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Vision for Historic Preservation in Missouri

Missouri will be a state that progresses and prospers while preserving and respecting its unique heritage. Citizens of all ages will appreciate the unique and fragile nature of Missouri’s historic places and archaeological resources. Preservation will be widely recognized as a major contributor to tourism, economic development, and quality of life. Government officials at all levels, legislators, and private-sector leaders will include preservation concerns as they make decisions about Missouri’s future. Missouri’s diverse constituencies will work together as partners in a statewide preservation effort. A high level of services will be provided to assist members of the preservation community in accomplishing preservation goals throughout Missouri.

Executive Summary

In the spring of 2016, efforts began to revise and update Missouri’s current statewide preservation plan, *Preservation Horizons: 2011-2017*. This planning process revealed that Missouri’s preservation community has had great success in recent years. There is a growing preservation ethic as communities embrace preservation as a means of supporting economic development, retaining community identity, and improving quality of life. At the same time, the preservation challenges identified in previous plans remain relevant today. To address these challenges, the 2018-2024 plan focuses on six preservation goals similar to those identified in the previous plan:

- **GOAL # 1**: Understand the value of historic preservation.
- **GOAL # 2**: Strengthen and enhance historic preservation as an economic development tool.
- **GOAL # 3**: Continue the identification, evaluation, and protection of Missouri’s cultural resources.
- **GOAL # 4**: Enhance cooperation and partnerships among government entities, institutions, and the private sector.
- **GOAL # 5**: Integrate historic preservation strategies into planning and routine procedures at all levels of Missouri government: local, regional, and state.
- **GOAL # 6**: Improve the delivery of historic preservation services to include innovative technologies and an expanded information network.

The broad goals established in the planning process are joined in this document with a series of objectives and actions that can be taken by individuals, local preservation groups, and government agencies to preserve and increase appreciation for our state’s historic properties. The plan recognizes that these groups share a vision, but each play a different role in preserving the history and historic places of our state and communities. No one person, group, or agency can do it all, but we can each do our part to overcome challenges and move toward our vision of a “…state that progresses and prospers while preserving and respecting its unique heritage.”
The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was passed by President Lyndon B. Johnson and went into effect on October 15, 1966. It created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, directed states to establish State Historic Preservation Offices, expanded the National Register of Historic Places to include resources of local significance, developed the Section 106 Review Process for assessing the effect of federally funded undertakings on historic properties, and created grants to the states to help each state carry out its historic preservation responsibilities.

In July and August, the State of Missouri, under the direction of the State Liaison Officer, Joseph Jaeger, Jr., conducted a pilot program with an archaeologist and architectural historian to help determine what resources would be necessary for the state to undertake its responsibilities under the NHPA. On August 29, a report was sent to the National Park Service (NPS) in response to its inquiry regarding the amount of federal grant money Missouri would request and an outline of the State’s anticipated involvement in survey and planning projects for the 1969 fiscal year. The grant amount needed was estimated at $75,000, with the expectation that the Missouri State Legislature would appropriate an equal amount to support the program.

In July, the Missouri State Historic Survey and Planning Office was established as a section of the Historical Division of the Missouri State Park Board. The new office’s responsibilities included conducting a statewide survey to identify and record historically significant buildings, sites, and objects; to prepare a comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan; to nominate historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places; to defend recognized sites against detrimental threats as provided under Section 106 of the NHPA; to administer federal grants-in-aid for preservation, acquisition, development, survey, and planning projects; and, “To promote generally the goals and ideals of historic preservation within Missouri.”

In July, the first property in Missouri for which a successful nomination was prepared by Historic Survey and Planning Office staff was listed in the National Register of Historic Places on February 25. Still standing today, it is the 1834 Lohman’s Landing Building in Jefferson City.
1970 The Louis Bolduc House, located in Ste. Genevieve, was declared a National Historic Landmark. This house, constructed in 1792 by merchant Louis Bolduc, is a rare surviving example of a dwelling built using the French Colonial method of poteaux-sur-sol, or vertical posts on a wood sill. This example has a stone foundation, and also retains its bouzillage, a mixture of clay and grass as a wall filling. Now a museum, the house and grounds have been fully restored and are now open to the public.

1971 The first publication produced by the Historic Survey and Planning Office was titled "Foundations from the Past." This large booklet discussed Missouri’s Historic Preservation Program, and talked to state residents about the NHPA, the history of the state, what had been done previously to protect Missouri's historic resources, what still needed to be done, and recommended actions for achieving those goals. It also contained three appendices which included all Missouri sites listed in the National Register along with a photo of each site, the National Register Criteria, and information on how National Register sites are selected.

1972 A significant portion of the sites listed by the Historic Survey and Planning Office in the National Register this year were archaeological in nature. One of these, the Imhoff Site in Cooper County, is a small habitation site that was probably occupied for at least 500 years. It is considered to be an outstanding example of a Middle Woodland Period site and an excellent example of proof of the Hopewell continuum theory.

1973 The Missouri Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was established. The council’s primary responsibility is to approve nominations to the National Register of Historic Places for Missouri. (Below: 2017 council members, three members absent)

1974

1975

1976

1977

1978

1979

1976 The Missouri Heritage Trust was founded. This later became known as the Missouri Alliance for Historic Preservation, and currently goes by the name of Missouri Preservation. This is Missouri’s statewide 501(c)3 not-for-profit historic preservation advocacy group. Included among their many historic preservation activities is sponsorship of the annual Missouri Statewide Preservation Conference, bringing awareness to threatened properties by preparing and releasing its annual list of Missouri’s Most Endangered Historic Places, and providing recognition to those individuals and organizations throughout the state that have contributed to historic preservation efforts in Missouri by presenting the Statewide Preservation Honor Awards.

1977

1978 The Pelster House-Barn was listed in the National Register of Historic Places. An extraordinarily rare resource type, where both the human dwelling and the barn for livestock are built together under a single roof, this c. 1860 building is the only known example in Missouri. House barns, such as this example in Franklin County, are often associated with traditional ethnic German heritage. It was constructed using a technique known as fachwerk, where a heavy timber frame is erected and then infilled with limestone and plaster.

1979 The Missouri State Revolving Fund was established.
1980 A degree program in historic preservation was started at Southeast Missouri State University in Cape Girardeau. Through the years, the program has grown and many graduates have gone on to exemplary careers in the historic preservation field.

1981 The Mutual Musicians Association Building was declared a National Historic Landmark.

1985 The Harry S Truman Farm Home was declared a National Historic Landmark.

1986 The first Certified Local Governments (CLGs) were established in Missouri. The CLG Program, which is administered by the NPS, is designed to bring preservation decision-making and activities down from the state and federal levels to the local level. Of the seven municipalities that attained CLG status in 1986, all are still participating in the program 30 years later. These CLGs, in order of admittance are: Kirkwood, St. Joseph, Liberty, Blue Springs, Washington, Joplin, and Kansas City. Today, Missouri has 59 CLGs.

1987 The Missouri Unmarked Human Burial (UMHB) statute was enacted. This law provides a detailed process for handling the discovery of unmarked human burials, with the exception of those within the boundaries of a recognized cemetery.

1988 The 1906 Shelley House on Labadie Avenue in St. Louis was at the root of the landmark United States Supreme Court case Shelley vs. Kraemer in 1948. In 1930, the Shelleys, an African-American family, emigrated from Mississippi to St. Louis, where many houses had legal covenants attached that precluded their owners from selling to people of color. Several years later, they found a homeowner who was willing to ignore the requirements of the covenant, and the Shelley family purchased the house. Another homeowner on Labadie Avenue sued the Shelleys, and the case made its way through the legal system to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court’s decision in favor of the Shelleys substantially broadened the principle of equal access to housing for all Americans. This precedent led to significant changes in discriminatory practices, such as “red-lining,” which restricted ethnic minorities from purchasing homes in areas they desired. This historic property was placed on the National Register on April 18, 1988 for its historic significance in the areas of Law, Social History, and Ethnic Heritage.

1989
1990 The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) was enacted on November 16, to address the rights of lineal descendants, Indian tribes, and Native Hawaiian organizations to Native American cultural items, including human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony. This groundbreaking legislation fundamentally changed the handling and disposition of these types of artifacts by museums and federal agencies. One provision of the law encourages repatriation of artifacts to the groups or lineal descendants who have proven cultural affiliation to them.

1991 Historic Preservation in Missouri firmly entered the digital age with the implementation of the State Historic Preservation Office’s first computerized Cultural Resource Inventory System (CRIS), a mainframe computer database. During its first year in use, information on more than 11,000 resources were entered into the system. Although “primitive” by today’s standards, CRIS was revolutionary for its time. The system made the retrieval of information related to simple queries such as “how many sites are associated with German heritage?” or “where are buildings designed by Mary Rockwell Hook located?” Prior to the introduction of CRIS, the Missouri Cultural Resource Inventory occupied a very cramped space on the 9th floor of the Jefferson State Office Building, where all information had to be retrieved by hand from multiple sources.

1992 Route 66, that famous highway known as “The Mother Road” which runs from Chicago, IL to Santa Monica, CA, celebrated its 66th anniversary. From St. Louis, Route 66 runs 300 miles and passes through 10 Missouri counties before exiting the state just west of Joplin. Many important historic properties related to the automobile culture which Route 66 helped to establish are still in existence. One of these, the Boots Court Motel, is still open and operating.

1993 The Great Flood severely affected large areas of the state, and was particularly damaging to both above- and below-ground cultural resources. With waterways serving as the main transportation routes for much of Missouri’s history, many of the state’s most significant historic properties are located near rivers. Due to the extreme height of the floodwaters and the long duration of the standing flood - from July into September in many areas – places that had never flooded before were under many feet of water for an extended period of time.

1997: Big Eddy excavations began. During the course of five digging seasons, between 1997 and 2005, the discoveries made at this archaeological site changed the understanding of the length of time humans were thought to have lived in Missouri.

1998 The Missouri State Historic Tax Credit went into effect.
2004 | The Missouri Main Street Connection, Inc. (MMSC) was established after the state legislature eliminated funding for the Missouri Main Street Program, which had been administered by the Department of Economic Development. A private, not-for-profit 501(c)3 organization, MMSC has grown from serving 12 Main Street Communities to working with over 140 Missouri Communities in a four-tiered program. MMSC focuses on educating downtowns in how to use their unique historic resources as a catalyst for highly successful economic revitalization projects.

2004 | This year also marked the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. After authorizing the purchase of the 825,000-square-mile Louisiana Territory from France for $15,000,000.00, President Jefferson ordered the expedition to explore and document this new United States land acquisition. The Lewis and Clark Expedition spanned 8,000 mi (13,000 km) in three years, taking the Corps of Discovery, as the expedition party was known, down the Ohio River, up the Missouri River, across the Continental Divide, and to the Pacific Ocean. The expedition’s trail spanned the breadth of what is now the state of Missouri, and is marked in many places with interpretive signs so people may still follow in the steps of Lewis and Clark.

2006 | Liberty Memorial, the World War I memorial that stands above the National World War I Museum, was declared a National Historic Landmark. The memorial was designed by Harold Van Buren Magonigle, winner of the national competition that was held to solicit design ideas. Groundbreaking took place in 1921, and construction was finished in 1926. Famous persons who attended the groundbreaking ceremony included then-Vice President Calvin Coolidge, Lieutenant General Baron Jacques of Belgium, Admiral Earl Beatty of Great Britain, General Armando Diaz of Italy, Marshal Ferdinand Foch of France, and Missouri native General John Pershing of the United States. A local veteran, Harry S Truman, was chosen to present flags to the various military commanders present. The completed memorial was dedicated on November 11, 1926, by U.S. President Calvin Coolidge. Queen Marie of Romania was present to witness the dedication.

2008 | After discovering that Missouri had over 35,000 barns built prior to 1960 still standing, second only to Texas at the time, the Missouri Barn Alliance and Rural Network (Mo BARN) was established to promote preservation, restoration, documentation, and repurposing of the many rapidly disappearing historic barns and farmsteads in Missouri.

2009 | The SHPO received the prestigious Osmund Overby Award from the Missouri Alliance for Historic Preservation for its digitization of all of Missouri’s National Register of Historic Places nominations. This award, established in 2003, is given to an individual or entity to “recognize published works that contribute to the documentation and interpretation of Missouri’s architectural history. It honors Dr. Osmund Overby, Art History Professor Emeritus and former head of the historic preservation program at the University of Missouri, Columbia. Dr. Overby was a nationally recognized leader in historic preservation and one of the founding members of Missouri Preservation.”
2010 Ladue Estates, a post-World War II mid-20th-century development in Creve Coeur was listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Ladue Estates is historically significant as an exceptional example of a West St. Louis County planned suburban development representative of post-war urban flight during a short period of time when land in that area was cheap, plentiful, and acquired by the highest-quality builders. Constructed from 1956 through 1965 by Goldberg & Company, it is highly intact and still in use as a residential subdivision. All the ranch-style homes featured complete GE kitchens, full basements that utilized a drainage system patented by Harold Kessler, Goldberg’s son-in-law, and catered to an affluent Jewish community that was restricted through discriminatory practices as to where they could relocate.

2013 In July, with listing of the Stoutimore House in the National Register of Historic Places, Missouri could boast that it now had National Register-listed properties in each of its 114 counties. Located in the City of Plattsburg, seat of Clinton County, the David L. and Sallie Ann Stoutimore House is a superb example of Second Empire architecture, and retains many of its original features. Designed by local architect Joseph H. Bennett, it was constructed in 1892. The house features a concave mansard roof with dormers, square tower with cupola, and quoins at the corners of the building, all typical design elements of Second Empire-style residences.

2014 Known for having the highest concentration of extremely rare surviving examples of French Colonial architecture in the Mississippi Valley, the City of Ste. Genevieve also retains much of its original French Colonial agricultural landscape known as long lots. This very unique combination of original French Colonial architecture, particularly homes constructed using the poteaux-sur-sol (post-on-sill) and poteaux-en-terre (post-in-ground) methods, combined with its French colonial landscape features caused the NPS to undertake a two-year Special Resource Study of the city, with a view to determining how best to preserve these resources in the future, perhaps by bringing some of them directly under NPS control. Ste. Genevieve has also been under consideration by the United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for designation as a World Heritage Site.

2016 Two notable historic properties in Kansas City were listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The Kansas City Boulevard System is an extensive parks and boulevards system designed by George E. Kessler as part of the “City Beautiful” movement, popular during the late 19th and very early 20th centuries. The oldest parts of the system, which are still in use, comprise a historically significant designed landscape that was an integral component of the city’s growth and development during this period. Another notable property is the 1974 Kemper Arena. While less than 50 years of age, according to the nomination it is considered to be “an exceptional local example of the enclosed multipurpose entertainment arena, a property type that evolved in the mid-twentieth century to include functional elements of a traditional auditorium, a music venue, and a sports facility.”
Chapter 2
About Us
The State Historic Preservation Office

Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (54 U.S.C.A. § 302301) and the State Historic Preservation Act (§§ 253.408 to 253.412, RSMo), as well as 253.022, RSMo, the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is responsible for establishing, implementing, and administering federal and state programs or plans for historic preservation. The SHPO is located in the Department of Natural Resources' Division of State Parks. State law (RSMo 253.408 and 253.410, RSMo) designates the director of the Department of Natural Resources as the state historic preservation officer and that the director of the SHPO should be designated as a deputy state historic preservation officer. The SHPO carries out a broad range of activities to facilitate the identification, evaluation, registration, and protection of Missouri’s cultural resources. The SHPO’s duties include the following:

Survey and National Register
The SHPO is responsible for directing and conducting a comprehensive statewide survey of historic, archaeological, architectural, and cultural properties and maintaining an inventory of such properties. Architectural surveys provide a record of the built environment by systematically documenting intact buildings by location or theme. They document construction dates, architectural details, styles or types, alterations, current conditions, and provide brief histories of properties. Reflecting the time they are conducted, surveys provide a “snapshot” of a given area and are often the first step in preserving properties. They are most frequently used to identify properties or districts eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, but can also be used for planning and economic projects. Historic and architectural surveys are housed in the SHPO’s cultural resources inventory and available to the public online at: http://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/survey_eg.htm.

The SHPO is also responsible for identifying and reviewing nominations of potentially eligible Missouri properties to the National Register of Historic Places, which is the federal honor roll of buildings, sites, structures, objects, and districts important in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering or culture. Nominations for Missouri’s National Register-listed properties are available to the public online at: http://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/mnrlist.htm.

Review and Compliance
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act directs federal agencies and their designees to consider the impact of their undertakings on historic properties. The SHPO is responsible for reviewing federal undertakings and comments on the eligibility of properties for listing in the National Register, comments on any possible effects to properties that may be eligible for listing or are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and makes recommendations about how to avoid or minimize effects.

Archeological Assistance
The SHPO provides archeological assistance for the administration of state laws relating to archeological properties, and promotes awareness of Missouri’s archeological resources through public archeology surveys, programs, and events in cooperation with state and federal agencies, federally recognized American Indian tribes, the private sector, and other interested parties.

Cultural Resources Records
The SHPO also maintains a variety of records regarding cultural resources investigations and historic properties, such as National Register nominations and architectural surveys. These records are useful to federally recognized American Indian tribes, state and
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federal agencies, local governments, private organizations, and individuals involved in planning for the preservation of the state’s significant historic properties. Many of these records are accessible through the SHPO website. Others may be available for research by appointment.

Certified Local Government and Community Outreach
The National Historic Preservation Act was amended in 1980 to expand the state-federal partnership to the local level through the establishment of a Certified Local Government (CLG) program. Missouri local governments must enact preservation legislation and establish preservation commissions to achieve CLG status. Once certified, CLGs are eligible for an earmarked pool of federal grant funds and are given priority assistance by program staff. Missouri currently boasts 59 CLG partners.

Historic Rehabilitation Tax Incentives and Technical Assistance
Since 1976, federal tax law has provided tax incentives for historic preservation. The National Park Service currently administers a 20 percent investment tax credit for the approved rehabilitation of certified historic structures for income-producing use. The Missouri Department of Economic Development currently administers a 25 percent state rehabilitation credit that also is available for the rehabilitation of income-producing or residential properties. The SHPO’s role is to review applications and provide technical expertise to property owners, developers, and architects on rehabilitation practices to ensure that each rehabilitation project generally complies with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Upon request, the SHPO also offers technical assistance with preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration techniques. The program maintains extensive files of detailed technical information suitable for architects, professional craftsmen, and do-it-yourselfers.

Historic Preservation Revolving Fund
Pursuant to 253.408.2(11) RSMo, the SHPO is responsible for administering the Historic Preservation Revolving Fund established by § 253.402, RSMo. The fund may be used to acquire, preserve, restore, hold, maintain, or operate historic properties for their protection, preservation, maintenance or operation.

Historic Preservation Grants
The SHPO is responsible for administering Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grants as mandated by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and makes a portion of its annual allocation available each year in the form of matching grants. Grants may be used for a variety of purposes including the preparation of nominations to the National Register of Historic Places, architectural or historic surveys, archaeological surveys, public information and educational activities, and acquisition and development projects for historic properties. Grant applications are mailed, on request, to the public annually in early summer and posted online. Ten percent of the federal allocation is dedicated to projects sponsored by Certified Local Governments (CLGs).

State Commissions
Two statutorily created commissions play a role in advising the SHPO on preservation matters. These
commissions are the Missouri Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Unmarked Human Burials Consultation Committee.

Currently, the Missouri Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (253.412 RSMo) provides advice to the SHPO on the full range of Historic Preservation Fund-supported activities; reviews and makes recommendations on National Register nominations; participates in the review of appeals to National Register nominations; provides general advice and guidance to the State Historic Preservation Officer; and reviews and provides advice on the state’s Historic Preservation Plan.

The State Historic Preservation Officer, in consultation with the Unmarked Human Burial Consultation Committee if it has a quorum, (194.400-410 RSMo), is responsible for determining the proper disposition of unmarked human burials or human skeletal remains under the State Historic Preservation Officer’s jurisdiction that are discovered as a result of construction or agricultural earth-disturbing activities and cannot be related to any living peoples. The Committee’s approval is also required before the State Historic Preservation Officer can delay reinternment of remains for an additional scientific study. All actions and decisions of the State Historic Preservation Officer and the UHBCC must be consistent with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (as appropriate). Federally recognized American Indian tribes have an important role in the proper treatment and identification of human remains.

**Architectural Surveys**

Architectural surveys provide a means of documenting the built environment to identify historic resources. Surveys are often the first step in many preservation projects and can be used in local planning efforts. Survey forms record construction dates, note architectural details, identify styles or types, note alterations, comment on current conditions, and can provide brief histories of individual resources.

The Missouri State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) currently has over 400 general architectural surveys in its archive. The majority of surveys in the SHPO archives focus on the major cities and surrounding areas of St. Louis [Independent City] and Kansas City. While more surveys come in every year, there is still a great need to document Missouri’s built environment. Nearly 40 counties have no surveys and many others only have a few or one. As surveying provides a basis for our understanding of historic resources in the state, future surveying is strongly encouraged, especially for areas in the southern portion of the state where little is documented. To find out more about architectural surveys, please visit the SHPO’s survey page at: [https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/archisurvey.htm](https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/archisurvey.htm).

Many of the architectural surveys in the SHPO’s archive are available online at: [https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/archisurvey.htm](https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/archisurvey.htm).

To see if your property has been surveyed, please visit the SHPO’s Map Gallery at: [http://www.dnr.mo.gov/mapviewer/historic_districts_sites.html](http://www.dnr.mo.gov/mapviewer/historic_districts_sites.html).
Accomplishments Since 2011

There have been 236 NEW LISTINGS in the National Register of Historic Places representing 10,252 INDIVIDUAL RESOURCES.

All unrestricted nominations are scanned and available online.

The SHPO reviewed 19,297 federally-assisted projects and evaluated 22,876 properties for eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Communities entered into a preservation partnership with the SHPO and National Park Service through the CLG program. These communities include: Carthage, Hannibal, Weston, Fulton, Normandy, O’Fallon, Rolla, Sedalia, and Wentzville.

Missouri awarded $1,374,389 in federal funds for listing properties on the National Register, completing architectural, historic and archaeological surveys, completing planning, and outreach activities, preparing historic building feasibility studies, and rehabilitating historic buildings. The grant dollars are only a portion of the money used to fund these projects. The total investment by Missourians is $2,269,579.
Missouri Preservation recognized **74** projects and individuals for their contribution to preserving Missouri’s historic places.

The SHPO made resources more accessible to the public and professionals through Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and digitization:

- **In total, more than** 38,819 archaeological sites were mapped in GIS.
- **80%** of the historic/architectural survey collection has been scanned and made available online. (70,797 resources to date)
- The entire eligibility assessment collection has been scanned and entered into the GIS. (1,282 assessments)
- Since 2014, a Section 106 Determination of Eligibility layer captured 1,039 properties, of which 658 are potential historic districts.

Founded in 2008, the Missouri Barn Alliance and Rural Network identifies, preserves, and protects Missouri’s rural and agricultural history.

The City of Washington (2012) & Cape Girardeau (2015) were chosen as Great American Main Street Award Winners.
The Planning Process

Our Sense of Place: Preserving Missouri’s Cultural Resources 2018-2024 is the result of ongoing historic preservation planning efforts. Under the guidance of the NPS, the SHPO has continued to work with its preservation partners to implement and update the statewide preservation plan. The statewide preservation plan establishes broad goals and outlines actions that can be taken by individuals, communities, local preservation groups, and government agencies to preserve and increase appreciation for Missouri’s historic properties.

The planning process included five phases: organization, data collection, draft preparation, plan revision, and final plan approval. The phases are outlined below.

Organization Phase
The statewide planning committee began the organizational phase in March 2016. The committee developed a strategy for soliciting public input, produced survey questionnaires, and scheduled and organized meetings. Public meetings were held at six separate locations, targeted to ensure geographic distribution with one meeting in each Missouri State Parks region.

With the goal of encouraging the broadest possible participation, the committee focused on publicizing the planning process and developing and implementing a publicity plan that:
—Distributed media releases, which included information about the planning process, a regional public meeting schedule and locations, and availability of the online questionnaire.
—Posted the schedule of regional public planning meetings as well as a link to the planning questionnaire on the SHPO website.
—Distributed electronic notifications containing information on all regional public planning meeting dates and locations, with links to the online questionnaire through preservation listservs, like those maintained by Missouri Preservation and the Missouri Main Street Connection, and DNR/the SHPO electronic distribution groups.

Data Collection Phase
Public input is a vital part of the preservation planning process. To gather this input, the SHPO worked with statewide agencies and organizations and local preservation partners to set up and publicize regional public preservation planning meetings, stakeholder meetings, and the distribution of questionnaires. The SHPO issued media releases announcing meetings and outlining the planning process.

Stakeholder/Public Meetings
The Annual CLG Forum, May 13, 2016, marked the beginning of the data collection phase. As preservation partners active in local government preservation programs, the 105 Forum attendees were invited to discuss questions that revolved around issues that affect historic resources locally and in the state, strategies for addressing these issues, and the state’s preservation strengths. After small group discussions, the participants voted in favor of their top three choices. These responses and ideas were collected, summarized, and included in the plan.

A similar, if more general, approach was taken at each planning meeting, including the six regional public meetings held between May and July 2016 and the SHPO, agency, and federally recognized American Indian Tribes workshop. The statewide planning committee worked with state and local agencies to host regional meetings at Weston Bend State Park, Washington, Jefferson City, Cape Girardeau, Webb City, and Chillicothe. The SHPO staff held an additional planning charrette for state and federal agencies and federally recognized American Indian Tribes during the July American Indian Tribal Workshop hosted by the Missouri Army National Guard. The SHPO issued press releases to all newspapers announcing the planning process and distributed notifications and reminders through popular Missouri preservation listservs, distributed materials outlining the preservation planning process, and invited the public to these open forums. The SHPO staff also made contact with preservation partners in the field, encouraging their attendance and asking them to invite local stakeholders.

Each meeting followed the same agenda. Staff introduced the planning process and facilitated discussion. Each audience member was asked to supply responses to a series of questions. Responses were recorded on flip charts. Once gathered, audience members prioritized their top concerns. Responses and priorities gathered...
in each meeting were compiled and used to update the statewide plan. Participants in each meeting raised similar preservation issues as they related to local and statewide goals. For example, at every meeting, attendees identified the need for more communication through social media. When asked to identify the most important methods for the SHPO to use in conducting public outreach activities, the use of electronic media outranked all other suggestions. Other major themes emerged in the discussions at all meetings, including: the need for heritage education at all levels, especially K-12; a need to address demolition by neglect and the importance of local government support for historic preservation; the need for effective financial and economic incentives; and the need to provide protection for American Indian cultural properties, as well as education about Missouri’s American Indian Tribes.

**Questionnaires**
The SHPO staff reviewed surveys used by other states and developed a 12-question online survey that contained both multiple choice and short answer questions relating to preservation issues in Missouri (see Appendix C for a copy of the online survey questions and responses). Three questions related to an individual’s involvement in preservation, county of residence and contact information. The questionnaire was posted on the SHPO’s website from May 13, 2016 to August 30, 2016.

The SHPO received 128 responses to the questionnaire from individuals residing in 23 of the state’s 114 counties and the City of St. Louis. Organizations represented by respondents included state and federal agencies, historical societies, museums, local and statewide nonprofits, CLGs and historic preservation commissions, colleges and universities, historic business districts, Main Street groups, and economic development organizations. The SHPO staff tallied responses to the multiple choice questions and transcribed and organized written responses and comments.

Responses to the multiple choice questions show a wide variety of interests and concerns. Most respondents recognized preservation as important because it provides a sense of place. Preservation was also valued because it strengthens communities, improves quality of life, highlights architecture and art, and enhances economic development. A recurring theme in most multiple choice questions was the need for better integration of preservation at the local level. For example, when asked to pick three of the state’s most pressing preservation challenges, 73 percent chose the demolition or neglect of historic structures, 43 percent cited the lack of integration of historic preservation considerations into planning and zoning, and 38 percent cited the lack of economic incentives to stimulate private preservation and rehabilitation. The questionnaire followed the same basic pattern as the regional planning meeting. The survey encouraged respondents to look at preservation challenges and identify possible solutions. Better education was the most frequently suggested solution, closely followed by the need for better integration of agency, community, and citizen efforts.

The survey also asked respondents to identify threatened resource types in the state to help guide future architectural and historic survey efforts. 51 percent chose “Downtown/Main Street” as one of their top three most threatened resources, 38 percent chose residential buildings, and 27 percent chose commercial buildings and archaeological sites. However, respondents expressed concern for all 14 categories of resources provided.

**Draft Preparation and Plan Revision**
The basis for the preservation plan for 2018-2024 is Preservation Horizons: 2011-2017. Revisions to the goals, objectives, and action
plans are based on input gathered during regional meetings and through planning questionnaires to ensure that everyone is able to find usefulness in the plan. The SHPO staff have compiled and tabulated responses from the public planning process, noting priorities, issues, and themes that arose in both the meetings and questionnaires. Though each region and individual had their own concerns and specific issues within the preservation movement, the general themes were remarkably similar to previous statewide preservation planning results. Planning participants identified the need for heritage education and training, financial incentives, and the need for better communication and networking. These themes are highlighted in the plan’s broad goals, objectives, and action plans. Lists of the findings summarized from the meetings and questionnaires are on file with the SHPO.

The SHPO staff drafted a revised plan. Additional revisions were made by the staff planning committee. A draft of the completed plan was provided to

the Missouri Advisory Council on Historic Preservation electronically on July 5, 2017 and comments were solicited. A copy of the revised plan was also submitted to the NPS for review and comment. The public, partners, and federally recognized American Indian Tribes were invited to comment on the draft plan (posted on the SHPO website from July 1-August 15, 2017).

Final Plan Approval
Additional revisions to the plan were made to address comments and suggestions provided by the NPS, partners and the public. The final draft of the new plan was approved by the Department of Natural Resources Director in 2018.
Chapter 4
Critical Preservation Issues
Critical Preservation Issues
We appreciate the individuals who provided comments during public meetings and/or via the online survey, in this section referred to as “respondents,” and have compiled a list of critical preservation issues in Missouri based on their feedback. We found that respondents connect historic preservation to their sense of place. The consensus being that our history, architecture, and archaeology are unique and irreplaceable. Respondents felt that historic properties help generations connect to their past, which instills a sense of pride and community identity. The challenges they identified include: how to ensure that these resources are protected from looting, demolition or neglect; appreciated for their value to the community; and protected through shared responsibility. In particular, the respondents were concerned that downtowns/mainstreets, archaeological resources, residential buildings, agricultural properties, schools, and churches, among many others property types, need more visibility and protection.

When asked to offer solutions to these challenges, participants responded with a broad range of ideas. Public education was identified as the most important way to make sure that everyone appreciates historic properties. The need to use social media and other modern technology to increase awareness, support, and participation in preservation was stated at every event and in the online survey. There was also a great interest in K-12 education. Other, equally important concerns expressed were better integration of historic preservation in state and local planning, the need for stronger preservation laws, and greater emphasis on the preservation and protection of pre-historic archaeological and traditional cultural archaeological sites. These solutions were integrated into the goals, objectives, and action items presented in this document.

Public Awareness and Education
Missouri’s history and surviving historic resources span approximately 15,000 years of human occupation. Respondents expressed a concern that more can be done to help the public connect with historic resources. While they acknowledged that several stakeholders have already developed programs that support preservation education in Missouri schools, respondents would like to increase that emphasis and support. Likewise, respondents found that technical training is needed to guide craftsmen and owners of historic properties on appropriate preservation techniques. They also identified the need to train and educate public officials at the local, state, and national levels about the benefits of preservation.

Economic Development
Respondents suggested that economic data describing the impact of historic preservation should be collected, properly analyzed, and distributed to key stakeholders. They thought that decision makers who have a major role in preservation (e.g. bankers, realtors, community development officials) need to better understand the economic impact.
of historic preservation in their communities and that community leaders should continue to seek new ways to expand Missouri’s heritage tourism industry.

Incentives and Funding
In 1998, Missouri instituted the State Historic Preservation Tax Credit for owners who incur qualified expenses while rehabilitating historic properties. Respondents in the planning process expressed support for this program.

Respondents also noted the need for funding and incentives for preserving resources not eligible for the tax credit program, including buildings owned by the public or not-for-profit organizations, religious buildings, historic bridges, and cemeteries, among others.

Identification, Evaluation, and Protection of Historic Resources
Nationwide, preservation practices have evolved from a focus on individual landmarks to preserving entire districts and saving landscapes. Respondents suggested that Missouri should increase the scope of its inventory of surveyed historic resources, especially for downtowns/main streets, commercial buildings, residential buildings, agricultural buildings, historic and prehistoric archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and sacred sites. These resources were identified as some of the most threatened historic properties during the planning process and are resources on which little survey has been conducted in the state to date. Currently, only 66 percent of counties have at least one traditional architectural survey.

Preservation in Policies and Planning
Respondents stated that efforts to protect identified historic and cultural resources should be encouraged and supported at all levels in both the public and private sector. They maintain that preservation and protection of historic sites and buildings should be a central part of community strategic planning processes and be recognized for these contributions to quality of life and building sustainable communities.

Partnerships and Cooperation
Respondents stated that formal and informal avenues of interaction between local, state, federally recognized American Indian Tribes, federal agencies, and the private sector should continue to be developed and strengthened. They contend that public and private partnerships should maximize opportunities identified by historic preservation and economic development. According to respondents, additional support and assistance should be provided to local governments, and stronger and more effective relationships with members of the Missouri preservation network be developed.

Delivery of Service
Preservation services must be delivered in the most effective manner possible according to participants. The rapidly changing face of technology is creating new challenges and providing new opportunities for service delivery. They argue that the public sector, private sector, and non-profit preservation organizations should expand their outreach, enhance their communication networks, and increase the number and types of preservation services they can make available to Missouri’s small towns and rural communities.
The broad goals established in the planning process are joined in this document with a series of objectives and actions that can be taken by individuals, local preservation groups or government agencies to preserve and increase appreciation for our state’s historic properties. The plan recognizes that these groups share a vision, but each play a different role in preserving the history and historic places of our state and communities.

**GOAL 1: Understand the value of historic preservation.**

**Objective 1.A: Develop educational and informational materials and programs highlighting the rich diversity of Missouri’s historic and cultural resources.**

**ACTION PLAN**

1.A.1. Provide practical, achievable, and up-to-date preservation information in a range of formats, including books, publications, and electronic media.

1.A.2. Develop information appropriate for schools, planners, and public officials.

1.A.3. Support an annual statewide preservation conference appealing to a broad range of interests.

1.A.4. Include preservation topics in statewide conferences that address issues such as economic development, downtown revitalization, and environmental concerns.

1.A.5. Participate in local events by distributing preservation information and offering interactive activities.

1.A.6. Showcase successful preservation projects that can be used as models.

1.A.7. Develop partnerships and programs targeted at preserving historic rural and agricultural resources.

1.A.8. Highlight cultural landscapes, linear cultural resources such as trails, and resources along historic transportation corridors.

**Objective 1.B: Assist preservation planning and activities.**

**ACTION PLAN**

1.B.1. Gather and disseminate information on current preservation practices, such as available services, incentives; and case studies that illustrate “best practices.”

1.B.2. Publicize local preservation goals and priorities through social media, traditional publications, and websites.

1.B.3. Locally, develop networks of local preservation partners and continue to identify and connect with new organizations.

1.B.4. Publish an interactive forum and digital directory of craftsmen who have skills related to the repair and maintenance of older properties.

1.B.5. Develop a database of volunteers who are interested in community service rehabilitation opportunities.

1.B.6. Establish a statewide volunteer day to physically rehabilitate historic properties.

**Objective 1.C: Develop and publicize local preservation activities, needs, and incentives.**

**ACTION PLAN**

1.C.1. Acknowledge Missouri’s successful preservation projects through statewide and local award ceremonies, local press coverage, websites, and social media, such as Missouri Preservation’s Honor Awards or community curb appeal awards.

1.C.2. Develop a data exchange to publish statewide and locally threatened and endangered resources and establish a databank of resources available for rehabilitation, such as St. Joseph’s endangered properties list.

1.C.3. Develop an archive of “before and after” photographs and develop case studies that show alternatives for rehabilitating and reusing historic resources.

**Objective 1.D: Inform the public about the importance of and need to protect archaeological resources.**

How to Use This Chapter
ACTION PLAN
1.D.1. Support public awareness activities such as Missouri Archaeology Month, traveling trunks, talks, tours, Archaeology Café, and other special events.
1.D.2. Publish educational material and publicize the importance of archaeology through programs in elementary and secondary schools.
1.D.3. Provide opportunities to develop partnerships with, and learn about, American Indian cultures and the importance of site stewardship.

Objective 1.E: Encourage historic preservation through the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools.

ACTION PLAN
1.E.1. Develop “teaching with historic places” curricula.
1.E.2. Encourage students to research and write about local historic places and publish their work.
1.E.3. Sponsor an annual contest which Missouri students could enter by writing an essay about the importance of historic preservation.
1.E.4. Provide instruction in preservation techniques in high school industrial arts and/or vocational training programs.
1.E.5. Use National Register of Historic Places nominations and local survey information in classroom activities in schools.
1.E.6. Encourage classes to experience historic sites.

Objective 1.F: Provide preservation training to professionals, government officials, and the general public.

ACTION PLAN
1.F.1. Support historic preservation programs in Missouri’s universities and colleges.
1.F.1.a. Establish a consortium of public and private colleges and universities throughout Missouri to offer historic preservation courses.
1.F.1.b. Provide student internships and opportunities for participation in historic preservation projects.
1.F.1.c. Increase cultural sensitivity training for the protection of archaeological resources that encourages the use of new technologies to reduce the physical impact on sites.
1.F.2. Provide information on the role of preservation in sustainable development and the protection of the environment.
1.F.3. Provide specialized information and training programs for craftsmen and do-it-yourselfers.
1.F.4. Use a broad range of professionals and skilled individuals to establish hands-on workshops for those interested in developing preservation skills.
1.F.5. Publicize guidelines on rehabilitation issues dealing with hazardous materials.
1.F.7. Support “how to” workshops for conducting historic/architectural surveys for preservation planning purposes, National Register nomination writing, Section 106 Review, and the development of local preservation programs.

GOAL 2: Strengthen and enhance historic preservation as an economic development tool.

Objective 2.A: Document and publicize the economic benefits of historic preservation.

ACTION PLAN
2.A.1. Track, record, and update economic data as measures of preservation’s impact on jobs, businesses, property values, public revenues, and quality of life.
2.A.2. Collect and distribute data and case studies that document the differences between redevelopment and new development, increases in property tax and property values following rehabilitation, and neighborhood improvement.
2.A.3. Link preservation to land-use documenting the savings to communities through the re-use of existing infrastructure.

2.A.4. Link rehabilitation of historic buildings with sustainable development and “green” building design, promoting rehabilitation as a means of recycling, conserving energy, reducing infrastructure costs, and reducing landfill load.

2.A.5. Document the public costs of unused buildings (i.e. loss of tax revenue, crime, perception of blight).

2.A.6. Provide information on profit and marketability, capital resources, community benefits, sustainability of businesses, and the economic and social impact of vacant buildings.

2.A.7. Market historic buildings and provide information that can aid in the rehabilitation of these properties.

2.A.8. Provide information on the opportunities for historic downtown redevelopment.

Objective 2.B: Provide information on the benefits of heritage tourism.

ACTION PLAN
2.B.1. Highlight sustainable heritage tourism activities in the state.
2.B.2. Identify regional heritage tours around common themes.
2.B.3. Combine tours of heritage sites with scenic vistas and outdoor recreation opportunities.
2.B.4. Highlight and interpret historic resources and landscapes along historic transportation corridors.
2.B.5. Take advantage of local heritage festivals, state, regional, and county fairs to promote preservation.
2.B.7. Develop and use standardized roadside signage highlighting nearby historic and cultural resources.
2.B.8. Publicize the economic benefits of local heritage tourism programs and activities.

Objective 2.C: Provide economic incentives for historic preservation.

ACTION PLAN
2.C.1. Expand public-private partnerships with local banks to provide low-interest loans for historic rehabilitation.
2.C.2. Use incentives such as landscape conservation easements to protect archaeological sites, farms and scenic vistas.

Objective 2.D: Provide funding for preservation services, grants, and loan programs.

ACTION PLAN
2.D.1. Provide technical assistance to local government officials and private groups to plan, establish, and manage local revolving funds for rehabilitation projects.
2.D.2. Seek new funding sources for technology improvements such as grants or other cooperative funding ventures with agencies having common interests.
2.D.3. Seek federal funding to assess brownfields and hazardous materials in historic areas.
2.D.4. Expand preservation partnerships with and among private sector foundations, civic associations and other donor institutions.

GOAL 3: Continue the identification, evaluation, and protection of Missouri’s cultural resources.

Objective 3.A: Increase the number of historic and architectural properties surveyed and evaluated.

ACTION PLAN
3.A.1. Identify thematic or statewide historic context deficiencies and prioritize the development of new historic contexts.
3.A.2. Develop mobile application forms and instructions for historic and architectural surveys and online training videos to encourage resource identification.
3.A.3. Encourage communities to develop survey plans for areas not yet inventoried and areas with high potential for resource loss. Develop teaching videos focusing on the benefit of planning.


3.A.5. Provide technical assistance to counties and towns interested in comprehensive architectural surveys.

3.A.6. Train local groups, volunteers, and students to recognize and record cultural resources in their area.

3.A.7. Incorporate local survey data into the state inventory and expand data sharing partnerships.

3.A.8. Preservation partners should meet annually to develop a list of resources that need to be surveyed (the highest priorities for the state in that year).


Objective 3.B: Use traditional and innovative methods to protect identified architectural properties.

ACTION PLAN

3.B.1. Discourage the demolition or destruction of historic resources.

3.B.2. Collect and track qualitative data showing the loss of existing historic resources that are determined eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

3.B.3. Establish and publicize methods that both accommodate the Americans with Disabilities Act and preserve the character of historic buildings.

Objective 3.C: Increase the scope and rate of archaeological identification and evaluation.

ACTION PLAN

3.C.1. Ensure that the data related to the archaeological surveys of Missouri are kept current and accessible to all qualified parties.

3.C.2. Ensure that artifacts are appropriately cared for in perpetuity.

3.C.3. Develop educational materials for avocational archaeologists and the general public, including a fact sheet on artifact identification and training opportunities for volunteers.

3.C.4. Expand and support internships and university-led archaeological field schools in Missouri that focus on teaching non-destructive field methodology.

3.C.5. Increase the number of professionally conducted or supervised archaeological surveys undertaken in Missouri.

3.C.6. Develop archaeological contexts and support the nomination of archaeological sites to the National Register.

3.C.7. Preservation partners should meet annually to develop a list of resources that need to be surveyed (the highest priorities for the state in that year).

Objective 3.D: Improve methods for the protection of archaeological sites.

ACTION PLAN

3.D.1. Improve partnerships with federally-recognized American Indian tribes and archaeological interest groups to prioritize implementation of archaeological planning goals.


3.D.3. Develop resources in partnership with federally-recognized American Indian tribes to inform and educate the public on the connection between modern tribes and archaeological sites.

3.D.4. Develop methods to protect archaeological sites against looting, development, erosion, and other threats.

3.D.5. Develop proactive outreach programs to inform the public about archaeological basics; participate in educational seminars and conferences.
3.D.6. Create programs, such as site stewards, to promote the protection of archaeological sites on privately owned land.

3.D.7. Inform and educate local officials about the importance of archaeological sites in their area so that they can make sound decisions on the local level.

Objective 3.E: Increase the identification, evaluation, designation, and protection of historic resources associated with underserved populations.

ACTION PLAN
3.E.1. Form working relationships with underserved communities in order to expand recognition of their contributions to Missouri’s heritage.

3.E.2. Involve people of all backgrounds as stewards and partners in preservation activities.

3.E.3. Develop programs and educational materials that recognize and encourage awareness of diversity through consultation with underserved populations.

3.E.4. Increase the availability of preservation services to preserve cultural resources important to underserved communities.

3.E.5. Identify, preserve, and protect places that accurately reflect the contributions of underserved people.

Objective 3.F: Increase the preservation of significant urban, rural, and small town historic landscapes.

ACTION PLAN
3.F.1. Develop contexts for urban, rural, and small town cultural and historic landscapes.

3.F.2. Expand survey of urban, rural, and small town historic landscapes.

3.F.3. Increase survey and nomination of historic urban and rural landscapes to the National Register of Historic Places.

3.F.4. Continue to identify, interpret and preserve historic trails and transportation corridors and their associated historic buildings and sites.

Objective 3.G: Nominate significant properties to the National Register of Historic Places and Local Registers.

ACTION PLAN
3.G.1. Continue the determination of eligibility of historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places and Local Registers.

3.G.2. Continue the nomination of properties that were identified as eligible in historic and architectural, archaeological, and landscape surveys.

GOAL 4: Enhance cooperation and partnerships among government entities, institutions, and the private sector.

Objective 4.A: Improve communication and interaction with and among state, federal, and tribal agencies.

ACTION PLAN
4.A.1. Develop interagency agreements on cultural resource management, data sharing and training among state, federal agencies, and federally-recognized American Indian Tribes.

4.A.2. Expand the use of newsletters, mailing lists, listservs, social media, website links, and other shared communication tools.


4.A.4. Enhance and expand cooperation and consultation with federally-recognized American Indian tribes with an interest in Missouri.

4.A.5. Increase collaboration in training workshops, conferences, and site visits aimed at promoting historic preservation.

Objective 4.B: Strengthen support for preservation activities by local governments and encourage interaction and cooperation among local governments.

ACTION PLAN
4.B.1. Provide frequent local public forums to interact with the SHPO staff, preservation commissions, city planners, economic development staff, and elected officials.
4.B.2. Update and distribute a CLG training manual including such information as model preservation ordinances, establishing local incentives, developing and using design guidelines, and strategies for neighborhood revitalization.

4.B.3. Facilitate and expand networking among local preservation commissions.

4.B.4. Use local, state, and national webpages and listservs whereby CLGs can share information about resources, best practices, and rehabilitation projects in progress.

Objective 4.C: Enhance relationships among established preservation partners and develop working relationships with new partners in the private sector.

ACTION PLAN

4.C.1. Network more effectively with national preservation partners such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation and Preservation Action.

4.C.2. Continue to support Missouri’s preservation partners, including but not limited to: Missouri Preservation, the Missouri Main Street Connection, Missouri Municipal League, Missouri Barn Alliance and Rural Network, and the Missouri Archaeological Society.

4.C.3. Establish working relationships with regional planning commissions, councils of governments, local preservation organizations, neighborhood groups, downtown revitalization groups, and local historical societies.

4.C.4. Highlight preservation outreach and communication efforts to state associations that have the potential to influence historic preservation efforts, including the Missouri Municipal League, Missouri Association of Counties, Missouri Bankers Association, and Missouri Association of Realtors.

4.C.5. Develop new partnerships with chambers of commerce, local realtors, bankers, public accountants, homebuilders, and developers.

4.C.6. Include preservation issues in continuing education courses of architects, engineers, realtors, and other related professionals.

4.C.7. Expand the preservation network to include organizations, agencies, and institutions dealing with environmental, and sustainability issues such as AIA and the Green Building Council.

4.C.8. Develop partnerships with museums and local history organizations to distribute preservation information and encourage preservation of buildings, neighborhoods, historic sites, cultural resources, and archaeological sites.

4.C.9. Provide information to landowners and local governments on the protection of cultural landscapes and archaeological sites that reflect the interaction of humans and the land such as parks, farms and ranches, and transportation corridors.

GOAL 5: Integrate historic preservation strategies into planning and routine procedures at all levels of government: local, regional, and state.

Objective 5.A: Demonstrate the link between historic preservation and sustainable growth, environmentally sound policies, and economic development.

ACTION PLAN

5.A.1. Publicize preservation as part of effective land-use planning and the rehabilitation of existing building stock as a cost-effective alternative.

5.A.2. Establish guidelines on disaster response and recovery that could be implemented to mitigate the future impact of natural events (flooding, earthquakes, tornadoes, etc.) on historic properties.

5.A.3. Publicize the environmental advantages of preservation and rehabilitation.

Objective 5.B: Integrate preservation activities at the local level.

ACTION PLAN

5.B.1. Create local redevelopment teams that assist owners and developers of historic properties in obtaining the necessary permits and approvals and make them aware of programs for historic rehabilitation.
5.B.2. Train preservation commissions to work cooperatively and effectively with local planning and zoning boards.

5.B.3. Provide information on local historic buildings, prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, cultural and historic landscapes, and ethnic resources to make preservation relevant to the community.

5.B.4. Support preservation efforts of local governments and designate new CLGs.

5.B.5. Form partnerships between government officials and private groups to establish and manage local preservation revolving funds.

5.B.6. Assist local governments in developing their own preservation plans.

5.B.7. Support public infrastructure improvements in historic areas.

5.B.8. Support local neighborhood organizations that work to revitalize historic areas in cooperation with the local government.

Objective 5.C: Support municipal and county governments in the preservation of publicly owned historic properties.

ACTION PLAN

5.C.1. Encourage the development of planning documents that support the long-term rehabilitation of a building.

5.C.2. Offer grants and technical assistance to protect the character-defining features of a building.

5.C.3. Encourage dedicated local revenue to historic building maintenance.

5.C.4. Fund the rehabilitation of county and municipal buildings still in use for their historic function.

GOAL 6: Improve the delivery of historic preservation services to include innovative technologies and an expanded information network.

Objective 6.A: Use technology to improve public access to historic preservation information.

ACTION PLAN

6.A.1. Continue to provide up to date cultural resource database systems and expand functionality.

6.A.2. Expand GIS technology to enable links to site files and reports for authorized users.


6.A.4. Partner with historic preservation organizations and government agencies to develop cultural resource management applications.


6.A.7. Keep up to date on trending applications. Develop a preservation network in Missouri and link into the national network.

6.A.8. Develop and/or populate information in applications that list cultural resource attractions. Ensure that the information is accurate and reliable.

Preservation Partners
The people and agencies that shape historic preservation in Missouri come from a varied background. Involvement in local and state preservation activities springs from a love and passion for the state's history and historic places. For many local, state, and federal governmental agencies, involvement is prescribed by legislation or ordinances. Below is a description of some of the stakeholders in Missouri.

Governmental Agencies: Federal
The following federal agencies have a major presence in Missouri. These federal agencies own land, operate facilities, administer programs, and issue permits and licenses. All of these activities have the potential to affect historic properties and are subject to the provisions of Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is a major landowner, holding title to the Mark Twain National Forest that covers approximately 1.5 million acres in the state.

The National Park Service (NPS) manages six sites in Missouri: George Washington Carver National Monument, Harry S Truman National Historic Site, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Ulysses S. Grant National Historic Site, and Wilson's Creek National Battlefield. The NPS manages the National Historic Trails Program, which includes a number of privately and publicly owned historic trails such as, the Santa Fe Trail, Route 66, the Trail of Tears, the Lewis and Clark Trail, and others. The NPS is also a partner in the administration of the National Register of Historic Places and federal preservation grants.

The Department of Defense (DOD) operates a number of facilities in Missouri, such as Fort Leonard Wood (Army), Whiteman Air Force Base and Jefferson Barracks (Air Force).

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) owns and operates National Wildlife Refuges, including the Big Muddy, Mingo, and Swan Lake.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) manages major lakes in Missouri, including Truman, Stockton, Pomme de Terre, Long Branch, Mark Twain, Bull Shoals, Taneycomo, Table Rock, and Clearwater. The Corps is also responsible for issuing permits for waterway and wetland development.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provides technical assistance on soil conservation in every county, and owns the historic Elsberry Plants Materials Center.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has a large presence in the state as it administers a number of programs that affect historic properties in rural and urban areas.

The General Service Administration (GSA) oversees the use and disposition of federally owned buildings in Missouri.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) oversees disaster recovery efforts, many of which impact historic resources.

Other federal agencies do not own land, but are very active in issuing licenses or permits, or administering funding programs that potentially affect historic resources. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) funds improvements to highways, railroads, and airports.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) issues licenses for communication towers, many of which are attached to or constructed near historic properties. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development (RD) and Rural Utilities Service (RUS) provide assistance to homeowners, small business and utilities for rehabilitation and development.

American Indian Tribes
Missouri has no Indian lands or reservations. However, approximately 40 federally-recognized American Indian tribes have expressed an interest in Missouri. Some of these tribes include the Osage, Sac and Fox, the Peoria, and the Quapaw, all with a long association with the state. A few other federally-recognized American Indian tribes include the Shawnee, Delaware, Cherokee and Potawatomi, who were forcibly removed through Missouri. These tribes have varying levels of involvement with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and Section 106.
Governmental Agencies: State

State government is also a major stakeholder. Like the federal government, the state owns land, operates facilities and administers programs. However, there is no state law that provides for review of state actions that might affect cultural resources. State agencies frequently receive federal funding, permits or licenses that then require review and comment under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The Department of Conservation (MDC) is a major landowner, managing nearly one million acres throughout the state. MDC has recently devoted resources to developing an in-house program assigned to better identify and manage historic properties.

The Department of Economic Development (DED) administers several programs that affect historic properties. Federal Community Development Block Grant funds administered by DED are made available to smaller cities, towns and rural communities in the state. Under the state’s Neighborhood Assistance Program, DED provides state tax credits for certain community investment activities, which can include historic preservation. DED currently administers the State Historic Preservation Tax Credit. DED’s Division of Tourism promotes Missouri’s tourism destinations and is involved in developing a cultural tourism plan that will highlight Missouri’s historic places. The Division of Energy administers residential, commercial, and manufacturing energy programs.

The Missouri Housing Development Commission (MHDC) is the state’s housing finance agency. The Commission is dedicated to strengthening communities and the lives of Missourians through the financing, development, and preservation of affordable housing. MHDC administers state tax credit programs and funding from the federal U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) administers programs that have a major impact on cultural resources. Most of MoDOT’s activities are supported by federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration which are subject to review pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. MoDOT also administers the National Transportation Enhancement Provision program, designed to assist in the maintenance of structures and sites related to transit activity.

The Department of Public Safety (DPS) houses the Missouri National Guard and operates and maintains a number of historic buildings and armories.

The Office of Administration (OA) is responsible for work on state-owned buildings and sites. Among these sites are the historic buildings that make up the Capitol Complex in Jefferson City, as well as such significant buildings as Louis Sullivan’s Wainwright Building in St. Louis, which now houses state offices. OA is also involved in leasing properties for state use, many of which are historic buildings.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has been a partner with the SHPO in developing a heritage curriculum which may be viewed on their website.

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) houses both the State Historic Preservation Office and Missouri State Parks. Missouri State Parks plays a major role in cultural resource stewardship; the division operates 88 parks and historic sites as of June 2017. Many of the parks under its management also contain historic structures and archaeological sites, some of which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places and also include National Historic Landmarks, such as Watkins Woolen Mill State Historic Site.

Governmental Agencies: Local

Local governments play an increasingly important role in preservation activities in Missouri. Unless state or federal funds are involved, the state and the federal government do not regulate private property for historic preservation purposes. Under Missouri law, counties and municipalities can enact local preservation legislation and establish preservation commissions. More than 60 communities have preservation ordinances and/or commissions. At least three counties have enacted some form of preservation legislation. Each local preservation program is different and reflects the level of regulation with which the local community is comfortable.
Some communities, particularly in rural areas, are dealing with loss of population and a dwindling economic base resulting in a large percentage of vacant and poorly maintained buildings in their historic commercial and residential districts, as well as loss of family farms in unincorporated areas.

Certified Local Governments have established local historic preservation programs that meet certain standards making them eligible to be official partners with the SHPO and the NPS in the nation’s historic preservation program. CLGs regularly take advantage of grants and technical assistance to maintain and promote their local historic preservation programs. They engage the public in the preservation process and conduct outreach to educate citizens, community leaders, and local officials about the value of preserving their heritage. They work to integrate preservation of cultural resources into their comprehensive planning process.

Private Organizations

A growing number of private organizations at the national, state, and local levels are key partners in the preservation movement.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to a national network of people, organizations, and local communities committed to saving places, connecting us to our history, and collectively shaping the future of America’s stories. The Midwest Office, located in Chicago, is responsive to preservation needs in Missouri, providing field services, grants, advocacy assistance, and information.

The Missouri Main Street Connection (MMSC) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to enhancing the economic, social, cultural, and environmental well-being of historic downtown business districts. MMSC engages communities by offering training, technical assistance, and financial grants. It also teaches a signature Main Street Four-Point Approach, developed by the National Trust, to promote revitalization.

Founded in 1976 as the Missouri Heritage Trust, Missouri Preservation, (formally known as Missouri Alliance for Historic Preservation), is actively working to protect the historic resources of Missouri through networking, education, advocacy, recognition, technical assistance, and public awareness. With a full-time professional executive director offering technical assistance and public awareness programs, such as the Places in Peril and the Annual Statewide Honor Awards Ceremony, the statewide nonprofit works to fulfill its mission to establish a preservation ethic throughout the state. Missouri Preservation also offers regional educational and technical workshops and presents the Statewide Preservation Conference annually. Missouri Preservation also provides educational information about current public policy issues at the local, state, and federal levels that impact the preservation community. Missouri Preservation keeps its members informed through a listserv, newsletter, and website.

The Missouri Archaeological Society (MAS) was formed in 1934 to preserve antiquities and accumulation of scientific knowledge. The society publishes
a newsletter, the Missouri Archaeological Society Quarterly, and a scholarly journal, *The Missouri Archaeologist*. As part of its mission MAS members assisted in developing and maintaining the Archaeological Survey of Missouri (ASM), now housed at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The ASM no longer catalogs new site data, but for 70 years was the primary depository for archaeological site forms. Information on its 36,000 cataloged sites is available to researchers on a limited basis.

**The Missouri Barn Alliance and Rural Network** was established in 2008 to encourage the education, identification, and preservation of agricultural resources in Missouri. Since its formation, the organization has partnered with the USDA’s Forest Service to preserve the publicly-owned Piney River Heritage Farm and with the SHPO to create a Barn and Farmstead-specific architectural survey form.

Active local preservation organizations flourish throughout the state, in both urban areas and small communities. Longstanding organizations, such as the Landmarks Association of St. Louis and the Historic Kansas City Foundation, serve the state’s major urban areas. A variety of other private organizations have been formed throughout the state to serve smaller communities.

**Historical Societies**

Missouri has a large number of active historical societies. The State Historical Society of Missouri in Columbia maintains large reference and newspaper libraries and a manuscript collection, provides a clearinghouse of information on county historical societies, and publishes a journal, *the Missouri Historical Review*. The Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis, a major library and archive of information on St. Louis history, promotes appreciation of local history through publications about historic neighborhoods and communities. Its quarterly journal is *Gateway Heritage*. County historical or genealogical societies exist in most of Missouri’s 114 counties.

**Universities**

Southeast Missouri State University in Cape Girardeau has offered an undergraduate degree in historic preservation since 1980; a graduate degree in history with an emphasis in historic preservation is also offered. The University of Missouri-Columbia, the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and Central Methodist University in Fayette.

Kansas City offers a graduate certificate in historic preservation. The University of Missouri-Columbia offers a number of preservation courses, primarily under the Department of History and the Department of Art History and Archaeology. Anthropology and archaeology courses and, in some cases, advanced degrees are offered at Washington University, Missouri State University in Springfield, the University of
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Appendix A
National Register of Historic Places in Missouri
The National Register of Historic Places includes districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture. These resources contribute to an understanding of the historical and cultural foundations of the nation. Missouri boasts more than 2,030 listings (= more than 35,000 individual resources) in the National Register.

Multiple property documentation forms provide historic contexts by which properties can be listed on the National Register. Unless specifically noted or restricted by law, links to the following documents are available on the SHPO website at: http://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/mnrlist.htm. The following are Missouri’s multiple property documentation forms.

**Multi-state**
- Civil War Era National Cemeteries
- Highway Bridges of Nebraska: http://www.nebraskahistory.org/histpres/nebraska/MPD/HwyBridgesNe.pdf
- Historic and Historical Archaeological Resources of the Cherokee Trail of Tears
- Historic Resources of the Santa Fe Trail, 1821-1880
- United States Second Generation Veterans Hospitals: http://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/preservation/Multiple_Properties_Documentation_Form_VA_Hospital.pdf

**Regional/Statewide**
- Antebellum Resources of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties, Missouri
- Cherokee Trail of Tears in Missouri
- Emergency Conservation Work (E.C.W.) Architecture in Missouri State Parks, 1933-1942, Thematic Resources
- Historic and Architectural Resources of the Mark Twain National Forest
- Missouri Ozarks Rural Schools
- One-Teacher Public Schools of Missouri, c. 1774 to c. 1973
- Prehistoric Rock Shelter and Cave Sites in Southwestern Missouri
- Route 66 in Missouri
- Rural Church Architecture of Missouri, c. 1819 to c. 1945

**County**

**Benton County**
- Historic Resources of Cole Camp, Missouri

**Boone County**
- Historic Resources of Downtown Columbia, Missouri
- Social Institutions of Columbia’s Black Community (Partial Inventory)
Buchanan County
— Historic Resources of Frederick Avenue, St. Joseph
— Historic Resources of St. Joseph, Buchanan County, Missouri

Butler County
— Historic Resources of Poplar Bluff, Missouri

Cape Girardeau County
— Historic and Architectural Resources of Cape Girardeau, Missouri

Carter County
— Missouri Lumber and Mining Company Historic Resources

Clay County
— Historic Resources of Excelsior Springs, Missouri
— Historic Resources of Liberty, Clay County, Missouri

Cole County
— Historic Southside (Munichburg) Multiple Property Submission

Cooper County
— Historic Resources of Boonville, Mo. (Partial Inventory: Historic and Architectural Properties)

Crawford County
— Historic and Architectural Resources of the City of Cuba, Missouri, 1821-1963

Franklin County
— Historic Resources of Washington, Missouri

Greene County
— Historic and Architectural Resources of Springfield, Missouri

Howard County
— Historic and Architectural Resources of Fayette, Missouri

Howell County
— Historic and Architectural Resources of West Plains, Missouri

Jackson County
— Apartment Buildings on the North End of The Paseo Boulevard in Kansas City, Missouri
— Armour Boulevard Multiple Resource Area
— Downtown Hotels in Kansas City, Missouri
— Historic Colonnade Apartment Buildings of Kansas City, Missouri
— Historic Resources of the 18th and Vine Area of Kansas City, Missouri
— Historic Resources of the Kansas City Missouri School District Pre-1970
— Historic Resources of Lee’s Summit, Missouri
— The Kansas City System of Parks and Boulevards
— Railroad Related Historic Commercial and Industrial Resources in Kansas City, Missouri
— Residential Structures in Kansas City by Mary Rockwell Hook
— Working Class Hotels at 19th and Main Streets (vicinity), Kansas City, Missouri
— Working-Class and Middle-Income Apartment Buildings in Kansas City, Missouri

Jasper County
— Historic Resources of the City of Carthage (Partial Inventory: Historic and Architectural Properties)
— Historic Resources of Joplin, Missouri

Johnson County
— Antebellum Resources of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties, Missouri
— Historic and Architectural Resources of Warrensburg, Missouri

Lafayette County
— Antebellum Resources of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties, Missouri
— Historic Resources of Lexington (Partial Inventory: Historic and Architectural Properties)

Lewis County
— Historic Resources of La Grange, Missouri

Livingston County
— Historic and Architectural Resources of Chillicothe, Missouri

Marion County
— Hannibal Central Business District Multiple Resource Nomination
Newton County
— Historic Resources of Joplin, Missouri
— Historic Resources of Neosho, Newton County, Missouri
— Historic Resources of Neosho, Newton County, Missouri – AMENDMENT

Pettis County
— Antebellum Resources of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties, Missouri
— Osage Farms Resettlement Properties in Pettis County, Missouri

Pike County
— Historic and Architectural Resources of Louisiana, Missouri
— Historic Resources of Clarksville, Missouri

Ray County
— Historic Resources of Excelsior Springs, Missouri

St. Charles County
— Historic Resources of Augusta, Missouri

St. Louis City
— Historic and Architectural Resources of The Ville, St. Louis [Independent City], Missouri
— Historic Auto-Related Resources of St. Louis [Independent City], Missouri
— Historic Resources of Carondelet, East of Broadway, St. Louis (Partial Inventory: Historic and Architectural Properties)
— Historic Resources of LaSalle Park, St. Louis (Partial Inventory: Historic and Architectural Properties)
— St. Louis, Missouri, Public Schools of William B. Ittner
— South St. Louis Historic Working- and Middle-Class Streetcar Suburbs

St. Louis County
— Historic Resources of the City of St. Ferdinand (Partial Inventory: Historic and Architectural Properties)
— Historic Resources in Ferguson, Missouri
— Historic Resources of Kirkwood, Missouri

Ste. Genevieve County
— Historic Resources of Ste. Genevieve, Missouri

Saline County
— Antebellum Resources of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties, Missouri
— Historic and Architectural Resources of Sweet Springs, Saline County, Missouri

Taney County
— Historic Taneycomo Lakefront Tourism Resources of Branson, Taney County, Missouri
Missouri has a dynamic past that stretches over 13,000 years of human occupation. In its cultural landscape and built environment, we can envision early hunters stalking mastodons across icy plains, immigrants creating farms and homes out of untouched wilderness, or entrepreneurs building cities and factories. These places tell the "story of us"—how our ancestors arrived, lived, built communities, and became a nation.

Prehistory

Missouri’s moderate climate, topographic diversity, and rich natural resources have attracted settlers for more than 13,000 years. Evidence of human occupation can be found in the state’s archaeological sites, landscapes and its built environment. There is much to learn about the state’s prehistoric and historic cultural resources, but with each year the catalog of Missouri’s historic places inventoried or listed in the National Register of Historic Places grows.

Missouri’s archaeological community has a long history of identifying and documenting the state’s archaeological resources. Organized in 1934, the Missouri Archaeological Society (MAS) unites professional and amateur archaeologists to promote the identification, study and interpretation of prehistoric and historic remains in the state. As part of its mission, MAS members assisted in developing and maintaining the Archaeological Survey of Missouri (ASM), now housed at the University of Missouri-Columbia. ASM no longer catalogs new site data, but for 70 years was the primary depository for archaeological site forms. Information on its 36,000 cataloged sites is available to researchers on a limited basis.

The State Historic Preservation Office’s (SHPO) role in maintaining information on archaeological sites has evolved. Initially, the SHPO provided grants to support the ASM’s mission to maintain an inventory of archaeological sites and as the primary depository for forms on sites identified during the review of federal projects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 continues to be a driving force behind the identification of archaeological resources in the state. Today, the SHPO has taken the responsibility for issuing site numbers, and maintaining archaeological site forms and information. In addition to numerous paper and electronic forms and cultural resource management reports, the SHPO maps archaeological site information on a Geographic Information System (GIS). GIS layers are shared with partnering state, federal, and local governmental agencies and professional archaeologists conducting research and archaeological investigations in the state.

The SHPO also assists archaeologists and property owners to list significant sites in the National Register of Historic Places.

Missouri’s archaeological record provides evidence that the state’s earliest human inhabitants arrived at the end of the last ice age. In 1979 archaeologists found Clovis culture spear points in direct connection with mastodon bones in the Kimmswick Bone Bed, part of Mastodon State Historic Site in Jefferson County. Later Paleoindian Period (12,000-8,000 BCE) sites can be found across the state, indicating a growing population throughout the period. The National Register-listed Rodgers Shelter (Benton County), for example, provides evidence that these Early Hunter tradition cultures lived largely on wild game and fish in the region. Missouri’s Big Eddy site in Cedar County, may be one of the most revealing Paleoindian sites yet found in the state. The site contains deposits from more than 10,000 years of periodic habitation, but may be most significant for its well stratified Paleoindian deposits. These deposits provide rare insight into the early occupation of the Midwest.

Big Eddy and sites such as National Historic Landmark Graham Cave in Montgomery County also add to our knowledge of the Dalton Period (8,000-7,000 BCE), a transitional time between the Paleoindian and Archaic periods. Marked by changes in climate, flora and fauna, this era includes cultures of the Hunter-Forager tradition. Archaeological remains from this period indicate the making of clothes using bone needles, food processing using mortars and grinders, and technological advances in spear points and wood working tools, notably serrated Dalton points.

The next period, the Archaic, covers roughly 6,000 years of human history and is divided into three broad eras: Early Archaic (7,000-5,000 BCE), Middle Archaic (5,000-3,000 BCE), and Late Archaic (3,000-1,000 BCE). This period is marked by a growing dependence on foraging, with cultures depending on the hunting and trapping of small animals and gathering edible wild plants. Forager groups developed differently, based on their varying
dependence on animals or plants in their diet. Variety in diet and a more settled lifestyle sparked a greater diversity in tools and other resources found in the archaeological record. It is in the later part of the archaeological period that evidence of permanent or semi-permanent settlement sites are found, as well as evidence of the agriculture and pottery making. The Late Archaic Period is also marked by an increasing ritualization of burial practices, as evidenced by bundled bones and burial goods found at the Cuivre River Ceremonial Complex in Lincoln County.

The Woodland Period (1,000 BCE to 900 CE) is the next identified archaeological period and is also divided into an early, middle, and late period. The Early Woodland Period (1,000-500 BCE) is marked by the development and use of fired clay. While cultures during the period continued to rely on modified bones, stones, and shells for tools and utensils, objects manufactured from fired clay are more common. The Middle Woodland Period is evidenced by sites of well-organized permanent or semi-permanent settlement and well manufactured clay fired goods. The Middle Woodland Period is often viewed as the cultural and social height of the period, with a “cultural decline” during the Late Woodland phase. However, the later period saw continued technological advances in tools and other artifacts and continued use of fortifications and mounds. The Gay Archaeological Site in Cole County (National Register-listed in 1971) contains examples of these Late Woodland mound and fortification groupings. Archaeological investigations on Fort Leonard Wood in Pulaski County have also found complexes of burial and habitation sites with Late Woodland ceramics and projectiles.

The Mississippian Period extends from 900 to 1700 CE and is marked by the emergence of a Village-Farmer culture. Mississippian period cultures developed large permanent village and city sites that relied upon cultivation of corn and other crops for their diet. Settlements of fortified towns and villages allowed for a period of innovation in manufacturing, trade, and the development of a ranked society with complex religious and social mores. Large religious and commercial centers and satellite communities, such as the one found at Cahokia, IL, developed during this period. Present day St. Louis was one such center, historically marked by large mound complexes, all of which have been destroyed by historic period urban development except for a portion of Sugar Loaf Mound (listed in the National Register in 1984). During the later part of the period new populations immigrated to Missouri bringing distinctive pottery and stone tool traditions with them. The Oneota culture prospered in Missouri beginning in the fourteenth century, leaving a significant record of their culture at the National Historic Landmark Utz Site in Saline County. This same site, later occupied by the Missouri tribe, was noted by European explorers traveling the Missouri River in the seventeenth century.

**Exploration and Settlement**

Early European explorers entering Missouri seem to have left more in the written record than the archaeological one. Hernando De Soto reached and crossed the Mississippi River in 1541, exploring the Arkansas Ozarks and claiming the Mississippi Valley for Spain. His band of conquistadors cut a brutal swath through the southern states but did not quite reach what is now Missouri. It wasn’t until Marquette and Joliet made their epic voyage down the Mississippi in 1673 that we see the first written accounts of Missouri’s topography and peoples. The explorers described a large Illinois tribe village in what is now Clark County that included 300 lodges and approximately 8,000 inhabitants. Archaeological excavations at the site, now Illinivich Village State Historic Site, confirm Marquette and Joliet’s written account. Their description of the confluence of the Missouri River, as “so great was the agitation that the water was very muddy, and could not become clear” continues to be an apt description of the “Big Muddy.”

Marquette and Joliet’s expedition opened the way for a series of French explorers, traders and missionaries who claimed the Mississippi River and its tributaries for France. Although Rene Robert Cavalier’s (Sieur de la Salle) dream to create a French empire in the Mississippi River valley never came to full fruition, his claim on the river and naming of the Louisiana territory in 1682 strengthened France’s claim to and influence on the Midwest. The French missionaries and traders that explored Missouri also built its first settlements. The earliest settlements in the state, such as Father Gabriel Marest’s mission near the mouth of the River Des Peres and Etienne de Bourgmont’s Fort Orleans (Carroll County) were short lived, both lasting approximately three years. More permanent French settlement and
involvement in the state may be linked in part to the discovery of lead in southeast Missouri by Antoine de la Motte Cadillac in 1715. This discovery sparked an industry that would be central to the area's economy for more than 200 years. Cadillac’s Mine de la Motte became the center of a small settlement that still exists in Madison County.

The French founded several historically significant communities in Missouri, notably along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. In most of these towns, little remains from the earliest settlement period, but in Ste. Genevieve we see a glimpse of French colonial life, buildings, and landscape. The Mississippi River town claims 1735 as its founding date and in its heyday was the principal seat of the Spanish rule of the western Louisiana Territory. The town retains one of the largest collections in the country of French Creole buildings from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and has retained several early buildings from the growing American population in the first two decades of the 1800s. The town's oldest buildings are recognized as National Historic Landmarks.

Though seemingly remote, the political turmoil in Europe and the eastern North American colonies had a profound effect on the development and disposition of land in the Louisiana Territory. During the Seven Year’s War, France ceded Louisiana to Spain. Though Spain ruled over the territory beginning in 1700, governors relied heavily on local French residents to manage the territory and maintain peaceful relations with aboriginal tribes. After the American Revolution, forays made by George Rogers Clark into the Illinois territory helped push the border of the US to the Mississippi River, opening the door for Americans to enter and settle in the Louisiana Territory.

One of the earliest American arrivals in Spain-controlled Missouri was George Morgan, who founded New Madrid in 1789. Soon afterward Spain allowed non-Catholic migrants into the territory providing generous land grants to encourage settlement and development. Most early settlement stayed near the Missouri and Mississippi rivers that provided convenient transportation and access to the Gulf of Mexico. The Louisiana Territory, secretly returned to French control in 1800, was an increasing burden to its European controllers, notably in light of ongoing wars with England and the Haitian revolution. So, when France offered to sell the entire Louisiana Territory to the US for $15 million, President Thomas Jefferson agreed. The US assumed control of Lower Louisiana in December 1803, and the upper portion of the territory (including Missouri) on March 10, 1804.

Jefferson soon planned one of the most celebrated expeditions of exploration in American history. The Lewis and Clark voyage of discovery left St. Louis in May 1804, returning from their 7,700 mile journey in September of 1806. The explorers spent three months of the two year trip exploring and describing Missouri. Fort Bellefontaine in St. Louis County hosted Lewis and Clark as the final stop of their returning journey. The fort was established in 1805 and is considered to be the first United States military post west of the Mississippi River. While the fort is non-extant, the site and the 1930s boys’ home that sits next to it, were listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2016 under Criterion D: Archaeology in association with the fort, and Criterion A: Social History, for its association with the boys’ home.

Today, Lewis and Clark’s trail through Missouri is marked and interpreted through the Lewis and Clark Across Missouri website (lewisclark.geog.missouri.edu) and at state parks and historic sites such as Lewis and Clark State Park and Clark’s Hill/Norton State Historic Site.

Missouri continued to be a starting point for western exploration and settlement, and a major player in the fur trade throughout its early settlement and statehood period. Forts such as Fort Osage (1808), in what is now Jackson County, sought to provide political stability in the new territory through trade and alliances with American Indians in the area. Though the original Fort Osage is long gone, a replication based on original plans and archaeological research, is now a county run interpretive site and is designated a National Historic Landmark.

The State of Missouri

Missouri wrote a constitution in 1820 and became a state on August 10, 1821. Despite its growing population (roughly 70,000 in 1820) and the organization of a state government, most of the state was still a frontier. The state drew new settlers from around the world, but especially from southern and southeastern states of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina. These settlers may have found the state attractive not only for its natural resources and agricultural potential, but also because it allowed slavery. New settlers established several communities along the Missouri River.
in central and western Missouri including Franklin (1817) and Boonville (1819). These two communities, directly across the river from one another, were important riverboat ports and outfitters for the Santa Fe Trail. When floods destroyed Franklin in 1826, many inhabitants and businesses moved across the river to Boonville. Examples of heavy timber frame houses and brick homes dating from the 1820-30s can still be found in Boonville and other historic river towns.

Some of Missouri’s earliest efforts to recognize significant historic places are linked to its position as a gateway to the west. The Missouri Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) lobbied the General Assembly to purchase the "Old Tavern" in Arrow Rock in 1923. The DAR supervised the restoration of the tavern and opened it to the public. The tavern later became Missouri’s first state-owned historic site. Arrow Rock, a significant ferry crossing in the 1820s, became a trail head for the Santa Fe Trail, with the Old Tavern as one of its landmarks. Changes to the path of the Missouri River destroyed the town’s economy, leaving it miles from the river’s bank. Though the town’s population and economic base declined, many of the historic buildings remained. The historic character of the community and its link to western settlement and transportation caused the entire town to be designated a National Historic Landmark in 1963. Arrow Rock Ferry Landing was listed in the National Register in 2013.

In addition to its connection to western settlement and trade, Missouri’s early statehood period also saw the slow growth of industry. Some of the earliest manufacturers supported the western outfitting and agricultural needs, such as wagon and saddle making and metal works. The earliest large scale industries centered in the state’s largest city, St. Louis. By 1850, Missouri ranked 14th among states in industrial production. A decade later, 60 percent of the state’s industrial production came from St. Louis’s manufacturing plants, though several iron smelters developed near the source of ore in Crawford, Madison, Phelps, and Washington counties.

Despite industrialization and growing urban areas, prior to the Civil War, agriculture was the state’s largest economic occupation. The state’s rich soil and varied topography attracted new immigrants. Two of the most notable groups were Americans from the southern states (many from Kentucky and Tennessee), and Germans. Both groups initially settled near major rivers, before moving deeper into the state’s interior. Settlers from the southern states brought enslaved blacks and crops such as tobacco and hemp that heavily relied on slave labor. Southern immigrants had a significant impact on the state’s society, politics, and built environment. Many of Missouri’s large antebellum farm homes have close ties to southern culture and slavery. Examples of these include National Register-listed properties such as the Greek Revival style George A. Murrell House and outbuildings in Saline County, and Oakwood in Howard County.

Between 1810 and 1860, Missouri’s enslaved population grew from 3,011 to 114,509. Though most enslaved blacks in Missouri worked in agriculture, they also held positions in the mining industry, on riverboats and docks, and as skilled builders and laborers. Missouri also had a small population of free blacks, just over 3,500 in 1860. The majority of free blacks lived in St. Louis where, despite societal limitations that restricted their economic and educational opportunities, there grew a small, wealthy aristocracy. Both the free and enslaved population played a key role in the economy and society of Missouri before and after the Civil War. Several court cases involving those enslaved in the state also impacted the national debate on slavery in the United States. The 1846 ruling of St. Louis Circuit Court Judge John Krum that denied the claim that blacks were citizens of the United States, was later adopted by the Supreme Court when they rejected Dred Scott’s (a slave living in Missouri) petition for equal protection under the law.

The state’s growing German-born population also made a lasting impact on the state’s culture and built environment. The United States experienced a large wave of German immigration between c. 1820 and 1860. Many were drawn to Missouri by the publication of Gottfried Duden's Report on a Journey to the Western States of North America in 1829. German settlement in the state concentrated along the Missouri River valley between St. Louis and Cole Counties and south along the Mississippi River. Today, communities such as Augusta (St. Charles County), Washington (Franklin County), and Hermann (Gasconade County) retain historic buildings and neighborhoods built by and for German immigrants. These areas are also the center of a revival in winemaking, an industry historically associated with the state’s German population.
Improved transportation systems spurred economic and population growth in the state. The Missouri and Mississippi rivers were the original highways, with flatboats or keelboats plying the waters in the early period. Beginning in 1817, steamboats plied the waters of the Missouri, Mississippi, and other large rivers in the state, boosting trade and growth of river towns such as Cape Girardeau, Jefferson City, Brunswick, and St. Joseph. By the 1850s, river transportation was being supplemented and replaced to an extent by the railroad. The first trans-state railroad, the Hannibal and St. Joseph, was completed by 1859. The Civil War retarded construction of the Pacific Railroad, and it was not until 1865 that the line connected St. Louis and Kansas City. Rail construction, though an iffy proposition with speculation rampant, burgeoned after the Civil War, creating new towns, opportunities for business growth and development, and pushing agriculture from largely subsistence to a profit-making enterprise.

Population growth and the expanding economic base encouraged the development of religious, educational, and social institutions across the state. Early education in Missouri was private and/or parochial rather than public. By the 1850s, the state began appropriating more adequate funding and regulations for public schools, but higher education was largely in the hands of religious organizations. St. Louis University, founded in 1818, was the first institution of higher learning west of the Mississippi River. William Jewell College’s Jewell Hall (1849) represents early efforts at higher education in Western Missouri. In central Missouri, Westminster College (1851) in Fulton and Central Methodist University (1855) in Fayette, continue to provide college and graduate studies today.

Missourians in the 1850s supported education, but also addressed other issues of social improvement. Private and religious organizations, such as the Sisters of Charity in St. Louis, took the lead in pioneering healthcare and other charitable institutions. State government also made an effort to address social welfare, opening a state penitentiary in 1836. More charitable enterprises were considered by the General Assembly in the 1850s. During this decade, the assembly appropriated public funds for a state mental asylum and school for the deaf in Fulton (1851) and school for the blind in St. Louis (1855).

The debate over slavery, though a hot topic since the settlement period of Missouri, also heated up during the 1850s. The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 sparked pro-slavery Missourians to take action to insure that Kansas would be open to slavery. Armed conflict between Free-Staters and Boarder Ruffians (pro-slavery) broke out on the Missouri and Kansas border in 1854, continuing intermittently for the next several years. The border wars set the stage for later conflict during the Civil War.

Despite the strong pro-Southern feeling in much of the state, Missourians took a surprisingly moderate stance to issues of secession. When Governor Claiborne Jackson, a Southern sympathizer, called a convention to consider secession in early 1861, Missourians did not elect a single secessionist delegate to the convention. Though Missouri did not secede from the Union, its citizens took arms on both sides of the conflict. During the war, more than 1,000 skirmishes, fights, and battles took place on Missouri soil, more conflicts than any state except Virginia and Tennessee. Missouri’s historic places tell stories of all aspects of the war, its brutality, impact on society, and its triumphs. The significance of Missouri in the Civil War has been recognized by both the state and federal governments through the purchase and interpretation of the Wilson’s Creek Battlefield by the National Park Service and at several state historic sites, such as Fort Davidson and Battle of Lexington. The National Register of Historic Places also includes several Civil War related properties including the Marion County Jail, site of the Palmyra Massacre, Moore’s Mill Battlefield in Callaway County, and Fort Benton, an earthwork fort, in Wayne County.

Missouri after the Civil War took both a progressive and retributive stance politically and socially. Missouri became the first slave state to free its enslaved population on January 11, 1865. The 1865 constitutional convention also promoted public education for all and supported industrial growth. Led by Charles Drake, the convention also passed an “Ousting Ordinance” that dismissed all state officials and disfranchised anyone who had taken arms against or supported those who engaged in hostility against the United States. This “Ironclad Oath,” abolished by state referendum a few years later, was but one example of continuing division in the state after the Civil War. In southwest Missouri, the Baldknobbers (pro-Union) organized to mete out vigilante justice. Their activities soon escalated into gang violence, sparking some Southern sympathizers to form the Anti-
Baldknobbers. The violence meted out by both groups continued into the late 1880s. The atrocities of war also gave rise to some of the state's folk heroes, Jesse James and the James-Younger Gang. Jesse rode with pro-south guerillas during the war, and banded together with some of his compatriots as an outlaw gang after the war.

The last three decades of the nineteenth century were times of booms and busts in the state. New railroad companies and expanding lines sparked the platting of new communities and provided transportation for the state’s manufactured and agricultural goods. Towns such as La Plata in Macon County grew from small settlements, platted in 1854, to important regional trade centers, thanks to the construction of the North Missouri Railroad through town in 1867. Due to the conjunction of several rail lines, a railroad bridge constructed in 1869, and the efforts of community boosters, the Town of Kansas grew from a small river town to the second largest city in Missouri in just two decades. The historical significance of La Plata’s commercial district and the archaeological significance of the Town of Kansas Site (what we know as Kansas City today) are recognized through National Register listings in 2008 and 2011 respectively.

The agricultural economy of the state transformed with the transportation revolution. Hemp, a major product before the Civil War, disappeared as an agricultural product while livestock production (hogs, cattle, horses, mules, etc.) increased across the state. Mechanization, improved transportation, and expanding markets pushed advancements in farm output. The growing market economy responded more readily to changes in the overall economy, so depressions and recessions such as the one that struck in 1873, hit farmers hard. The evolving agricultural economy pushed many farmers to unite to have a stronger voice in the economy, to learn about improved farming techniques, and to seek more competitive freight rates and buying power. The Grange held its first national convention in St. Louis in 1873, and similar organizations of farmers proliferated throughout the state. Greater interest in agricultural education and scientific farming methods was also boosted by the creation of the College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts at the University of Missouri in Columbia in 1870. The opening of the University’s first agricultural experiment station in 1888 furthered scientific farming practices in the state and nation.

Advances in agriculture and industry are evidence of the ingenuity of the state’s citizens, but Missourians also liked to play. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, opera houses attracting speakers and traveling troupes of entertainers proliferated across the state. A few of these early houses, such as the Greenfield Opera House (Dade County) and the Lohman Opera House (Cole County), both listed in the National Register, were some of the most elaborate buildings in the city’s streetscape. Sports teams and activities also proliferated during the era. The St. Louis Browns began playing in St. Louis in 1876 joined by the Cardinals in 1899. Schools organized basketball and football teams, and many communities supported town baseball teams. Missouri’s culture was also represented in literature with the publication of Mark Twain’s *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn* and Harold Bell Wright’s *Shepherd of the Hills*. Missouri’s African-American citizens also added to the rich culture of the state and nation. Musicians such as John “Blind” Boone toured the nation playing both ragtime and classical music, and composer Scott Joplin wrote the *Maple Leaf Rag* in honor of the Maple Leaf Club in Sedalia (Pettis County).

Chuck Berry, considered one of the founders of rock-n-roll, wrote many of his most famous songs, such as *Johnny B. Goode* and *Rock and Roll Music*, while he lived on Whittier Street in St. Louis. Homes of Boone, Joplin, and Berry are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and the Scott Joplin house in St. Louis is a state historic site.

By the turn of the century, concerns over political corruption resulted in Progressive Era reforms. These reforms affected how the state and city governments operated but also had a profound effect on the built environment. Progressives sought to reform more than politics; they also looked at the condition of the poor and blighted urban areas. Influenced by the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair, the progressive City Beautiful Movement sought social reform and civic virtue through city beautification and urban planning. Planning for the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition brought City Beautiful ideas to St. Louis, transforming open land in the western part of the city into a large urban park and fairgrounds. The City Beautiful had a profound effect on Kansas City, transforming it from a boomtown to a modern urban center. By 1920, Kansas City had implemented George E. Kessler’s entire 1893 plan for a parks and boulevard system in the city, and had plans to expand the roadway system and park lands. In 1920, the city...
had 90 miles of improved boulevards and park drives, and over 2,500 acres of parks and parkways. A Multiple Property Document Form for the Kansas City Parks and Boulevards was completed in 2014, and a district recognizing Kessler’s designs was listed in the National Register in 2016. Kessler also planned St. Joseph’s parks and boulevard system, much of which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Mobilization for World War I shelved many reform efforts. Increased food production during the war helped Missouri’s agricultural economy and its citizens and native sons assisted the war effort. Missouri born General John J. Pershing was Commander-in-Chief of the American Expeditionary Force in Europe, a career and life represented by the Pershing Boyhood Home State Historic Site in Laclede. Other Missourians played a less public, but equally vital role, notably the Missouri mule. The US shipped over 200,000 mules to Europe during the war, many of them from Missouri. The war helped Missouri’s economy, but had a dark side. There were more than 11,000 casualties of war from Missouri. On the home front, Missourians of German decent faced prejudice and discrimination from overzealous patriots. Following the war, Missourians continued to show support for its WWI veterans, constructing large war memorials in Kansas City, Columbia, and St. Louis. Kansas City’s Liberty Memorial is now a National Historic Landmark.

Like most of the country, Missouri’s citizens experienced the rise and fall of fortunes during and just after WWI. Economically, Missouri did not recover quickly from the post-war recession. Missouri’s agriculturally based economy was beset by troubles and manufacturing grew very slowly. One major Missouri industry, brewing, was devastated by the 18th Amendment and very few of the state’s brewers survived Prohibition. While the economy of the country as a whole boomed by the mid-1920s, Missouri’s fortunes, in an economic and social sense, were mixed, leading the historian Richard S. Kirkendall to label 1920s Missouri as “Boom Times-For Some.”

Throughout the 1920s, Missouri could boast of being in the country’s “top ten” in several areas. Its population was ranked ninth in the country, and St. Louis was one of the ten largest cities in the United States. Missouri’s mines led the country in lead production, and were ranked high in marble, lime, and clay. As swamps were drained, the Bootheel became a leading producer of cotton. Despite the high rankings, Missouri’s economy was experiencing a leveling-off period. Manufacturing and agricultural segments grew, but growth was below the national average. Statistically, Missouri’s population tended to be poorer than that of neighboring states, and many areas experienced a loss in jobs and population. Even some of the advances the state made in the 1920s, namely the growth of the cotton farming in the Bootheel, would eventually lead to problems, as the southeastern section of Missouri became one of the hardest hit by the effects of the depression.

Numbers cannot tell the social and psychological impact of the Depression on Missouri’s citizens, but statistics can help us understand the swift and damaging effects to the state’s economy. Between 1929 and 1933, Missouri’s economy suffered a significant downturn in manufacturing, agricultural, and business sectors. In four years, the value of manufacturing products to the state’s economy fell 51 percent from $777 million to $383 million and unemployment increased from 16 percent in 1930 to 38 percent in 1932 and 1933. Missouri’s banks also suffered as more than 300 closed in the early 1930s. Farmers were especially hard hit throughout the 1930s, both by the general economy and by the weather. The value of gross product of crops in Missouri fell from $309,601,000 in 1929 to just $82,360,000 in 1932; and livestock had a similar, though not as drastic, decline. The value of farmland also dropped from an average of $53 to $31 per acre. Droughts in 1930, 1934 and 1936 exacerbated the problems.

Missouri’s response to the Great Depression between 1929 and early 1933 paralleled that of the federal government. At both the state and federal levels there was a general reluctance for direct government intervention in relief activities. The election of President Franklin D. Roosevelt marked a change in the federal approach to the Depression, as did the election of Governor Guy B. Parks in Missouri. The economic impact of New Programs varied, but federal relief efforts changed the face of Missouri’s rural and urban areas. More than 41 Civilian Conservation Corp camps worked in Missouri, developing state and local parks, and creating the Mark Twain National Forest. The Civil Works Administration, Public Works Administration and the Works Progress (Projects) Administration (WPA) built roads, schools, courthouses, and recreational venues. Writers and artisans hired by the WPA also documented some of the state’s historic resources, and published a travel guide that provides an overview of Missouri in the 1930s.
New Deal programs benefited the citizens of Missouri, but it was mobilization for World War II that brought the state and country out of the Depression. Missouri’s workforce and industrial plants supplied the war effort, and its men and women stepped up to fight and work. St. Louis plants provided ordinance, Kansas City built B-25 Mitchell Bombers, and 450,000 Missourians joined the armed services. Several of these plants and manufacturers, such as the Pratt and Whitney Plant in Kansas City and the Curtiss-Wright Aeroplane Factory in St. Louis, are listed in the National Register. Missouri also became a training ground for inductees into the military with the creation of Fort Leonard Wood and Camp Crowder. The state also saw a demographic shift as rural populations moved to the cities to find work in war-time factories.

Missouri’s Harry S Truman also rose to prominence when he became president at the death of Franklin Roosevelt. The former Jackson County politician and U.S. Senator guided the nation through the end of WWII and into the postwar years. Truman’s life is well illustrated by historic resources in the state, including the National Park Service-maintained Truman Home in Independence, the National Historic Landmark Truman Historic District, and the Truman Birthplace State Historic Site in Lamar, Barton County.

**Missouri’s Recent Past**

Widespread economic depression and limited availability of building materials during the war dramatically slowed the construction of new residential and commercial buildings. While it is easy to recognize the significance of the post WWII building boom, the sheer number and variety of building types and modern design movements are just starting to be studied. As the traditional “50 year” guide for evaluating historic significance moves towards the 1970s, historians and preservationists in the state are growing to appreciate the state’s “Mid-Century Modern” or “Modern Movement” resources. Below are a few examples of efforts to recognize and study post-WWII resources.

With Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grant funding, the City of St. Louis conducted an architectural survey of Mid-Century Modern commercial resources. Lee’s Summit included a context for post-WWII resources in their citywide Multiple Property Document Form and has listed several ranch house districts under this cover document.

Recognized for its significance to the African American community, Bennett Avenue Historic District in St. Louis may be the first ranch house district listed in the National Register in Missouri (NR-listed 2008). This neighborhood was established by and for African Americans during a time of red-lining and housing discrimination. Similarly, in 2010, Ladue Estates in St. Louis County was listed in the National Register for its significance as a Jewish enclave. Like African Americans, the Jewish populace was also often not permitted to live in new suburban developments established outside of city centers. In addition to its cultural importance, Ladue Estates is significant as a collection of high style Mid-Century Modern ranch houses.

Kemper Arena in Kansas City, the McDaniel Building in Springfield, and the Chapman House in Cape Girardeau are among several post-WWII properties listed in the National Register.

Interest in postwar contexts and architecture contexts continues to grow. St. Louis County Parks has conducted several postwar studies, including an architectural survey of Modern Movement churches in St. Louis County. The historic importance of Route 66 has been the subject of numerous contexts, surveys, and National Register listings in the state. Communities and preservation groups continue to show an appreciation and interest in preserving their “Modern” history.

Ironically, it was developments arising in the 1950s and 1960s that provided a grassroots preservation movement. Federally funded urban renewal and interstate highway projects ravaged many historic rural and urban areas, destroying archaeological sites, residential neighborhoods and historic commercial districts. An example is the Pruitt-Igoe housing projects in St. Louis that has been the subject of national scrutiny of urban renewal and housing policies. Constructed in the 1950s, Pruitt-Igoe was a series of high-rise apartments intended to house residents displaced via “slum clearance” in the City of St. Louis. Via mismanagement, Pruitt-Igoe soon went into decline and was ultimately demolished in the 1970s. While the housing project is long gone, its impact continues to be studied to this day. In 2011, the housing project was the subject of the 2011 documentary *The Pruitt-Igoe Myth*.

A groundswell of protest and grassroots organization pushed the 89th Congress to pass the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The act
recognized that "historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people."

The 1966 law also set up a framework of funding and supporting state historic preservation offices throughout the country and encouraged states to establish ongoing programs to foster identification, evaluation, registration, and protection of cultural resources of national, state, and local significance. Missouri was one of the first states in the nation to take advantage of this program, receiving federal approval for the formation of a State Historic Preservation Office in 1968.

The State Historic Preservation Office was created to facilitate local preservation efforts. The National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, provided a tool box of programs such as the National Register of Historic Places, the Certified Local Government program, and financial incentives to empower organizations, local governments, and individuals to strengthen and shape the statewide preservation movement.

In 1976, via federal law, a preservation incentive was created when a 20 percent tax credit became available for the rehabilitation of income-producing properties deemed "certified historic structures." In 1998, Missouri began offering a 25 percent tax credit for rehabilitation projects for both income-producing and residential properties listed in the National Register. These programs encourage the rehabilitation and continued use of historic properties while respecting their character defining features, not only for today's owners, but the benefit of future generations also.

It is important to recognize that preservation in the state of Missouri is not the responsibility of any one entity or organization. The network of individuals, governmental, and private sector partners working together and cooperatively is what makes for effective preservation of Missouri's irreplaceable heritage.
Appendix C
Response to Online Survey
QUESTION 1
Describe yourself and your connection to Missouri’s history and historic places. Please choose the one with which you identify most closely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner of a historic property</td>
<td>13.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional architect or engineer</td>
<td>8.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional historian or architectural historian</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-for-profit organization, member or staff</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (at any level)</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator (at any level)</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local historic preservation commission, member or staff</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected official (local, state or federal)</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employee (local, state or federal)</td>
<td>8.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocational archaeologist</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned citizen</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History enthusiast and/or heritage tourist</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 2
In order to understand the needs and priorities of different parts of the state, please indicate which county or independent city (not town) in which you reside (For example: St. Louis County; St. Louis City).
QUESTION 3
What is the population of the city or town where you reside?

ANSWER

0.00%  10.00%  20.00%  30.00%  40.00%  50.00%  60.00%  70.00%  80.00%

0-499 residents  500-2,999 residents  3,000-29,999 residents  40,000 or more residents

QUESTION 4
Please choose the top three reasons why preservation of Missouri's cultural resources is important to you.

ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enhances economic development</td>
<td>35.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highlights architecture and art</td>
<td>39.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improves quality of life</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interprets prehistory and history</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotes tourism</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides a sense of place</td>
<td>54.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides learning opportunities</td>
<td>19.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports downtown revitalization</td>
<td>27.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strengthens communities</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 5
What preservation threats or challenges worry you the most? Check your top three choices.

ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>demolition or neglect of historic structures</td>
<td>73.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deterioration of town centers</td>
<td>33.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development (commercial or residential)</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of economic incentives to stimulate private preservation and rehabilitation</td>
<td>38.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of general information or education</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of sensitivity to archaeological resources</td>
<td>13.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of public support</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of shared vision</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of funding</td>
<td>28.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loss of rural resources</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure to maintain publicly owned buildings</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publicly-funded infrastructure projects (i.e. roads, civic centers/improvements)</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of integration of historic preservation considerations into planning and zoning</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 6
What strategies could be used to address issues affecting historic resources in Missouri? Check your top three choices.

ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>better enforcement of existing laws</td>
<td>16.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better integration of agency, community and citizen efforts</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creation of more local preservation plans and ordinances</td>
<td>37.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creation of more private financial incentives</td>
<td>37.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creation of more local financial preservation incentives</td>
<td>38.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased public education</td>
<td>51.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop elementary and secondary education curriculum</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stronger historic preservation laws</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training for public officials</td>
<td>22.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION 7
What do you see as the most threatened historic resources types? Check your top three choices.

ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agricultural buildings/farms</td>
<td>21.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archaeological sites</td>
<td>26.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>battlefields/forts</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridges</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cemeteries</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious properties</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscapes</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial buildings</td>
<td>26.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downtown/main streets</td>
<td>50.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial sites/buildings</td>
<td>8.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public buildings</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>21.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential buildings</td>
<td>38.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources related to underserved populations</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 8
Preservation Horizons 2011-2017: Missouri's Comprehensive Statewide Preservation Plan established six preservation goals to support the plan's vision. Please identify the importance of these goals to you today on a scale of 1 to 5.

ANSWER

![Graph showing the importance of each goal on a scale of 1 to 5.]

- Improve the delivery of historic preservation services to include innovative technologies and an expanded information network
- Integrate historic preservation strategies into policy, planning and routine procedures at all levels of Missouri government: local, regional and state
- Enhance cooperation and partnerships among government entities, institutions and the private sector
- Accelerate the identification, evaluation and protection of Missouri’s historic, cultural and archaeological resources
- Strengthen and enhance historic preservation as an economic development tool
- Increase understanding, appreciation and support for the value of historic preservation

*5 - Very Important  4 - Somewhat Important  3 - Important  2 - Less Important  1 - Not Important*
QUESTION 10
What do you believe are the most important methods for the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office to use in conducting historic preservation public education activities? Please check no more than three items.

**ANSWER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-site staff assistance</td>
<td>18.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Hands-on” training workshops and demonstrations</td>
<td>33.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional training events where individuals or communities can share information and ideas</td>
<td>35.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>11.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheets, brochures and other publications</td>
<td>20.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic preservation curriculum for students</td>
<td>34.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits of products used for rehabilitation work</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences with national speakers</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures and presentations</td>
<td>20.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and “canned” slide information/training programs</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities for volunteers to participate in local historic preservation efforts</td>
<td>29.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of media (TV, newspapers, electronic mailing system, social media, etc.)</td>
<td>40.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>29.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail discussion list</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION 11**
Which activities should the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office emphasize in the next six years? Choose no more than five.

**ANSWER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>29.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying historic architectural resources</td>
<td>38.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting rural heritage and the preservation of agricultural buildings and farmsteads</td>
<td>19.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating efforts with state, regional and local planning agencies</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the preservation of archaeological sites</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing information about historic and prehistoric resources</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening partnerships with Missouri’s not-for-profit preservation organizations</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering historic preservation conferences and preservation-related training</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the Certified Local Government (CLG) program</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing tax incentives for historic building rehabilitation</td>
<td>57.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing grants for the identification, registration and protection of historic resources, including historic building rehabilitation</td>
<td>52.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting local preservation commissions</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the inventory of historic properties more accessible to the public</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting federal, state and local preservation legislation</td>
<td>32.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and educating about recent past sites and structures (post WWII)</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating efforts with federally recognized American Indian tribes</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing historic context development to address statewide themes (i.e. agriculture, civil rights, women’s history, etc.)</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building partnerships with underserved populations to strengthen efforts to identify, register and protect historic resources (i.e. women’s history, ethnic heritage, LGBT, etc.)</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster planning for historic properties</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 12
How did you find out about this survey?
Please check all that apply.

ANSWER

- 50.00%
- 26.56%
- 15.63%
- 7.81%
- 3.13%
- 0.78%

- Website
- Newspaper
- Email listserv
- Your local government representative
- Individual/friend/neighbor
- Other: Landmark Association, Social Media, Coworkers, etc.
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