and concurrence with the local commission's eligibility opinion. Consultants prepare the nominations, and draft nominations submitted to the MHC are reviewed by MHC National Register staff for their adherence to MHC and NPS technical and substantive requirements. When in final form, National Register nominations are presented to the MHC commissioners, who serve as the National Register State Review Board, and who consider nominations at quarterly meetings. Once approved by the State Review Board, nominations are submitted to the NPS for review and listing by the Keeper of the National Register.

Massachusetts has the third-highest number of National Register listings in the country, and the office continues to receive a high volume of nominations. Every year approximately 50 properties are submitted for eligibility opinions and 15 to 20 completed nominations are received. Around 20 to 24 nominations are presented to the State Review Board for approval every year. Nominations are roughly split between honorary designations and those submitted as part of the federal and state historic

rehabilitation tax credit programs. Between 2018 and 2022, Massachusetts added 84 new listings to the National Register of Historic Places and amended two previous listings.

Local Government and Planning Support

Through all of these programs, PPD staff support local historical and historic district commissions in their preservation efforts. While other PPD staff support survey projects and the National Register process, the Local Government Programs Coordinator provides direct support to communities on local preservation and regulatory issues, such as adopting a demolition delay bylaw or ordinance, establishing a local historic district, and otherwise supporting preservation activity at the local level. The Local Government Programs Coordinator answers questions, manages the MHC's guidebooks on various local preservation topics, offers a series of regular virtual workshops on preservation issues, and coordinates with other agencies and organizations on local preservation training opportunities and planning projects.

Technical Services Division

MHC's Technical Services Division (TSD) staff are responsible for the review of projects under state and federal law as well as the state and federal historic rehabilitation tax credit program. TSD staff includes architectural and archaeological reviewers. As noted earlier, the MHC participates in federal Section 106 reviews, with similar legislation and regulations at the state level (Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 9, Sections 26-27C and 950 CMR 71) providing for the MHC's review of state permitted, funded, or licensed projects. Between 2018 and 2022, the MHC reviewed an average of 8,000 state projects and approximately 3,000 federal reviews per year. Not every project involves historic resources, or impacts to historic resources; only around 10 projects per year lead to a Memorandum of Agreement to mitigate adverse effects to historic or archaeological resources from proposed work.

Historic rehabilitation tax credits are available for National Register-listed income-producing properties at the state and federal levels, and TSD staff review all projects under both programs, working closely with NPS staff to review federal tax credit projects. Between 2018 and 2022 an average of 38 federal tax credit projects were completed per year with a total of 187 projects over the period; many of these also received state tax credits.

Our Preservation Partners

Throughout the Commonwealth, other agencies and organizations undertake historic preservation work at the local, tribal, regional, and state level. They participate in programs offered by, and receive technical and financial assistance from, NPS and the MHC.

Tribal Organizations

Massachusetts is the homeland of the Massachusett, Nipmuc, and Wampanoag. Today, the state has two federally recognized tribes, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe and the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head-Aquinnah. The Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians are a federally recognized tribe based in Wisconsin but with ancestral ties to the Berkshires and an office there. The Nipmuc Nation is recognized by the state. The MHC works closely with the THPOs and other tribal representatives,

especially during the review of projects that may impact archaeological resources and culturally-sensitive lands.

National Park Service Units

The National Park Service has a strong presence in Massachusetts including six National Historic Parks, seven National Historic Sites, the Cape Cod National Seashore, and the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area. These historic parks, sites, and landscapes reflect the significant national role that Massachusetts played in the Revolutionary War era, the early national Maritime Economy, and the Industrial Revolution, in addition to recognizing groups and individuals significant to American history. All of the National Park Service's locations play a prominent role in the Commonwealth's heritage tourism economy and are a significant draw for visitors.

National Heritage Areas

Massachusetts also is the home to five National Heritage Areas covering regional-scale, historic, lived-in landscapes. Four of these extend into neighboring states. Designated by Congress and supported by the National Park Service through public-private partnerships, National Heritage Areas include historic, cultural and natural resources which together represent cohesive, nationally important, living landscapes. While the Park Service provides some funding, National Heritage Areas are managed by non-profit organizations that promote natural, cultural, and historic sites within their boundaries, encourage tourism, make connections between related sites, and provide grant funding to support preservation activities.

The Essex National Heritage Area, established in 1996, includes the 34 communities of Essex County, Massachusetts. Freedom's Way National Heritage Area, established in 2009, covers 45 communities stretching west-northwest from Malden through Middlesex County and northeast Worcester County, extending into southern New Hampshire. The John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, designated in 1986, connects 25 towns along the Blackstone River watershed between Worcester and Providence, Rhode Island. The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor, established in 1994, and renamed in 2014, covers 35 towns in the Quinebaug and Shetucket River Valleys, nine of which are in south-central Massachusetts and the rest in eastern Connecticut. The Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area, established in 2006, includes 29 communities in the southwest corner of Massachusetts and the northwest corner of Connecticut.

Massachusetts Department of Conservation & Recreation

At the state level, the Department of Conservation & Recreation (DCR) is an important partner that manages parklands and sites across the Commonwealth. DCR's properties encompass more than 450,000 acres and include historic buildings, statues, landscapes, and other resources. DCR's staff include cultural resources specialist to assist the organization in managing their resources.

Regional Planning Agencies

Thirteen regional planning agencies (RPAs) cover the state, supporting larger, regional planning efforts and providing technical support to communities. Several of these provide more direct historic preservation support.

The enabling legislations for two RPAs, the Cape Cod Commission (CCC) and the Martha's Vineyard Commissions (MVC) grant them specific regulatory powers, allowing them to review "developments of regional impact," larger projects that can have an outsized impact on the

communities in their service areas. Relative to historic resources, review of projects is primarily triggered by a property's inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

In the western part of the state, the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission (PVPC) includes a staff preservation planner who can often provide technical historic preservation support to communities that do not otherwise have the capacity to engage historic preservation planning services. Support might range from advising the local historical commission or completing an inventory form for a specific historic property, to larger projects such a survey of multiple historic properties or the preparation of the historic and cultural resources chapter of a municipal master plan.

Local Commissions

Under state law, the Commonwealth's 351 cities and towns can establish local historical commissions (MGL Chapter 40, Section 8d) and local historic district commissions (MGL Chapter 40C and various Special Acts). These local commissions are appointed by the community's Select Board, Town Manager, or Mayor and City Council. While they are partners in the MHC's work, the MHC does not have any direct control or oversight of their membership or actions.

Nearly all communities have an active historical commission that oversees preservation efforts community-wide. These commissions are not granted regulatory powers under state law, but many communities have adopted a demolition delay bylaw or ordinance that the historical commission oversees. Historical commissions document their community's historic resources, educate the public about the resources, and serve as advocates for their community's historic resources in the local planning and permitting process.

One hundred and twenty-four communities have established at least one local historic district with a commission to oversee it. Under the enabling state law or their specific Special Act of the state legislature, these local historic district commissions have the regulatory power to review and approve changes to properties within their districts. Districts vary widely in the number and character of properties they protect. Many communities have a district protecting their historic town center or downtown area; Somerville has over 200 single-property local historic districts; and the entire island of Nantucket is designated a local historic district. MGL Chapter 40C allows communities latitude to decide what historic resources are important and significant enough to be protected by a local historic district. While the MHC reviews and comments on preliminary study reports for proposed local historic districts, the MHC does not have the power to approve or deny the establishment of a local historic district; all decisions are made at the local level.

Thirty communities in the Commonwealth that have both a local historical commission and a historic district commission presently participate in the NPS's Certified Local Government (CLG) program. One of the main benefits of participating in the CLG program is that the MHC must pass-through 10% of its yearly federal funding to CLGs. This is done through the competitive Survey & Planning Grant program, where a portion of program funding is dedicated to CLG applicants. As a result CLGs are more favorably positioned to carry out multi-year preservation planning projects. For example, CLGs Marblehead, Medford, and Nantucket have completed survey plans and then have been able to implement them over multiple years with matching Survey & Planning grants, comprehensively moving through their community, updating their inventory of historic resources neighborhood by neighborhood.

Non-Profit Organizations

Throughout the state a variety of non-profit organizations, large and small, work to support historic preservation efforts. Major statewide organizations include Preservation Massachusetts, Historic New England, and the Trustees of Reservations.

Established in 1985, Preservation Massachusetts is the statewide historic preservation advocacy organization, supporting community efforts to advocate for their historic resources through education and campaigns. Preservation Massachusetts supports the state historic rehabilitation tax credit program, maintains circuit riders to advise local commissions, and organizes the statewide historic preservation conference.

Founded in 1910 as the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, Historic New England is the oldest regional historic preservation organization in the United States. It works to preserve and protect historic buildings and landscapes across New England, and maintains important collections of objects and documents. It owns a variety of historic properties, from 18th century farmhouses to the Mid-century Modern Gropius House, most of which are regularly open to the public. They also hold a number of preservation restrictions on privately-owned properties, protecting those properties in perpetuity.

Founded in 1891, the Trustees of Reservations is the oldest land conservation organization of its type in the world, and is a steward through ownership or through conservation restrictions of significant natural and historic properties throughout Massachusetts, including historic mansions, estates, and designed landscapes, from the Crane Estate in Ipswich out to Naumkeag in Stockbridge.

More specialized organizations include the Community Preservation Coalition and the Massachusetts Archaeological Society. Formed in the 1990s, the Community Preservation Coalition (CPC) supports municipalities who are in the process of adopting or who have adopted Massachusetts' Community Preservation Act (CPA). CPA provides local and state funding for historic preservation, affordable housing, and open space and recreation projects. All funding is managed and directed locally. To date, 196 communities have adopted CPA. The CPC provides support for communities going through the adoption process as well as technical support for those who have adopted it. The CPC also advocates at the statewide level for CPA support, such as increasing the funding provided to the trust fund.

Founded in 1939, the Massachusetts Archaeological Society supports archaeological work across the Commonwealth. It is a membership-based organization that publishes the peer-reviewed journal *The Bulletin* and also operates the Robbins Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology in Middleborough.

At the local level, several communities have non-profits focused on historic preservation advocacy in their city or town. Major cities such as Boston (Boston Preservation Alliance and Historic Boston, Inc.), New Bedford (Waterfront Area Historic League), Springfield (Springfield Preservation Trust), and Worcester (Preservation Worcester), and smaller communities like Dartmouth (Dartmouth Preservation Trust), Nantucket (Nantucket Preservation Trust), Newburyport (Newburyport Preservation Trust), and Salem (Historic Salem, Inc.) have dedicated preservation organizations. And many more communities have a local historical society that, while often focused more on the community's general history, may also play a role in local preservation advocacy efforts.

Education Programs

Several of the Commonwealth's many colleges and universities offer advanced degrees in historic preservation. Major programs include Boston University's Master of Arts in Preservation Studies, UMass-Amherst's Master of Design in Historic Preservation, and Boston Architectural College's Master of Design Studies in Historic Preservation. For training in more physical preservation work, North Bennet Street School offers a post-secondary education course in preservation carpentry. These programs, as well as associated programs in public history and planning, support the network of preservation practitioners in Massachusetts.

Goals and Accomplishments from 2018-2022

This section will review progress by the MHC and partner organizations across the state towards the goals and objectives presented in the *Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Plan 2018-2022*. The 2018-2022 goals can be found in Appendix I.

Do you have projects from 2018 to 2022 that supported these goals and objectives? Please send them to Jennifer.Doherty@sec.state.ma.us. We are also looking for photographs to help illustrate accomplishments.

Goals and Objectives for 2023-2031

Vision Statement

This vision statement will guide historic preservation efforts in Massachusetts over the coming eight years:

Historic preservation efforts in Massachusetts will include the Commonwealth's full range of historic, cultural, and archaeological resources associated with all of the groups and peoples who have lived here. Historic preservation will be integrated into local, state, and federal planning processes, supporting sustainable and resilient development in all of the Commonwealth's communities. Local, regional, tribal, and state agencies will have the funding and technical resources they need to carry out their desired historic preservation activities.

What follows are the goals and objectives that will support preservationists working toward this vision. There are five core goals: Building Capacity, Documentation and Protection, Housing and Economic Development, Sustainability and Resiliency, and Public Outreach and Education. Within each goal are several specific objectives, tasks that the MHC and its partners can undertake to advance toward the above vision of historic preservation in the Commonwealth. Each of the goals is described in detail below, highlighting past successes, opportunities for improvement, and public feedback.

Building Capacity

Any successful historic preservation program needs to have a supportive level of funding and technical knowledge to undertake the program. Historic preservation requires funding and technical knowledge at all levels – to support commissioners and staff, to document historic properties and sites, to produce National Register of Historic Places nominations, and to protect, preserve, and rehabilitate historic properties and sites. Massachusetts has a number of programs to support preservation efforts: degree-granting programs to train practitioners; a variety of preservation organizations at the local, state, and regional level; and funding sources such as MPPF and local CPA grants for physical preservation work.

However, in recent years many preservationists in Massachusetts have struggled with a lack of capacity to support their efforts. Half (51%) of survey respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My community has the financial resources to undertake most of our preservation priorities," and 44% of respondents believe that a lack of funding will most impact their historic preservation efforts in the coming years. Funding was also prominent when survey respondents were asked how outside organizations can best support their efforts. Nearly two-thirds (64%) of respondents stated that organizations could best provide support by providing grants for physical preservation work; that was almost double the next-highest recommendation, to support a local network of preservation partners, at 36%. A lack of funding was mentioned in 93 of the 304 responses when survey respondents were asked to describe why their local preservation efforts were not successful.

Capacity also extends beyond funding to knowledge. While the MHC supports training for local historical and historic district commission members through its regular workshops and its work with

regional historical commission coalitions, a report by the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission found that many Berkshire County local commissions were unfamiliar with the offerings of the MHC and unsure about their role as commissioners. Regional historical commission coalitions, which meet two to three times per year, have been active in the central and western parts of the state, and preservation staff at the Cape Cod Commission have managed their own roundtable series for several years. An eastern Massachusetts coalition covering the Metropolitan Area Planning Council region held its inaugural meeting in early 2023. Coalitions have not yet been organized in the Merrimack Valley and southeast/south coast regions.

Capacity is also dependent on the support of knowledgeable historic preservation practitioners. Yet in recent years, the MHC has experienced difficulty finding qualified candidates for open positions, and communities have found it challenging to secure qualified consultants to undertake grant-funded projects. Frequent job postings by some of the private firms suggest they too struggle with staffing. However, this shortage of practitioners was not as clearly reflected in survey results. Most respondents (33.67%) neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement “Preservation professionals (consultants, tradespeople) are easy to locate when needed for projects,” while only 29.34% disagreed or strongly disagreed. And while survey respondents (29.85%) saw lack of local staff and volunteers as impacting their preservation efforts in the coming years, only 7.65% believed a lack of preservation professionals would impact their future work. However, a lack of volunteers or a lack of knowledge about historic preservation issues among local commissioners was often cited by survey respondents when reflecting on local preservation failures over the past five years.

Having supportive levels of preservation funding and practitioners with the right level of knowledge will be critical to reaching this plan’s goals over the coming eight years. Preservation partners across the state should work to increase available funding, train local commissioners, and support advanced degree and technical training programs that can meet the needs for preservation professionals and skilled preservation tradespeople.

Goal 1: Building Capacity

Build capacity for historic preservation work within communities and the state

Objectives

- a. Provide increased funding for physical preservation work, preservation planning, and technical support
- b. Provide opportunities for the ongoing education of local historical and historic district commissions, municipal officials and staff, and other local preservationists such as local Community Preservation Committees
- c. Provide and regularly update educational materials on key historic preservation topics for state agencies, municipalities, and historic property owners
- d. Nurture a network of non-profit organizations, education programs, and professionals that can provide advocacy and technical assistance to local communities
- e. Encourage the growth of preservation trades programs to undertake physical preservation work
- f. Support advanced-degree historic preservation programs through internships, alumni networks, and outreach to instructors and students

Documentation and Protection

One of the most basic tasks of any historic preservationist is to document the historic resources in their community. You must know what you have in order to make informed decisions about protection. While many communities in Massachusetts have done a good job at documenting their historic resources, there is still much work to be done.

Survey respondents were split when asked to react to the statement, “My community has easily accessible, up-to-date information on most of our historic resources.” 43.87% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 24.74% were neutral, and 31.38% disagreed or strongly disagreed, indicating there is room for improvement in the documentation of historic resources. When considering only the answers from survey respondents in the western counties (Berkshire, Franklin, Hampden, Hampshire, and Worcester), respondents were slightly more likely to disagree with the statement: 37.5% agreed or strongly agreed; 24.26% were neutral, and 38.23% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This reflects the split seen in MACRIS, where communities in the western half of the state generally have fewer entries.

At the same time, over a third (36.17%) of all respondents said they would like to learn more about survey and the National Register of Historic Places, suggesting these may be tools that are underutilized by many local commissions. A similar percentage (37.08%) stated later in the survey that outside organizations could best aid preservation efforts in their community by supporting surveys and National Register listings. And 34 survey respondents noted that a lack of information about their community’s historic resources was hampering their preservation efforts.

As noted earlier, there were pushes in the 1970s and 1980s in many communities to document their historic resources, but since that time many of these inventories have not been revisited or updated. These earlier generation inventory forms may be missing historic documentation that is now more readily accessible digitally, and there may be resources that were not surveyed because they were then considered too recent. Using the National Park Service’s 50-year threshold for determining historic significance, if a community’s last major survey effort was in 1975, they may have only surveyed resources up to 1920s. In many communities, the later 20th century was a period of growth and change, and their inventory of historic resources may be missing information on properties that tell that later 20th-century story. Notably, only 10.54% of survey respondents stated that they were most concerned about the 20th-century resources in their community. Some educational support may be needed among the wider preservation community to see the potential value in these resources.

Since they were often the first pass at documenting a community’s historic resources, many survey projects from the 1970s and 1980s focused on those resources that were immediately visible and historic – stately older houses, major institutional buildings, significant landscapes such as town commons, and major historic commercial nodes. These surveys may have missed archaeological resources, more modest and altered housing associated with the community’s working class residents, or sites significant to the community for their cultural associations rather than their architectural significance. Only 12.34% of survey respondents stated they were most concerned about buildings and sites associated with underrepresented communities, perhaps again a blind spot where preservationists in Massachusetts need to focus their efforts. As communities move forward in their survey and inventory efforts, they should be sure they are focusing on the full range of resources that are present

today on the local landscape, documenting all manner of historic resources that contribute to the community's history.

Once a community has a comprehensive inventory and a solid understanding of its historic resources, it can then better make decisions about how best to protect them. Not all protection methods are appropriate for all resources, or for all communities. While a preservation restriction might protect a particularly intact, significant building, other buildings might best be protected through a demolition delay bylaw or ordinance. To protect their historic resources, communities should be making use of a wide range of preservation tools – demolition delay, local historic districts, state and federal regulatory review processes, preservation restrictions, or acquisition. Having a comprehensive inventory allows a community to determine the best methods of protection for its historic resources. A comprehensive inventory also provides support for the public advocacy and decision-making process around protection methods, as it provides clear rationale for the significance of the historic resources under consideration.

Goal 2: Documentation and Protection

Document and protect the Commonwealth's historic and archaeological resources

Objectives

- a. Establish, update, and expand communitywide, targeted, and thematic historic and archaeological surveys
- b. Survey, list, and designate a diverse range of historic resources in the Commonwealth by type, period, theme, association, and location
- c. Provide incentives, such as favorable grant scoring, to encourage the surveying, listing, or designating of resources associated with under-represented communities
- d. Advocate for the protection of historic and archaeological resources through the federal and state regulatory review processes
- e. Encourage and provide technical support for the use of a variety of regulatory protection measures at the local level, such as local historic districts, demolition delay, preservation restrictions, and historic preservation-friendly zoning
- f. Support the work of local conservation commissions, land trusts, and other state agencies to protect archaeological sites through their acquisition for conservation and or passive recreation
- g. Recognize that resources can be significant not only for their architecture but also for their historic cultural associations

Housing and Economic Development

Throughout this plan's public survey and in public comments received, one theme was constant – the impacts and pressures on historic resources of redevelopment and the push for economic development. Respondents frequently cited development pressures and efforts by local officials to promote economic development as reasons that their historic preservation efforts are hampered at the local level. Seventy of the 304 respondents who provided examples of historic preservation failures in their community cited economic development and development pressures. And when survey respondents named their top three preservation concerns in the coming years, "development

pressures,” at 43% of respondents, was a close second behind “lack of funding.” Finally, many of the preservation failures over the past five years cited by survey respondents related to demolitions, particularly of private historic residences, and the loss of significant historic agricultural landscapes at the expense of development.

The planning landscape in the eastern half of the state changed significantly with the adoption of MGL Chapter 40A, Section 3A in 2020. This section of the Zoning Act requires MBTA communities to amend their zoning and allow multi-family housing by right within a half-mile of their MBTA public transit station – subway, commuter rail, bus, or ferry terminal – or within their community if they are adjacent to a community with a stop. “MBTA communities” is defined in MGL Chapter 161A and its subsections, and includes communities with a station as well as those adjacent to communities with a station, for a total of 177 communities in the eastern part of the state (excluding Boston, which does not follow the Zoning Act). While Section 3A does not require communities to build multi-family housing, like MGL Chapter 40B requires them to build affordable housing, it does make it easier to develop sites to a higher density. The Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities (EOHLC) is tasked with certifying that communities comply with the new zoning over the coming years, retaining their eligibility for certain state grant programs.

As communities look to change their zoning to comply with Section 3A, preservationists will need to be vigilant to protect the historic areas surrounding many stations. Stations were often nodes of historic development in a community; as a rail line came through and a stop was provided, housing and other associated services developed around the station. As many of the rail lines and stops were developed in the 19th century, these historic nodes of development often include many layers of historic resources. Many areas around stations are also designated as local historic districts or National Register of Historic Places districts, calling out their significance to the community, and in the case of local historic districts, providing for protection from demolition and design review for new construction. The interaction between the required zoning changes and these historic preservation protections will be for individual communities and EOHLC to work out.

Historic preservation can also provide a guide for new development in these areas, by modeling a variety of multi-family housing types and by providing examples of building forms and styles that would blend new multi-family housing into existing historic neighborhoods. Many of the inner-ring “streetcar suburbs” historically included multi-family housing types with scales and forms that were designed to be architecturally compatible with single-family residential neighborhoods while densifying the areas along rail lines – more critical in a time before widespread automobile transportation. And beyond the requirements of Section 3A, historic housing forms can also provide models for “missing middle” housing throughout the state. Historic building forms and methods of living can exemplify a variety of housing forms to support all sizes of family units and income levels in economically diverse communities across the Commonwealth.

While historic resources may be threatened by development pressures, they represent an important piece of the economic development puzzle in Massachusetts. In fiscal year 2020, even during the pandemic, historical places/churches (11.3%), museums (11.4%), and state/national parks (10.3%) accounted for a significant percentage of visitor activities in the Massachusetts travel and tourism economy. The Massachusetts economy also benefits from the federal historic rehabilitation tax credit program, as well as a similar state credit. For federal fiscal years (October 1-September 30) 2018 to

2022, 221 projects were certified to receive the federal historic preservation tax credit, with a total of \$1,437,787,357 in qualified rehabilitation expenses across those projects. The federal and state historic rehabilitation tax credits are used across the state in communities large and small on income-producing properties supporting construction jobs, and providing new spaces for housing, professional offices, restaurants, and other commercial uses.

Historic preservationists have work to do in the coming years to incorporate preservation more fully into planning processes and economic development strategies. Their work should be supported with data and examples, showing the significant role that historic preservation can play in providing safe, affordable, and compatible housing for the Commonwealth's residents, and supporting economic development in all of the Commonwealth's cities and towns.

Goal 3: Housing and Economic Development

Support housing and economic development efforts with historic preservation

Objectives

- a. Incorporate historic preservation more fully into the local, regional, and state planning and development processes as a way to provide a variety of housing types in all communities
- b. Advocate for historic preservation as an important piece of the state's and individual communities' economic development strategies
- c. Support the development of additional housing units, and especially affordable housing units, in historic buildings
- d. Develop and encourage the use of creative planning tools to make use of historic resources for affordable housing
- e. Publicize research that highlights the positive connections between historic preservation, housing, and economic development
- f. Network with groups connected to development work, such as realtors and builders, and educate them on the positive role historic preservation can play in their work

Sustainability and Resiliency

It is often said that the greenest building is the one that already exists, positioning preservationists to be at the forefront of sustainability. The built environment constitutes approximately 40% of global emissions, with new construction, from fabrication of materials to the erection of new buildings, approximately 11%. Consideration of embodied energy presents an ever more compelling case to rehabilitate and reuse existing buildings rather than raze and replace. Most new "green" buildings are built from carbon-intensive materials (glass, steel, concrete) and may not stand long enough to compensate for the energy expended in their construction. In addition, demolition contributes a significant amount of material to landfills, while historic development patterns were often dense and mixed-use, in contrast to more suburban-style sprawl with spatial mismatch between living, working, and shopping requiring a car. 58.93% of survey respondents strongly agreed, and 31.63% agreed, that historic preservation is an important part of sustainable growth and development in Massachusetts, showing that Massachusetts preservationists already recognize the important role historic resources can play in a sustainable Commonwealth.

At the same time, historic resources are often threatened by the impacts of climate change – flooding, extreme snow and water loads, extreme temperature swings, and driving winds can all damage historic buildings and erode lands holding archaeological resources. 16.84% of survey respondents felt that climate change and other natural disasters would impact their preservation work in the coming five years. Massachusetts preservationists need to better position historic preservation as a sustainable activity while acknowledging that our historic resources need adaptations to be more resilient.

There have been some recent developments to connect historic preservation in Massachusetts more fully with sustainability and resiliency work. In 2021, as part of a Municipal Vulnerability Program (MVP) Action Grant, Nantucket released a resilience toolkit, and flood adaptation and building elevation design guidelines. Supported by the new Secretary of the Interior's *Guidelines on Flood Adaptation for Rehabilitation Historic Buildings*, these documents provide a framework for municipal officials and property owners to respond to climate change and its impact on Nantucket's nationally significant landscape. Projects like these also make connections between historic preservation, planning, and emergency management, further cementing historic resources as an important part of the municipal fabric. Other communities should follow Nantucket's lead in the use of the MVP program for preservation planning needs.

In Salem, the Salem Preservation Partners have developed an annual conference focused on historic preservation and climate change. *Preservation in a Changing Climate* is an offshoot of the national conference series *Keeping History Above Water*, held in Salem in 2021. *Preservation in a Changing Climate* has a regional focus on climate change issues related to those directly impacting historic resources in Salem. Finally, preservationists have been active participants in Coordinated Statewide Emergency Preparedness for Cultural Heritage in Massachusetts (COSTEP MA), organized in 2006 to make connections between heritage sites and collections managers, and the emergency management field. COSTEP MA provides information on disaster preparedness and response and supports the state's disaster planning efforts through projects like publicizing the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency's (MEMA) crowdsourced cultural heritage facilities mapping project. Begun in 2022, this allows cultural institutions to input information about their buildings and collections into a map, allowing MEMA to better prepare for and respond to disasters that may impact these cultural institutions.

However, there remains room for improvement in making the Commonwealth's historic resources more sustainable and resilient. Major storms have led to more frequent erosion and exposure of archaeological resources. Exposure often comes during a major storm where there might be limited access to the site, or immediate clean-up needs afterwards that need to be addressed, limiting the time available to recover or study the resources. Coastal resources are sometimes considered when climate change mitigation projects are planned that include landscape work, such as the addition of riprap or the planting of grasses.

Over the next eight years, preservationists in Massachusetts should work to make deeper connections with emergency management and planning officials at the local, regional, and state levels to be sure that historic, cultural, and archaeological resources are included when planning for or responding to climate change. Preservationists should also work to show how historic buildings can be an important part of a community's sustainability strategy – limiting landfill waste and the production of new products, and often providing dense, walkable or transit-oriented housing. Preservationists should

position their work not as something “nice to have,” but rather an important piece of the puzzle in helping the Commonwealth reach its climate change-related goals.

Goal 4: Sustainability and Resiliency

Position historic preservation as an important piece of a sustainable, resilient Commonwealth

Objectives

- a. Make connections with organizations planning for resiliency to highlight concerns about impacts to historic and archaeological resources
- b. Collaborate with emergency management officials at the local, state, and federal levels on disaster preparedness, response, and recovery
- c. Work with open space protection organizations to highlight the significance of cultural landscapes and the role they can play in strengthening the Commonwealth’s resiliency to climate change
- d. Demonstrate that historic resources are inherently sustainable through publicizing research data
- e. Seek collaborative efforts with energy-saving professionals, contractors, building officials, architects, and developers regarding best practices for rehabilitation and infill development
- f. Promote and provide technical support for the use of regulatory measures at the local level that support sustainability and resiliency, such as design guidelines and deconstruction bylaws and ordinances

Public Outreach and Education

To accomplish the work of preserving Massachusetts’ historic, archaeological, and cultural resources, preservationists in the Commonwealth need to develop a constituency that is supportive of their work. This constituency will help identify resources important to them and their communities, provide voices to speak up when a resource is threatened, and vote to support funding for historic preservation priorities.

However, public comments and survey respondents suggest that preservationists have not yet built this strong constituency in Massachusetts. As noted above, historic preservation is often seen as an impediment to housing and economic development needs, rather than a way to support them. Close to half (44.13%) of survey respondents identified “lack of funding” as the top impact to their historic preservation activities in the coming five years. And over half (51.02%) of survey respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “my community has the financial resources to undertake most of our preservation priorities.”

Survey respondents also indicate that support from municipal officials, staff, and the general public is lacking. Over half (55.61%) of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “my community has the municipal official and staff support to undertake most of our preservation priorities.” Sixty-nine of 304 respondents cited a lack of support as a reason for their preservation failures, and 64 also cited a general lack of interest in the community in preservation issues. Notably, 13 respondents made reference to a lack of interest by newer or younger residents, often with a negative connotation.

Preservationists should be working to flip the script, though, when it comes to some of these groups. New residents may have moved to a community because they value its historic resources – with some outreach, they could become an important part of a preservation strategy in a community. And younger residents will grow up to be tax payers and voters who can support preservation policy at the municipal level, or even take jobs in the preservation field. Rather than being discouraged by their lack of interest or seeing these groups as opponents, local preservationists should be working to reach out to them and involve them in decisions about the community’s historic resources.

Utilizing new methods of outreach will be an important part of developing a strong preservation constituency. Preservationists should work to reach out to community members, meeting them where they are. This may involve things like historic building markers and signs that the public can easily access as they go about their day. Or it may be new forms of media, such as apps or social media sites, that bring information about the community directly to residents. Preservationist should also be working to make stronger connections to local decision-makers and planning officials at all levels, so that historic preservation is more fully incorporated into the local planning and decision-making process. Overall, reaching out to community members to hear from them what history they think is important, and educating them about the preservation field, will be an important part of developing a strong preservation constituency in Massachusetts.

Goal 5: Public Outreach and Education

Raise the level of public awareness about historic preservation and educate the public about historic preservation’s benefits and tools

Objectives

- a. Encourage local historical and historic district commissions to make connections with other municipal boards and staff, regional planning agencies, and state agencies, to make historic preservation a key piece of the planning landscape
- b. Translate important preservation documents, such as preservation plans and informative materials on programs, into additional languages
- c. Develop strong connections with diverse groups not typically engaged in historic preservation activities such as underrepresented communities and K-12 educational institutions
- d. Make use of new media and methods to educate the public about historic preservation and historic resources in their community
- e. Encourage the development and expansion of local or regional non-profit historic preservation advocacy organizations
- f. Develop and share data and statistics that can be utilized for historic preservation advocacy

Appendix I – Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Plan 2018-2022, Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Identify and Document Historic and Archaeological Resources

1. Establish, update and, expand communitywide and targeted historic and archaeological surveys.
2. Improve access to inventory information through MHC's web-based MACRIS database and MACRIS-maps GIS.
3. Prepare survey plans for communities initiating and updating comprehensive historic properties surveys.
4. Document the full range of historic resources by period, type, location, and association.
5. Provide technical and financial assistance to cities and towns undertaking historic resources surveys.

Goal 2: Evaluate and Register Historic and Archaeological Resources

1. Evaluate historic property significance using the National Register of Historic Places criteria.
2. Assist local historical commissions, Certified Local Governments, and the general public in understanding the evaluation and registration processes and the requirements for National Register eligibility opinions and listing.
3. List National Register-eligible properties in the National Register of Historic Places.
4. Encourage the listing of properties in the National Register of Historic Places through publications and workshops, and explore other vehicles, such as social media.
5. List the full range of resources by type, period, theme, association, and location to diversify the National Register program.
6. Reach out to underrepresented communities through public meetings and publications to publicize the National Register program. Recognize that translations of MHC's National Register materials into other languages may be necessary to reach diverse communities.
7. Encourage the listing of National Register districts—the most efficient vehicle for listing the most associated historic resources in a single effort.

Goal 3: Protect Historic Resources through Education, Collaboration, and Public Awareness

1. Undertake public information programs to heighten public awareness of historic resources.
2. Develop new methods of outreach through social media, webinars, and the use of other technologies.

3. Develop a web presence that highlights statewide historic resources through inviting, accessible, and non-academic means.
4. Publicize preservation successes through local, regional, and state avenues.
5. Develop partnerships with a broad range of organizations to find common ground.
6. Collaborate with educational officials to bring local preservation into classroom activities.
7. Collaborate with local and regional land trusts and other open-space protection organizations on preserving cultural landscapes.

Goal 4: Protect Historic Resources through Greater Advocacy

1. Encourage the development of local or regional non-profit historic preservation advocacy organizations.
2. Provide training to individuals and organizations interested in local advocacy.
3. Advocate at the local, state, and national level for funding, policies, and regulations that support historic preservation.
4. Establish a statewide association of local historical and historic district commissions.
5. Develop and share data and statistics that can be utilized for historic preservation advocacy.

Goal 5: Strengthen the Stewardship of Historic and Archaeological Resources

1. Encourage and support state agencies, municipalities, and non-profit organizations to maintain their significant historic properties.
2. Develop programs or materials for homeowners on best practices for maintaining their significant historic properties
3. Improve state policies and regulations to encourage historic preservation.
4. Support the development of preservation trades programs that provide local jobs, workforce development, and a preservation option for historic property owners.

Goal 6: Protect Historic Resources through Financial Support

1. Administer, support, and publicize MHC's Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund (MPPF).
2. Administer, support, and publicize MHC's Survey and Planning Grant program
3. Administer, support, and publicize the federal and state historic rehabilitation tax credit programs.
4. Seek the expansion of the state historic rehabilitation tax credit program through significantly increasing or removing the annual cap.

5. Encourage cities and towns to adopt the Community Preservation Act.
6. Provide technical support to cities and towns requiring preservation restrictions as a result of Community Preservation Act grant awards.

Goal 7: Protect Historic Resources from Climate Change, Natural Disasters, and Human-Made Disasters

1. Encourage vulnerability modeling, planning, policies, infrastructure, and regulations that will help protect significant historic resources from climate change, natural disasters, and humanmade disasters.
2. Encourage owners of historic and archaeological resources to engage in disaster preparedness planning.
3. Promote coordination and communication regarding disaster-planning best practices between cultural-resources stewards and emergency-management agencies.

Goal 8: Include diverse cultural and ethnic communities in historic preservation.

1. Collaborate with diverse communities to learn how historic preservation could improve quality of life, community, and economic opportunities.
2. Provide opportunities for historic preservation that can reflect a broader range of cultures, traditions, and ethnicity.
3. Develop multilingual publications and webpages to engage a broader audience.

Goal 9: Protect Historic and Archaeological Resources through Assisting Local Governments

1. Encourage and assist communities in adequately identifying and documenting their historic resources, planning for their protection, and advocating for protective mechanisms.
2. Provide technical assistance to cities and towns interested in establishing local historic districts, demolition delay bylaws, architectural preservation districts, and other local protection mechanisms.
3. Provide regional workshops to local commissions and municipal staff on Secretary of the Interior Standards, preservation planning, local historic districts, demolition delay bylaws, design review and other topics as needed.
4. Investigate additional means of training such as the use of webinars.
5. Facilitate peer information exchange among local commissions.
6. Administer, support, and publicize the Certified Local Government program.
7. Administer, support, and publicize the Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund (MPPF) throughout Massachusetts targeting both urban and rural communities and municipalities and non-profit organizations.

Goal 10: Protect Historic and Archaeological Resources through Local Governments

1. Protect historic and archaeological resources through the passage and administration of local historic districts, demolition delay bylaws, architectural preservation districts, and other preservation local bylaws and ordinances.
2. Revise local bylaws and ordinances to encourage concentrated development, discourage sprawl, and revitalize commercial centers.
3. Attend training workshops offered by the Massachusetts Historical Commission.
4. Integrate historic preservation into the local planning and development process.
5. Revise local zoning to encourage adaptive re-use within urban neighborhoods and of underutilized buildings.
6. Adopt the Community Preservation Act as a source of funding for historic preservation projects.
7. If qualified, apply for status as a Certified Local Government through the Massachusetts Historical Commission.

Goal 11: Encourage Sustainable Development through Historic Resources

1. Demonstrate that historic resources are inherently sustainable through publicizing research data.
2. Seek collaborative efforts with energy-saving professionals, contractors, building officials, architects, and developers regarding best practices for rehabilitation and infill development.
3. Demonstrate that new housing construction and job creation in small and large cities is the most effective method of sustainable development.

Goal 12: Encourage Economic Development through Historic Preservation

1. Market statewide historic and cultural resources to both residents and out-of-state visitors.
2. Organize the many small historic and cultural institutions into larger heritage tourism efforts.
3. Demonstrate the need for additional infrastructure to support heritage tourism.
4. Develop niche heritage tourism themes such as genealogy, railroads, burial grounds, and bridges.
5. Undertake an economic-impact study regarding the economic benefits of historic preservation.

Goal 13: Protect Historic & Archaeological Resources through State & Federal Policies and Regulations

1. Review projects with state and/or federal involvement for their potential impact on historic and archaeological resources.

2. Encourage the use of preservation restrictions as a means of protecting significant historic and archaeological resources.
3. Monitor properties on which MHC holds preservation restrictions.
4. Develop creative and sensitive accessibility solutions for historic properties.
5. Provide technical assistance regarding the state building code as it relates to historic properties.

Bibliography

- Bronin, Sara C. and Leslie R. Irwin. "Regulating History," *Minnesota Law Review*, Volume 108, Issue 1. April 5, 2023.
- Compliance Guidelines for Multi-family Zoning Districts Under Section 3A of the Zoning Act*. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Housing and Community Development, October 21, 2022. <https://www.mass.gov/doc/compliance-guidelines-for-multi-family-zoning-districts-under-section-3a-of-the-zoning-act/download>.
- Einstein, Katherine Levine and Maxwell Palmer. *Representation in the Housing Process: Best Practices for Improving Racial Equity*. Massachusetts Coalition for Racial Equity in Housing, 2022.
- Federal Tax Incentives for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings: Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2022*. US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services. 2023. <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/upload/report-2022-annual.pdf>.
- Fordham, Robin. *Local Commissions and Preservation Planning: A status report on Berkshire County's 35 Historical Commission and Historic District Commissions*. Berkshire Regional Planning Commission, 2022. <https://berkshireplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/FINAL-VERSION-2.0-Berkshire-LHC-and-HDC-Report-Aug22.pdf>.
- Massachusetts Office of Travel & Tourism. *2021 Annual Report*. Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development. https://www.visitma.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/2022_Annual_Report_FINAL.pdf.
- National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. *Recommendations for Improving the Recognition of Historic Properties of Importance to All Americans*. 2023. <https://ncshpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/NHDAC-Full-Report.pdf>.
- PlaceEconomics. *Status of Historic trades in America*. The Campaign for Historic Trades, 2022. <https://historictrades.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Campaign-for-Historic-Trades-10.31.2022.pdf>.
- University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension. *Understanding and Advancing the Preservation Trades*. Northeast Regional Initiative for the Preservation Trades, 2023. <https://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2500&context=extension>.
- Bringing Embodied Carbon Upfront*. World Green Building Council. 2019. <https://worldgbc.org/advancing-net-zero/embodied-carbon/>.