Bridging Land Conservation and Historic Preservation
THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION (www.PreservationNation.org) is a non-profit membership organization bringing people together to protect, enhance and enjoy the places that matter to them. By saving the places where great moments from history—and the important moments of everyday life—took place, the National Trust for Historic Preservation helps revitalize neighborhoods and communities, spark economic development and promote environmental sustainability. With headquarters in Washington, DC, eight regional and field offices, 29 historic sites, and partner organizations in 50 states, territories, and the District of Columbia, the National Trust for Historic Preservation 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.
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Introduction

STEPHANIE K. MEEKS

In this issue of *Forum Journal*, we explore the intersection between preservation and conservation, and how the two movements can work together to protect “whole places” nationwide.

As preservation leaders, many of you have come face to face with the reality that preserving a place often means saving not only a building but also the natural environment surrounding it.

As you will read in this issue, we grappled with this recently at the National Trust for Historic Preservation in a very dramatic way in South Carolina when a company proposed a 6,600-acre mega-development (consisting of new housing, a hotel, and a golf complex) on the Ashley River Road near Drayton Hall, a National Trust Historic Site. Drayton Hall is part of a historic area that also includes the Ashley River Road (a National Scenic Highway), the Ashley River (a state scenic river), and National Register sites Middleton Place and Magnolia Plantation and Gardens. To prevent the historic and natural context of Drayton Hall and these other significant places from being overwhelmed by sprawl, we joined others in an intense national campaign and blocked the massive new development.

In the case of Drayton Hall, our work lined up very directly with the work of the land conservation community. Often this is the case, but even when it is not, there is almost always a natural synergy between the work of preservationists and conservationists.

I have seen this first hand in my own life, having spent 18 years at The Nature Conservancy before coming to the National Trust. I am often struck by the commonalities between the two movements. Both are built on a keen appreciation for the fragility of our heritage, be it natural or man-made, and a strong desire to preserve the unique and irreplaceable. Both movements are committed to sustainable solutions and focused on helping communities take action to preserve what matters to them.

And fortunately, both are full of people who recognize the power of a mutually beneficial partnership. Through the years, the National Trust has collaborated with the conservation community to lobby for favorable federal policy, address threats to tax incentives for conservation and preservation easements, advocate for public land protections, and save special places across the country. Most recently, we provided input to the federal agencies behind the America’s...
Great Outdoors Initiative, which aims to find new ways to connect people with the natural and cultural heritage in our parks and outdoor spaces.

Our challenge going forward is to expand these partnerships and uncover new ways of working with the conservation community on projects in which our objectives align. As leaders of the preservation movement, you are in a unique position to head up this effort. To help, we have created a new Preservation-Nation.org landing page (www.preservationnation.org/issues/land-conservation) which offers a host of success stories from around the country, as well as practical tips on Whole Place preservation.

I hope you’ll take a minute to visit the website, and then consider inviting your local land conservation colleagues out for lunch—or even better, for a visit to your favorite historic site. Investing in the relationship now could pay dividends down the line. Chances are you will find an able partner, and maybe even a kindred spirit as well. FJ

STEPHANIE K. MEEKS is the president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

In a long but successful campaign to prevent inappropriate development near Drayton Hall, a National Trust Historic Site in South Carolina, the National Trust joined a coalition that included a regional conservation organization. The battle highlighted the natural synergy that often exists between preservation and conservation interests.
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Collaborating to Save Whole Places

WENDY NICHOLAS

You might wonder what the National Trust for Historic Preservation is doing publishing a Forum Journal issue on land conservation topics. We care about historic places and the important sense of place and special character that they impart to communities. We certainly care about—and fight for—historic buildings. But historic buildings stand in a larger context, and preservation goals are well served if we focus on protecting the settings and larger cultural landscapes as well as the structures.

Let me share the story of what kick-started our efforts in recent years to reach out to land conservation leaders and to work to build bridges between them and historic preservationists. A few years ago, the National Trust’s Northeast Office was involved in a campaign to save a 1740s farmhouse on Massachusetts’ South Coast. It had been built, expanded, and lived in for 250 years by successive generations of one of the region’s founding families. The house was the focal point of an exquisitely beautiful landscape, which included barns and some small outbuildings, the intact family cemetery, and stone walls framing the fields. Lovely meadows rolled down to the marshes, tidal salt pond, sand dunes, and beach with stunning views across Buzzards Bay toward Martha’s Vineyard and the Elizabeth Islands. To my eyes, it has always been one of the most breathtaking cultural landscapes in all of America.

Over the generations, the family had amassed about 800 acres of land. Most of that land is now preserved through conservation easements, agricultural preservation restrictions, or as an Audubon Society sanctuary.

The house, however, was not protected. Yet it was one of the earliest houses in the area, the setting for the lives, stories, and events of generations, including visits by John Jay Audubon and General George Patton. I imagine that it never occurred to the family as it protected the land that anyone might demolish the house. But that is what happened.

The newcomers who bought the property in 2004 snubbed local pleas to retain the house, waited out a six-month demolition delay, and then proceeded to wipe it off the landscape. The community has lost one of its great treasures, and that landscape, now without its focal point, is no longer all that it was. To add insult to injury, the same scenario played out less than a mile away a year later.

I imagine you too have witnessed similar tragedies, where the history-laden, beloved structure—typically the focal point in a landscape—is destroyed despite the open...
space around it being protected. Or, where a historic building is protected and restored but the land surrounding it is sold off for development.

COMMON GOALS AND VALUES
Unfortunately, unlike in England where land and building preservation activities are united in one conservation movement, we are bifurcated here in the U.S. Those concerned with buildings and landscapes work independently of each other, and consequently our two movements are missing opportunities to truly preserve whole communities, to achieve comprehensive conservation.

Yet historic preservation and land conservation share many common goals and common values. The National Trust urges: “Saving Places that Matter.” The Land Trust Alliance tagline reads, “Conserving Places You Love.” We work in different ways with different tools, but we have much to learn from and contribute to one another’s success. It is time for each of us—whether historic preservationist or land conservationist—to venture out of our respective arenas and work together to save whole places.

WE’VE DISCOVERED REAL DIFFERENCES in the way historic preservationists and land conservationists work to protect properties.

Over the last several years, the National Trust has worked with the Land Trust Alliance and others to engage our respective members in learning about the tools and approaches each has to offer. We’ve held “listening sessions” to discuss opportunities and challenges for working together for whole place preservation. We have collected stories, case studies, and models, and have organized educational sessions on key topics at conferences.

The National Trust collaborated with the Land Trust Alliance in its publication of The Conservation Easement Handbook (1988, Revised 2005), and wrote the chapter on easements for historic buildings and culturally significant properties for the 2005 revision.

The National Trust was also closely involved with the development of the Land Trust Standards and Practices, including the revisions of those standards in 2004. Building upon the Standards and Practices, the National Trust, in consultation with the Land Trust Alliance, developed the Preservation booklet Best Practices for Preservation Organizations Involved in Easement and Land Stewardship. This publication translates the Land Trust Standards and Practices into a benchmark for historic preservation organizations.

ADDING TO OUR TOOL BELTS
We’ve discovered real differences in the way historic preservationists and land conservationists work to protect properties.

In preservationists’ tool belts are federal, state, and local regulatory protections that are useful to conservationists’ goals. Land trusts typically are not aware of these powerful tools, but need to be. As an example of their value, River Fields, Inc., a land trust in Louisville, Ky., discovered that the National Register listing of properties it protects along the Ohio River provided a significant advantage in its subsequent fight to prevent a utility company from siting new electricity transmission lines through the corridor. River Fields could tap federal Sections 106 and 4(f)
regulations to bolster its campaign to keep the landscape intact. Sections 106 and 4(f) are stronger protections than easements under Kentucky law, and River Fields now regularly pursues National Register listing for the properties it acquires.

Preservationists can guide land trusts in using national, state, and local historic designations to achieve their goals of saving places people love. Preservationists can help land trusts plug into the power of history to attract and motivate more people to help land trusts succeed with their projects.

Preservationists can also help land trusts figure out what to do with the buildings on the land they acquire. Land trusts tend not to have experience in building management, nor do they typically have the stomachs for it. They benefit from preservationists’ help in identifying re-use strategies and funding sources; from their connections to preservation-minded buyers; and from their ability and willingness to take preservation restrictions or easements on the buildings, while the land trust handles the conservation easements.

Land trusts, on the other hand, regularly employ tools that could be put to much better use by preservationists.

The easement, or conservation restriction, is the land trust’s most often-used protection tool. Conservation easement documents sometimes include provisions to protect the historic buildings on the property—and they certainly can. More often than not, however, they do not. Thus, as in my story from Massachusetts’ South Coast, the land is protected but the buildings and other important man-made aspects of the landscape are not.

To similarly protect the man-made features of a property, land trusts need to partner with a qualified entity to hold a preservation easement. But the truth is that if and when land trusts do look around for a preservation organization with which to collaborate on a comprehensive easement, they are oftentimes at a total loss to find one. So their conservation transactions omit consideration of the buildings and so miss the opportunity to protect them also. As preservation organizations, we need to expand our use of the easement tool by committing to establishing strong easement programs in as much of the country as possible. Although organizations should be conscious of the responsibility of holding easements.

We’ve learned also that land trusts use surveys to set their conservation priorities far more commonly and actively than preservationists do. Conservation interests collaborating with preservationists will often ask, “Where’s your survey?” “What are your priorities for protection?” It’s hard to prioritize if you
don’t know what you’ve got. It’s hard to
tell decision-makers and activists what’s
most important to protect without a
good inventory and assessment. The
preservation movement needs to redouble
efforts to complete (and bring into the
21st century) state and community sur-
veys—and then use them to set priorities
for permanent protection.

ADVANCING COLLABORATION
In short, we’ve concluded that historic
preservationists and land conservationists
each have knowledge and tools that can
really benefit the other. We simply need to
spend time getting to know one another
and looking out for opportunities to col-
laborate. The goal of this issue of Forum
Journal is to help preservation and conser-
vation practitioners make the connection
and to inspire much more collaboration.

Preserve Rhode Island’s executive
director Valerie Talmage shares “Lessons
from Land Conservation,” having spent
15 years leading land conservation work
in New England. She suggests “Ten Ways
for Preservationists to Be More Effective,”
including by adopting some of the conser-
vationists’ strategies.

Mary Pope Hutson, executive vice
president of the Land Trust Alliance,
describes how the American conservation
and preservation movements developed
along different paths. But, she says, in
the face of current threats, this is “Our
Moment to Build a Cultural Conserva-
tion Legacy” by bringing both movements
together as a cohesive force.

Together, we’ve learned that archeol-
ogy offers preservation tools—such as the
federal laws requiring archeological inves-
tigation prior to federally funded projects
proceeding—that land conservationists
are finding especially valuable. Andy
Laurenzi, resource protection specialist
for the Center for Desert Archaeology,
discusses how his organization teams up
with conservationists in his article “Land
Conservation and Historic Preservation: A
Natural Partnership in the Southwest.”

Along the way, we’ve uncovered truly
inspiring stories of conservationists, preser-
vationists, and historic site stewards work-
ing together to protect comprehensively
some pretty special places. One notable
success story is described by Drayton Hall’s
Ashley River Region coordinator Emily C.
Pack in “‘Whole Place Preservation’: The
Ashley River Region and the Watson Hill
Campaign.” Read about others in “Com-
bining Preservation and Conservation Val-
ues: Six Illustrative Examples” by Thomp-
san M. Mayes and Ross M. Bradford.

Finally, Roberta Lane, senior program
officer and regional attorney with the
National Trust for Historic Preservation,
writes about ways that land trusts and
preservation groups are participating in the
community planning process to achieve
their goals.

We hope that this journal issue will help
to spread these ideas and continue all these
positive developments. FJ

WENDY NICHOLAS is the director of the National
Trust for Historic Preservation’s Northeast Office.
Lessons for Land Conservation

VALERIE TALMAGE

People who are engaged in historic preservation and land conservation share similar goals. Both preservationists and conservationists sign on to “protect community character,” “improve quality of life,” “preserve heritage,” and “keep important places for future generations.” The natural and cultural resources that preservationists and conservationists care about often occupy the same ground—yet preservationists and conservationists tend to work in parallel. Although there are inspiring examples of preservationists and conservationists working together to save special places, these instances seem to be the exceptions and not the rule. Improving the likelihood that preservationists and conservationists will unite for comprehensive community preservation will give both groups a better chance of achieving their overlapping goals.

Separate Silos
Preservationists and conservationists have each developed specialized expertise—and that specialization results in a tendency to operate inside their separate information silos. Frequently a successful conservation project will conclude but leave historic features on the land unprotected. Similarly, a preservation project will end with no thought to the permanent protection of the land. Sometimes preservationists and conservationists may even independently work to protect the same piece of real estate without knowing the others’ interests and actions.

The information silos are reinforced by years of training in specialized fields with little overlap—say, architectural history and rare plant biology. The biologist is as unlikely to be able to “see” a building as old or significant as is the architectural historian able to “see” a weed as a species of concern. Only a rare individual can, with equal expertise, identify an endangered species, recognize the character-defining features of a historic house, and identify a stone as a Native American tool. Also rare is the individual who understands the difference between a National Register and a local historic district and who can also explain the tax advantages and requirements of a bargain sale of a conservation easement. Developing mastery of either preservation or conservation requires significant investment in learning subject matter, processes, and programs along with developing networks to support...
success. Commanding expertise in both fields is not common.

Ironically, the world doesn’t sort natural and cultural resources into neat categories. At least in New England, finding a parcel of land that does not contain traces of human use and settlement is rare indeed. If we are to protect the character of the communities where we work, live, and play, a combined approach to preserving both natural and historic resources is mandatory.

**DIFFERENT DRUMMERS**

Preservationists and conservationists both work to save places that matter to communities, but they use different tools and strategies. They even evaluate success in different ways. Four fundamental differences in approach have a profound effect on shaping the programs and activities of each specialty:

1. **Relationships with Owners:** The conservation community knows that its success lies in reaching voluntary agreements with owners—negotiating with owners to sell or donate conservation land or easements. Therefore, conservationists build relationships with owners and hone skills in negotiation. Land conservation groups consciously distance themselves from regulatory oversight and advocacy, keeping avenues to talk with landowners open and uncolored by advocacy positions. In contrast, preservationists are accustomed to advocating for and relying on governmental

*In traditional farms, like this one in Westport, Mass., the history and significance of the buildings and land are inextricably linked.*

PHOTO COURTESY PRESERVE RHODE ISLAND

*continues on page 16*
Ten Ways for Preservationists to Be More Effective

When preservationists and conservationists work within their separate arenas, the historic landscape is not fully protected. Too many instances of demolition of significant historic properties in otherwise protected landscapes testify to the dire results of this approach. Working harder within an information silo will not solve the problem—preservationists would be doomed to looking out from inside their box, wondering why those other people weren’t doing a better job of protecting all the heritage assets at stake. Working smarter and understanding what it takes to get out of our preservation box has great potential for achieving success in saving the whole places that we care about. Here are ten ways to climb out of our box and into greater alignment and engagement with conservation interests.

1. **BUILD CAPACITY:** Build the capacity of statewide and local preservation organizations to participate in conservation real estate transactions, to hold easements, to negotiate with property owners, and to collaborate with land trusts. Preservation organizations need both more boots on the ground and the wherewithal to take on a broader range of programs and activities.

2. **RISK CAPITAL:** Establish more (and more robust) preservation revolving funds. Revolving funds are pools of capital that are used to temporarily acquire historic properties that can then be turned over to more permanent stewards. If preservation revolving funds were available to work alongside those of conservation groups, sharing the risk, then preservationists would have “skin in the game.” Such participation not only assures a seat at a table, but has the wonderful effect of focusing attention and action to the opportunity and task. When money is at stake, a new level of seriousness enters the preservationist’s evaluation of risk and reward.

3. **ADJUST OUR ATTITUDE:** Learn how not to be the “preservation police.” Adding value to a project is different from regulating actions. Working with

---

**Coggeshall Farm, Bristol, R.I.**
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property owners for mutual gains would engage the many proud owners of historic properties in the preservation movement in a new and more satisfying relationship—invi
ting owners to be a part of the solution. If preservationists were known for being creative, entrepreneurial, flexible, and friendly, imagine how outcomes might differ. Developing a new paradigm with owners of historic prop-
erty could have a profound impact on preservation success.

4. BROADEN OUTREACH: Seek out partnerships and collaborations with land conservation groups. Move beyond the preservation silo and expand methods and outcomes. Preservationists can infiltrate land trusts and call for help on threatened properties in cases where there is synergy.

5. BE STRATEGIC: Adopt a strategic approach by articulating what is most important to protect and then determining the means best suited to accomplish the goals. Many land trusts develop a priority list of properties to work on, cho-
sen to accomplish their strategic goals. Preservationists are reluctant to commit in such a strategic way. The exercise of preservation organizations answering the question “What are the top properties to preserve in our geographic area?” might spark interesting conversations about what difference the organization is trying to make in its community. When the top priorities are articulated, then action plans can be envisioned, including assessing how owners of historic prop-
erties might be brought into the effort.

6. REFORM TAX POLICY: Work to make relatively small but significant changes to existing federal tax policy and improve the functionality of incen-
tives to permanently protect historic properties. For instance, change the requirement that a historic property be a “certified historic structure” to that it be “determined eligible for the National Register.” This substitution would continue the intended indepen-
dent guarantee of historic significance (to make certain the tax subsidy is in the public interest), but with a whole lot less bureaucracy. Another welcome change would be to address the difficulties of appraising preservation easements and the IRS’s challenges to deductions for easement donations. Perhaps give the owner/
taxpayer the choice of a modest fixed deduction instead of the complicated and sometimes unfathomable property-specific appraisal. A modest fixed deduction could alleviate owners’ concerns of triggering an IRS audit. Finally, many states
have created tax incentives for donations of land for conservation purposes—but few state tax incentive programs exist for donations of historic properties for preservation purposes. Such state tax incentives, even modest ones, could have a great impact on prompting donations.

7. SUPPORT STEWARDSHIP:
Devise a program, through insurance or a pooled endowment, so that small preservation organizations can take on easements. Small organizations need assurance that they can defend preservation easements and back up the preservation promise in a way that doesn’t bankrupt their organizations. An obstacle to preservation organizations taking on real estate transactions that involve easements and other perpetual obligations is stewarding these real property interests forever. Building an endowment in sufficient size to match these perpetual obligations, including any legal defense, is daunting for small preservation organizations. National help to devise an appropriate and affordable insurance product, or to build a pooled defense fund, seem like practical ways to allow small organizations to enter the world of easement transactions.

8. DEVELOP AN ACQUISITION STRATEGY:
Be strategic about deciding when and how the risk of acquisition is worth the preservation reward. Organizations that pass over acquisition as a tool to protect historic properties because of the risks and costs involved are throwing out the baby with the bathwater. In particular, the short-term acquisition of threatened properties that can then go to more permanent stewards is a familiar preservation tool, as is the acquisition of easements. Expanding the use of these tools so they are more common would amplify preservation success.

9. SEEK MORE FUNDING:
Work to increase funding at all levels for both land conservation and preservation! Preservation, in particular, would benefit from federal, state, and local policy focused on developing more funding.

10. ENGAGE NEW LEADERSHIP:
Capitalize on the voluntary commitment of the owners of America’s heritage assets to expand the preservation movement. The nonprofit leaders of preservation across the country—the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the statewide and local preservation organizations—can position themselves to use the passion and enthusiasm of the thousands of owners of historic places to join in protecting places that matter.
control of owners’ actions to protect historic properties—through, for example, historic district design guidelines or Section 106 reviews. Preservationists advocate for governmental regulation as a systematic approach to minimize harm to historic properties.

2. Acquisition Practices: Some preservationists avoid acquisition because of the risks and costs associated with ownership. Most preservation organizations look to others to acquire and rehabilitate property, offering technical assistance in preservation matters but rarely getting directly involved in ownership. Acquisition is not allowed as a part of federal and many state preservation grant programs. The handful of preservation revolving funds that do use acquisition as a tool contrasts to the more than 2,000 land trusts in America that own land and interests in land.

3. Funding Strategies: The majority of historic preservation activities are privately funded. Homeowners and commercial redevelopers fund most preservation projects from their own resources. Public funds that may subsidize a project are derived from (scarce) federal and state programs and from tax incentives for qualifying projects. In contrast, most conservation projects are primarily supported through federal, state, and local public dollars. Many conservation initiatives include a public vote to approve funds—convincing voters to raise their taxes to save a special place. Conservationists have become proficient at managing campaigns to get “Yes” votes for conservation funding. Because of their reliance on public funds, conservationists tend to be clear communicators regarding the public interest served by their work. Both conservation and preservation organizations rely on philanthropic support, but such support is more widely available in larger amounts for conservation organizations and projects.

4. Measures of Success: Preservationists count success as the rehabilitation of historic properties, keeping properties in productive use and on the tax roles. Success also means minimizing harm to historic properties, such as providing for archeological data recovery or requiring developers to adopt an alternative that avoids or minimizes adverse impacts to historic properties. Conservationists evaluate success by the permanent protection of places, either through fee ownership by a conservation organization or through a permanent conservation easement.

IF THOSE OF US in the preservation movement adopt some of conservation’s best practices and work collaboratively with conservation partners, we will be more effective in saving buildings along with land.

Conservationists use acquisition (in fee or through easements) as the primary method to protect important places.

3. Funding Strategies: The majority of historic preservation activities are privately funded. Homeowners and commercial redevelopers fund most preservation projects from their own resources. Public funds that may subsidize a project are derived from (scarce) federal and state programs and from tax incentives for qualifying projects. In contrast, most conservation projects are primarily supported through federal, state, and local public dollars. Many conservation initiatives include a public vote to approve funds—convincing voters to raise their taxes to save a special place. Conservationists have become proficient at managing campaigns to get “Yes” votes for conservation funding. Because of their reliance on public funds, conservationists tend to be clear communicators regarding the public interest served by their work. Both conservation and preservation organizations rely on philanthropic support, but such support is more widely available in larger amounts for conservation organizations and projects.

4. Measures of Success: Preservationists count success as the rehabilitation of historic properties, keeping properties in productive use and on the tax roles. Success also means minimizing harm to historic properties, such as providing for archeological data recovery or requiring developers to adopt an alternative that avoids or minimizes adverse impacts to historic properties. Conservationists evaluate success by the permanent protection of places, either through fee ownership by a conservation organization or through a permanent conservation easement.

BEST OF BOTH WORLDS
In short, preservation and land conservation specialists have each invested in accumulating expertise within their very different approaches to accomplishing strikingly similar goals. If the best practices from each discipline were com-
bined to work in tandem, the capacity of organizations to save places that matter to communities would increase. A united effort would likely have a bigger impact on protecting the natural and cultural assets of communities across America.

Preservationists can learn a lot from conservationists. If those of us in the preservation movement adopt some of conservation’s best practices and work collaboratively with conservation partners, we will be more effective in saving buildings along with land. In addition, we’ll become better preservationists too, with expanded skills and an expanded tool kit to save the places that matter everywhere. FJ

VALERIE TALMAGE is the executive director of Preserve Rhode Island. She is the former executive director of the Massachusetts Historical Commission and Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Officer. After 15 years of public administration, her career transitioned to land conservation projects, working as a land protection specialist for The Trustees of Reservations. In 1997 Talmage became the director of projects for the New England Office of the Trust for Public Land, overseeing a portfolio of conservation real estate transactions. In 2007 Talmage joined Preserve Rhode Island, the statewide preservation organization that itself stewards five historic sites while leading the state’s efforts to encourage Rhode Islanders to protect special places.

Preserve Rhode Island is working with land conservation groups on Block Island to develop a preservation easement program that complements the great land conservation work that is ongoing. A voluntary preservation easement program could be a winning strategy for protecting cultural landscapes on the island like this one.
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Our Moment to Build a Cultural Conservation Legacy

MARY POPE M. HUTSON

As a native-born Charlestonian, I see incremental changes and pressure points mounting in the historic district and the coastal lands there that cause a conservation practitioner like me to pause. Even those who are not actively concerned about changes to historic districts and landscapes probably worry and ask, what can be done?

Countless visitors and architectural historians have deemed Charleston a “national treasure,” and the natural integrity of the significant watersheds found in the early settlements of the Carolinas make the ecological importance of the coast equally significant.

Yet I see numerous challenges facing Charleston and its surrounding areas.

CHARLESTON’S CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION ROOTS

Over the last 75 years, leadership by key individuals and two renowned preservation groups—Historic Charleston Foundation and the Preservation Society of Charleston—have resulted in victories, preserving the built environment of Charleston and defeating large-scale changes on the peninsula and its environs.

The conservation movement in South Carolina has evolved in half the time with strong leadership and collaborations that are a national model for conservation. Through unique partnerships, a common mission, and a focus on key geographic areas, the leadership of private landowners and conservation groups has been very strategic in achieving the shared goal of protecting the natural heritage of South Carolina.

Working together, The Nature Conservancy, Ducks Unlimited, The Conservation Fund, Trust for Public Land, and 20 local land trusts have protected more than 500,000 acres in South Carolina to date.

Notable examples include the protection of 200,000 acres (of the identified 350,000 acres) of the Ashepoo, Combahee and South Edisto (ACE) Basin—one of the largest undeveloped estuaries on the east coast of the United States. The ACE model is now being emulated across America by many other conservation partnerships.
The individual landowners deserve enormous recognition for their commitment, and as a result of their efforts, generations have protected their land and the cultural heritage that also exists in the context of the land.

Charleston and its environs offer a strong story of place: a tapestry of heritage woven in the built and natural environment and inextricably tied together. These places live and breathe an integrated conservation and preservation ethic that is a model for the nation. With a state citizenry committed to both, strong institutional and individual leadership exist to advance conservation and preservation visions in South Carolina.

**CURRENT THREATS**

But current threats present preservation and conservation leaders in the city and outlying areas with the greatest challenges in decades.

In the historic district, “the walled city” is once again walled, but this time with condos touting “the best views in town,” not with wooden palisades to fortify the city from outsiders as it was in 1703. It’s all about providing buyers with a private, unobstructed view of the harbor and the tax revenue such development supposedly generates.

The latest challenge is a dramatic increase in cruise ships docking near the historic district, with few restrictions or requirements to comply with regulations that other businesses must adhere to throughout the year.

In the outlying areas of Charleston, new development patterns also threaten to isolate protected areas. The rural sea islands are endangered as well, threatened with expressways that would make it easier and faster to get to and from town. The heritage areas and corridors that were so carefully designated may be compromised as state and local budgets wane and their administrators look for tax revenue from the last great source—the land.

Also, the gambling interests are back from their defeat in 1994 for another assault on the city, with dockside gambling interests approaching North Charleston.

Neighborhood groups, the South Carolina Coastal Conservation League, preservation groups, the Committee to Save the City, and many leading citizens are engaging community members and urging them to action like never before to deal with these latest concerns. Letters to the editor, public meetings, petitions, and meetings with city and state officials are making an impact.

Charleston is unique, yes, but it is a microcosm of what is going on in other parts the country, deserving our immediate attention. The challenges for Charleston and its coastline—to retain the identity and the cultural legacy of the built and natural environments—are emblematic of the issues that many preservation and conservation groups are dealing with today.

**COMMON GOALS, DIFFERENT PATHS**

The professionals involved in historic preservation, land conservation, and smart growth today share a focus on protecting community character and the aspects of the environment, natural and man-made, that are critical to quality of life. These professionals work to protect historic, scenic, and natural habitat from adverse development. Although conservation and preservation interests work in different ways, they have similar purposes for the public.

But over the decades, the land conservation and historic preservation movements have become highly specialized and have moved away from the context
of a century ago. Historic preservation groups focus now almost entirely on the built environment, and land conservation groups on the natural environment. Yet originally “conservation” included both the built and the natural environment.

Charles Eliot, a young landscape architect then practicing in Boston in the 1890s, proposed the establishment of what would become The Trustees of Reservations, the first private nonprofit conservation organization of its kind in the country.

By the end of the 19th century, conservationists had successfully protected many of the natural wonders of the American West, but the dense urban regions of the East had received relatively little attention. Boston had become the nation’s fourth largest manufacturing center. Ironworks, glass factories, foundries, hundreds of industrial plants, large and small, sprang up everywhere, consuming farmland, countryside, riverfront, and even historic sites. Boston’s population swelled by tens of thousands, and living conditions were deplorable.

Against this backdrop of industrialization, very little had been done to set aside open space for Boston’s urban population, especially when compared to the extent of open space that had been set aside in London and Paris.

Eliot believed that country parks would provide fresh air, scenic beauty, and opportunities for quiet repose—antidotes to the ills of urban life. With this conviction in mind, Eliot wrote a letter to the New England periodical Garden and Forest proposing the formation of a new organization.

While country parks were central to Eliot’s vision, he argued for the immediate preservation of “special bits of scenery” still remaining “within ten miles of the State House which possess uncommon beauty and more than usual refreshing power.” As an example, he mentioned Waverly Oaks,
a steep hill in Belmont “set with a group of mighty oaks,” as well as what is today Rocky Narrows in Sherborn, the oldest property of The Trustees of Reservations.

To protect these places, Eliot proposed the creation of a unique statewide nonprofit organization—a corporation governed by a board of volunteer trustees who would be empowered by the state legislature to hold land free of taxes for the public to enjoy “just as a Public Library holds books and an Art Museum holds pictures.” Eliot enlisted a distinguished group of citizens to support his proposal. In a circular called The Preservation of Beautiful and Historical Places, the group laid down the special reasons why “places of historical interest or remarkable beauty should be withdrawn from private ownership, preserved from harm, and opened to the public.” They asserted that:

- “the existing means of securing and preserving public reservations are not sufficiently effective,”
- “lovers of nature will rally to endow the Trustees with the care of their favorite scenes, precisely as the lovers of Art have so liberally endowed the Art Museums,”
- the organization “will be able to act for the benefit of the whole people, and without regard to the principal cause of the ineffectiveness of present methods, namely the local jealousies felt by townships and the parts of townships towards each other,” and
- the Commonwealth “can no longer afford to refrain from applying to the preservation of her remarkable places every method which experience in other fields has approved.”

In the spring of 1891, the legislature voted to establish The Trustees of Public Reservations “for the purposes of acquiring, holding, maintaining and opening to the public...beautiful and historic places...within the Commonwealth.”

Today The Trustees of Reservations is one of the most successful and effective conservation groups in America. It has become a model for future conservation organizations at the national, regional, and state levels.

Professional specialization, the interests and backgrounds of charismatic individuals, and the missions of leading nonprofit groups all had an effect on the American conservation movement evolving in parallel with the preservation movement. They each developed their own vocabulary, political base, sources of funding and training which reinforced the differentiation. But now we are realizing that we can’t have the one without the other and that land conservation and historic preservation are inextricably linked.

**WORKING TOWARD A CULTURAL CONSERVATION LEGACY**

Over the next 50 years, with 100 million more people living in America, the challenge is ours to reenergize and create a deep and enduring collaboration between the land conservation and historic preservation groups in America. Through deeper partnerships, organizations will reach a broader audience and achieve greater relevance for the citizenry of this country who care deeply about protecting a community’s character and quality of life, but who may not necessarily identify themselves as historic preservationists.

**ALTHOUGH CONSERVATION and preservation interests work in different ways, they have similar purposes for the public.**
or land conservationists. These stronger coalitions, once built, will translate into an advocacy voice that will help ensure that we leave a cultural conservation legacy that protects and honors the full significance of American places.

These are tough times for those concerned about such things. Funding sources for land conservation and historic preservation at state and federal levels are frozen or in decline.

Cultural conservation is not high on the list of public concerns. In this highly mobile society, more and more people are losing appreciation for or allegiance to special places in America. The preoccupation of many teens and adults with electronic devices leads to what author Richard Louv calls “nature deficit disorder,” distancing them from the natural wonders and historic places that surround them.

All the while, political decision-makers are questioning whether our nonprofit groups are worthy of the public trust, as decision-makers in Congress, the Internal Revenue Service, and other agencies question the viability of our two movements, and increase scrutiny of organizations’ and property owners’ conservation transactions.

Meanwhile the predators are circling: government decision-makers at the local, state, and federal levels searching for budget cuts and revenue sources; real estate developers and property owners solely concerned with making money.

Our cultural legacy is tenuous at best if we continue to follow this same path.

Therefore, there is no doubt that the time is now to call for strengthening the movement to protect our cultural conservation legacy. This is our moment in time to articulate the value of this heritage, built and natural, and the relevancy of our work. Our voices and missions must resonate in every community of America.

Building bridges between the preservation and conservation communities must be our focus over the next decade. In order to make a greater “Case for Place,” we must become a cohesive force of well-trained and eager stewards by initiating a campaign to:

- **Create a national vision** for a comprehensive cultural conservation legacy.
- **Build capacity** of land conservation and historic preservation organizations by cross-training practitioners to understand the value of historic and natural resources. Expand toolkits and training—in universities, in our organizations, and in state and local government—to meet the needs of this evolving collaborative effort.
- **Establish networks**, state by state, so that groups can work together on common challenges to the built and natural attributes that are part of the same context.
- **Craft a national message**—a hopeful message spread by community and local champions.

- **Support a national forum** for the exchange of information on common threats, and best practices and strategies for addressing them.
- **Educate and influence government leaders** at the federal, state, and local levels.
- **Attract broad public support** throughout the country, encouraging citizens and communities to place greater value on our cultural legacy. Some 65 percent of America’s land is still privately held, and the work of conservation today rests in the

**TYPICALLY, conservationists and preservationists usually only talk to each other when there is a crisis, but it is evident that this must change.**

...
hands of countless private interests who can be engaged to care about what our landscapes and communities will look like in the next century.

**HOW TO START**

Typically, conservationists and preservationists usually only talk to each other when there is a crisis, but it is evident that this must change. We need to make the “Case for Place,” working together in a new spirit of cooperation.

In my estimation, this can happen best one place at a time. Practitioners should look at the current movements and leadership in their own regions, examine the evolution of the protection of each of that region’s cultural assets, then devise a joint strategy or vision for the future that is compelling. Language and initiatives that celebrate a cultural conservation legacy one place at a time can be shared more widely, to help develop and expand a national movement.

Every community in America has the leaders who can build the collaborations, but it must start and happen at the local level.

Will this lead us down the right path for preserving, together, our diverse cultural legacy for future generations?

Time will tell. FJ

MARY POPE M. HUTSON is executive vice president of the Land Trust Alliance.

1 The word “Public” was dropped from the legal name in 1954 to avoid confusion with publicly (e.g. government) owned land.

---

**The Land Trust Alliance**

Land trusts are nonprofit organizations that work with private landowners to voluntarily conserve forests, farms, parks, and other cherished places that enrich our lives. Local, regional, and national land trusts have conserved more than 37 million acres of important natural areas and working lands in every state—more land than in all of the national parks in the lower 48 states. Founded in 1982, the Land Trust Alliance leads and serves nearly 1,700 land trusts (local, regional, and national conservation organizations), with their more than 6,000 staff, 90,000 volunteers, and 2 million financial supporters. The Alliance’s mission is to save the places people love by strengthening land conservation across America. We do this by focusing on three strategic goals: accelerating the pace, improving the quality, and ensuring the permanence of conservation. By building highly effective and well-governed land trusts that protect lands with the highest conservation values and ensure their protection in perpetuity, we can preserve healthy human and natural communities, clean air and water, beautiful vistas, recreation areas, and working lands. The Alliance has a 20-member Board of Directors and a staff of 50. We also rely on a strong volunteer force, made up of an education faculty of more than 300 conservation experts as well as pro bono law firms and a national network of experts on conservation defense.
Combining Preservation and Conservation Values: Six Illustrative Examples

THOMPSON M. MAYES AND ROSS M. BRADFORD

Historic preservation organizations can and do protect farmland, open space, and natural resources. Land trusts preserve historic buildings and cultural landscapes. Preservation and conservation organizations work cooperatively to protect places that combine both natural and historic values. The examples that follow highlight several organizations that embody the idea that conservation and preservation are the same concept—flip sides of the same coin. Working together, conservation and preservation organizations can dramatically increase community support, access to resources, and the protection of places that embody multiple values—and lead to the protection of the whole place.

Preserving Natural and Historic Landscapes and Sites in Tennessee

The mission of the Land Trust for Tennessee (LTT), recipient of a National Trust Honor Award in 2010, is to preserve the unique character of Tennessee’s natural and historic landscapes and sites for future generations. Among its projects is stewarding the historic Glen Leven home and its surrounding 65 acres in Nashville, bequeathed to LTT. LTT is currently developing programs and seeking partnerships related to open space conservation, sustainable agriculture, and historic preservation for the property. LTT collaborated with the Capitol Grille restaurant at the Hermitage Hotel to grow heirloom vegetables on the historic estate, including butterstick zucchini, zephyr squash, French breakfast radishes, and Cherokee purple tomatoes. As indicated on LTT’s website, www.landtrusttn.org, the hotel is committed to gardening naturally and promoting sustainability. In other projects, LTT seeks to protect historic farm properties and cultural landscapes, such as the Beaman Park to Bells Bend Corridor near Nashville, an intact historic rural and agricultural landscape that may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places as a rural historic and archeological district.

Saving a Rural Historic Community in Maine

Known as the Sabbathday Lake Shaker Village, this highly intact Shaker community faced uncertainty about its future due to reduced farm revenues, rising taxes and maintenance costs, and pressure from suburban sprawl. Working in partnership, a group of private charities and public agencies formed a coalition and developed a strategy to save Sabbathday Lake including fundraising to purchase an easement from the Shakers that would permanently protect the community’s cultural, historic, and natural resources. The Trust for Public Land, Maine Preservation, the Royal River Conservation Trust, the New England Forestry
Foundation, Friends of the Shakers, the State of Maine, and the USDA Natural Resources and Conservation Service succeeded in their efforts, protecting more than 1,700 acres of wildlife habitat, walking and cross-country skiing trails, agricultural lands, and productive woodlands along with multiple historic buildings. Endowments were also established to ensure the permanent stewardship of the property.

Preservation, Conservation, and Open Space Advocates Work Together to Protect Oatlands Plantation

Oatlands Plantation, a National Trust Historic Site in Leesburg, Va., includes approximately 261 acres. An additional surrounding 385 acres are protected by open space easements. In a collaborative effort among the Piedmont Environmental Council, Oatlands, Inc., and the Jamestown Compact, an adjacent threatened parcel was acquired through a bargain sale and protected by an easement held by the Virginia Outdoors Foundation. A coalition of preservation and conservation organizations continued to fight to protect the context of Oatlands, including engaging legal action when necessary to ensure that adjacent development complies with regulatory requirements, such as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The collaborative efforts implicitly recognize the importance of the site for historic, cultural, agricultural, and open space values.

Protecting Agricultural and Natural Areas Near Danville, Ky.

An easement held by the National Trust protects multiple preservation, conservation, and agricultural values. Individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and a contributing property to the Harrodsburg Pike Rural Historic District, Cambus-Kenneth Farm also includes important Kentucky bluegrass agricultural land and remnants of a Kentucky woodland savannah. The easement requires the maintenance of historically significant buildings and the farmland, while protecting the savannah remnant from potentially damaging agricultural practices. Consisting of approximately 550 acres, the property, which cannot be subdivided, serves as a barrier against encroaching sprawl from Danville.
Combined Efforts by Two Organizations Protect Buildings and Land in Damariscotta, Maine

Patricia Geiringer, the owner of the Jones property, donated an easement to the Damariscotta Lake Watershed Association (DLWA) in 1995, primarily to protect the conservation values of the 86 acres of land, but also incorporating basic protections for the historic buildings. Ms. Geiringer subsequently donated the property to the National Trust, which worked with the DLWA to strengthen the easement’s protections for historic buildings, and to incorporate an additional 3-acre parcel that extended the property’s boundary to a nearby river. The easement is now jointly held and enforced by the DLWA and the National Trust.

Public-Private Partnership Protects Land and Buildings at Montpelier

This cabin, on a portion of Montpelier, James Madison’s home in Orange County, Va., was built by one of James Madison’s freed slaves, George Gilmore. The total Montpelier property includes approximately 2,700 acres, 1,900 acres of which are outside the historic core (the area including the residence of James Madison). More than 700 acres—including the Gilmore Cabin—were permanently protected by easements created through a unique public-private partnership between the Piedmont Environmental Council, the Virginia Outdoors Foundation, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, the Montpelier Foundation and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. An additional 200 acres—a National Natural Landmark old-growth forest—is protected by an easement held by The Nature Conservancy. FJ

THOMPSON M. MAYES is deputy general counsel and ROSS M. BRADFORD is associate general counsel for the National Trust for Historic Preservation.
Land Conservation and Historic Preservation: A Natural Partnership in the Southwest

ANDY LAURENZI

In the early 1990s, I worked for The Nature Conservancy in Arizona, spearheading the state chapter’s land conservation work and helping launch a landscape-level land conservation project in the San Pedro River watershed. We brought together state and local partners to identify priority wetland and riparian (bank side) habitats along the river and to explore ways of better protecting and managing these important areas.

One afternoon, Bill Doelle, CEO and president of the Center for Desert Archaeology, headquartered in Tucson, called to ask if he could visit to discuss some of the archeological work his organization was doing along the river. In particular, he hoped to glean any insights we might have about working with landowners and ranching and farming organizations, including the valley’s Natural Resource Conservation Districts. A week later in our conference room, Bill presented maps of the entire lower valley showing where Center staff had surveyed and what they had found. I was immediately struck by the parallel between our work to inventory and evaluate natural habitats at a landscape level and the approach the Center was taking to understand archeology at a basin-wide scale. We quickly recognized that there was much to be gained from our two organizations working together more closely—and thus began a collaboration that has continued for 15 years.

Today, as a result of a Partners in the Field grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, I am now working as the resource protection specialist for the Center for Desert Archaeology, meeting with Conservancy staff from a different place around the table to discuss the cultural resources of the San Pedro River basin and our mutual goals and objectives.

A PRODUCTIVE COLLABORATION

It is important to recognize that for many land trusts, preservation of historic resources is not a mission element. Although they may share preservationists’ values for protecting the places of our shared past, most land trusts are strapped for time and money to accomplish...
mission-related objectives. Preservationists may have an open door, but we also have a responsibility to walk through that door with resources—the time, expertise, and money needed to help protect natural and cultural places.

In the San Pedro Valley, where the Center for Desert Archaeology has worked the longest, collaboration with The Nature Conservancy has taken many paths. The Center has greatly benefited from The Nature Conservancy’s experience in working directly with landowners and from its technical land protection expertise. In turn, the Center has provided The Nature Conservancy with technical expertise for Section 106 compliance, which has enabled the Conservancy to meet its obligations for various state and federal land acquisition and stewardship grants. Applying an understanding of Section 106, the Center has assisted the Conservancy in designing conservation strategies that accomplish its mission while better protecting cultural resources. These strategies include riparian pasture design for grazing management, delineating areas to burn as part of a prescribed fire plan, and, in some instances, identifying areas to acquire as part of land protection projects.

In 2002, encouraged by the conservation vision in the San Pedro Valley promoted by The Nature Conservancy and Bureau of Land Management, local landowners approached the Center for Desert Archaeology to ask about donating a conservation easement over their land which did not include high quality wildlife habitat but outstanding cultural resources. Discussions with The Nature Conservancy helped the Center develop a conservation easement document that effectively addresses the additional issues that preservation of archeological resources entails (since they are nonrenewable and not subject to restoration if damaged). The Center paid close attention to templates provided by The Nature Conservancy and the Land Trust Alliance. This easement now protects three archeological sites, including a late Classic period pueblo dating back to the 15th century. With a few revisions, this template continues to serve as the Center’s model for conservation easement donations.

The Center also adds considerable firepower toward securing federal funding for land acquisition that may be difficult to justify solely on the basis of natural area values. In particular is a 130-acre conservation easement acquired by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the San Pedro River basin that limits development to protect an important prehistoric Native American village adjacent to a priority land conservation area. The significance of the site, which the Center was able to highlight, encouraged the BLM to make acquisition of this conservation easement a priority, using funding that was available for land acquisition. The Center also assisted the BLM by identifying sections of the property where future development might be allowed that avoid the prehistoric village features, and by providing recommendations on the specific terms in the easement that pertain to the archeological resource values.
Ownership of a piece of property may best be described as a “bundle of rights.” These rights include the right to occupy, use, lease, sell, and develop the land. A conservation easement involves the exchange of one or more of these rights from the landowner to someone who does not hold title to the property (“the holder”). The conservation easement grants to the holder certain rights regarding the use of property for specified conservation purposes while the title to the land and all other uses of the property remain with the private property owner. The easement is a legally binding covenant that is publicly recorded and runs with the property deed for a specified time or in perpetuity. It gives the holder the responsibility to monitor and enforce the property use restrictions imposed by the easement for as long as it is designed to run. An easement does not grant ownership nor does it absolve the property owner from traditional landowner responsibilities, such as for property tax, upkeep, maintenance, or improvements. Easement deeds are recorded with the county recorder’s office to ensure that future owners of the property are also bound to the terms of the easement agreement.

An archeological conservation easement is designed to provide the holder of the conservation easement the right to restrict certain activities on the private land, such as commercial development or residential subdivisions that are likely to compromise the long-term conservation of the cultural resources found on the property. An archeological site can include a historic or pre-historic structure, site, or place that has cultural significance. The easement holder in turn makes a commitment to monitor and protect the resources forever. Protection is achieved through regular and open communication with the landowner and annual visits to the property to ensure compliance with the easement restrictions. In rare instances steps may need to be taken to enforce the restrictions in the event of a violation.
Similarly, in 2004 the Center assisted the Southeast Arizona Land Trust (now the Arizona Land and Water Trust) in securing federal funding from the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection program, which is administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. The funding grant enabled the land trust to acquire a 2,300-acre conservation easement. The Center provided a National Register Determination of Eligibility for a prehistoric pueblo site with more than 100 rooms located on the ranch property. Ancestral Puebloan people who had migrated from the Colorado Plateau area into southeastern Arizona had occupied the site for 150 years. The eligibility determination contributed to the grant’s overall competitiveness nationally for funding within the Farmland Protection Program. It also led to specific easement provisions that will help to ensure long-term protection of the site and appropriate research use.

Today the Center continues to meet regularly with The Nature Conservancy and other area land trusts in Arizona and New Mexico. We inform them about the cultural resources they own or monitor as an easement holder; we share information on protection priorities; and we explore avenues for collaboration involving funding. Much of the job of preserving archeological sites is accomplished once they pass into the ownership of land trusts such as The Nature Conservancy or the Arizona Land and Water Trust, either as a preserve or when protected by a conservation easement. Our job is to ensure that the cultural resources are known to the land manager (and landowner, in the case of conservation easements) so that extra care can be taken to avoid inadvertent harm. Together with these individuals, we explore ways to better steward these resources to avoid or manage damage caused by vandals, looters, or unauthorized vehicle use.

MORE PARTNERSHIPS
The Center’s work with environmental advocates also extends beyond the land trust community to advocacy-oriented organizations seeking to promote greater protection of public lands. The Center’s work has been greatly enhanced by the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Public Lands Initiative and the Trust team based in its Mountains/Plains office and at its Washington, D.C., headquarters. This team advocates for increased protection of historic and prehistoric resources on lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and National Park Service. The team’s combined expertise helps inform our on-the-ground work in the Southwest.

During the past year, the Center has participated in a coalition spearheaded by the Arizona Wilderness Coalition, The Wilderness Society, and the Sonoran Institute. The group is advocating for an expansive public lands conservation initiative involving more than one million acres of predominantly BLM land in western Maricopa County. The group seeks congressional action to designate new Wilderness and National Conservation Areas, which will provide a clear mandate to protect natural and cultural resources. The Center has helped to identify specific areas to include in the proposal based on signifi-
cant cultural resources. Our participation helps ensure that the rich array of cultural resource values are recognized, to complement the ecological, scenic, and wilderness resource values that the other coalition members seek to protect.

Noteworthy cultural resources in the area include one of the most significant concentrations of petroglyphs in the Southwest; large Hohokam village sites with platform mounds, ballcourts, and adobe pueblos; mysterious hillside and hilltop ruins that may have had multiple purposes related to defense, habitation, and ritual; the historic trail corridor of the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail; and other historic trail segments such as the Butterfield Stage and the route of the Mormon Battalion led by General Crooke. While these areas are “protected” by virtue of their being located on public land, other legitimate uses of public land and easy access facilitated by vehicular travel can compromise these historic resources. Congressional designations that provide clear conservation intent help agency land managers reduce the conflicts that can occur on lands open to multiple uses.

These conflicts are most apparent when decisions are made regarding vehicular travel. What roads should remain open, what kinds of vehicles should be allowed on these roads, whether vehicles should be allowed off-road, and whether certain areas should be closed to all vehicular use—these decisions arouse a great deal of controversy among user groups, environmental advocates, and local communities. On many national forests and BLM areas, vehicles traveling off-road cause the most significant damage to historic and prehistoric sites. Once again, we have found common ground with several environmental advocates in developing recommendations to BLM and USFS units which have initiated travel management planning. Together we have advocated for off-road travel restrictions and road closures that promote more responsible travel management on our public lands.

Together with environmental advocates, we form a stronger voice for protection-
oriented policies. This summer—through a joint funding effort involving the National Trust, the Center, The Wilderness Society, and the Center for Biological Diversity—we have been able to put a team of archeologists in the field on the Tonto National Forest. The team is assessing the condition of nearly 100 prehistoric sites, most of which are large, masonry and adobe pueblo ruins. This information will guide our recommendations on Forest Service land management decisions and assist the Forest Service in its management of Priority Heritage Assets.

BUILDING ON SHARED VALUES AND PURPOSE
As the few examples I’ve given here demonstrate, there are ample opportunities for collaboration between the preservation and conservation communities. As with much of our preservation work, effective collaboration is, in essence, about building and maintaining relationships. Although preservation organizations such as the Center may not have viewed land trusts as a key audience for our work, the success of the land trust movement in the U.S. over the last 15 years suggests that they may be one of our most important constituencies. And this constituency is pre-disposed to our preservation mission, because its core mission also speaks to protecting America’s sense of place.

The preservation community will be well served by helping to define that sense of place so that it includes the built and natural environment, as well as the associated ancient and recent past. People are what define a landscape, whether in a scientific sense or a cultural sense. People and their place in that landscape become defining elements of a sense of place. One without the other draws a distinction that runs the risk of creating a barrier—and that would serve us poorly in the long run. Preservation and conservation interests must work together to confront the challenges that people throughout time have faced: using our natural world to live, work, and play in a manner that maintains its beauty, vitality, diversity, and cultural legacy far into the future.

ANDY LAURENZI is the resource protection specialist for the Center for Desert Archaeology in partnership with the National Trust for Historic Preservation through the Partners in the Field program.

The Center for Desert Archaeology

The Center for Desert Archaeology envisions a society in which the places of the past are valued as the foundations for a vibrant future. The Center works to preserve the places of our shared past. It achieves this mission by researching questions of broad interest, enabling people to learn about the past through creative and varied means, including promoting an ethic of preservation to the public and professionals, and acting to ensure long-term protection of our cultural heritage. The Center is a private 501(c)3 nonprofit organization based in Tucson, Ariz., working throughout the American Southwest and Northwest Mexico.
“Whole Place Preservation”: The Ashley River Region and the Watson Hill Campaign

EMILY C. PACK

George McDaniel, executive director of Drayton Hall (a National Trust Historic Site), will never forget the day in the spring of 2005 when he got the call from Bo and Mickey Barry, two longtime residents of the Ashley River Region and good friends to Drayton Hall. Mickey tearfully explained that the couple had agreed to sell their family property on the Ashley River in Charleston, S.C., only to learn from the local newspaper that the people who purchased it were developers who intended to use it to annex from North Charleston to a large tract of undeveloped timberland on the other side of the Barry property. Mickey exclaimed that she and her husband were now the “Judas Iscariots of the Ashley River Region.”

To understand the Barrys’ emotional phone call, one must know something about the historic region and what this threat of development would mean. A National Register Historic District, the Ashley River Region is a 13-mile corridor northwest of Charleston that is bound by the Ashley River, a State Scenic River, and Ashley River Road. Amidst this still-forested landscape are Drayton Hall, established as a plantation circa 1738 and now a National Historic Landmark; Middleton Place, a National Historic Landmark; and the 17th-century Magnolia Plantation and Gardens, all of which border the Ashley River. Archeological sites trace the region’s history from Native American habitation to 18th-century African American settlements to Civil War fortifications.

Concerns about development pressures and lack of coordinated regional planning in the area led the National Trust for Historic Preservation to include the Ashley River Historic District on its list of 11 Most Endangered Historic Places in 1995. Charles Duell, president of Middleton Place Foundation, declared, “It’s not just one thing, it’s everything in combination that makes this place a national treasure—and that’s why we have to preserve it.”

A REGIONAL THREAT EMERGES

The sale of the Barry property was just one aspect of a potentially catastrophic threat to the region. At stake was Watson Hill, a 6,600-acre, 10-square-mile tract of timberlands located in Dorchester County, S.C., just north of Charleston County. Historically rural, Dorchester had become one of the fastest growing counties in the state and its residents were deeply split over issues of suburban growth and private property rights. Watson Hill had been sold by the timber company MeadWestvaco to an out-of-state developer who proposed to build 5,000 homes, a hotel, a golf course, and a commercial center there. The plan would have required construction of a four-lane expressway paralleling the historic Ashley River Road, likely to trigger further suburban sprawl and a massive increase in traffic.

Since Dorchester County prohibited the type of density that the Watson Hill own-
ers wanted, the developers approached the Barrys and attempted to buy their land in order to annex through to the property from North Charleston, whose leaders had promised the developers the higher density their development required. Having discovered the developers’ true intentions and identity, the Barrys courageously backed out of the contract, feeling they had signed it under false pretenses. Realizing that the Barrys were the linchpin in the developers’ plans and that a costly lawsuit might prove too much for them, the National Trust for Historic Preservation and Drayton Hall partnered with the Historic Charleston Foundation, Middleton Place, and the Coastal Conservation League to indemnify the Barrys’ legal costs up to one million dollars.

Once the Barrys were comfortable with the indemnification agreement, McDaniel and others knew that they needed to look beyond traditional partnerships if they wanted to fight this behemoth and preserve the context of Drayton Hall. Fortunately for the preservationists in the Ashley River region, they didn’t have to look far to find willing and able partners right in their own backyard.

“WHOLE PLACE PRESERVATION” PUT TO THE TEST

What follows is a close look at a situation that historic sites across the country have faced for decades. As suburban sprawl continues its march across our landscape, historic sites have been forced to look beyond their gates to confront the roads, strip malls, and housing developments that continue to creep out of our urban centers. Thinking of our historic and cultural resources within the context of their communities and recognizing how sites are affected by their surroundings is the concept behind “Whole Place Preservation.”

In Drayton Hall’s case, McDaniel, a longtime educator, knew that preserving the plantation’s context to support place-based learning was critical to Drayton Hall’s survival long term, and that the Watson Hill development was a major threat to the site’s ability to engage its visitors. “When people visit Drayton Hall, they learn about our site’s history through verbal and written clues, obviously. But perhaps most importantly, they learn through the message that the site itself conveys. If we had jet skis zipping by on the banks of the river and high-rise hotels in the distance, our visitors’ learning would be impaired, and their connection to the site would be diminished.”

The same is true for visitors at most any historic site across the country, and that’s why historic sites need to put Whole Place Preservation front and center.

An aerial view of the Ashley River Region shows existing housing and commercial development east of Drayton Hall as well as the proposed Watson Hill development site. PHOTO COURTESY OF DRAYTON HALL.
Monticello Preserves Its Viewshed

Many other battles are being fought across America in an effort to achieve Whole Place Preservation. One notable example of partners allied for viewshed protection occurred at Monticello, Thomas Jefferson’s home in Virginia (the only home in America on UNESCO’s World Heritage list). In 2008 the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, which owns and operates Monticello, signed an agreement with the Piedmont Environmental Council to preserve as open space, in perpetuity, 150 acres on Montalto, the neighboring mountain that rises 410 feet above Monticello. There are no more important views to preserve from Monticello than those up to Montalto, Jefferson’s “high mountain.”

When the mountaintop first came on the market at $20 million in 2003, there weren’t many interested parties and the threat seemed minimal. When the price dropped to $15 million a year later and there were reports of strong interest in the development community, the Foundation decided that it had to act, and bought the mountain for the full purchase price, thus incurring debt and necessitating the immediate launch of a capital campaign. The president and CEO of the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Leslie Greene Bowman, recalls the campaign to save the viewshed of the site as the “high-water mark of the Foundation’s ongoing efforts to safeguard the historic and scenic nature of the views from Monticello.” In this instance, Bowman explains, protecting land once owned by Jefferson was clearly in line with Monticello’s mission. “Land stewardship is a typically Jeffersonian concept. In our case, acquiring Montalto was a very natural extension for us of the work we were already doing at Monticello. This campaign underscored our ongoing commitment to the preservation of context of this highly significant site.”

Now Jefferson’s “high mountain” is used by the Foundation for events and interpretation and will forever be preserved. Guests of the site at last year’s Heritage Harvest Festival, held atop the mountain, marveled at the sublime view down the mountain to the home and truly understood the role the mountain played in preserving the authenticity of the site.
PRESERVATION, CONSERVATION, AND COMMUNITY INTERESTS CONVERGE

For the first time on the state level, one proposed development endangered several nationally recognized historic sites and some of the most important wildlife habitat in the South Carolina Lowcountry. While the most obvious partnerships were between the three major historic sites that lined the Ashley River Road, a regional conservation group, the Coastal Conservation League, proved to be one of the most important allies in the fight. The threat pushed the preservationists and conservationists beyond their traditional partnerships and onto new ground, proving to each group the necessity of the other.

Dana Beach, the director of the Coastal Conservation League (CCL), had spent years working in the Ashley River Region with landowners and developers, helping people make conservation-minded decisions about their property. Beach had poured resources into the area and wasn’t going to let one developer threaten the progress that had been made in the fragile region. Beyond the development itself, Beach and his group were worried about its larger impact on the region, also referred to as the “ACE Basin,” named after the Ashepoo, Combahee, and Edisto Rivers. Beach says, “Had Watson Hill come to pass, more than two decades of private and public conservation investment in the ACE Basin would have been jeopardized. It was essential that environmental and habitat conservation groups joined forces with historic preservation advocates to secure the Ashley River. This is clearly a model for large-scale landscape-level protection here and elsewhere.”

SHARED CONCERNS LAUNCH A GRASSROOTS CAMPAIGN

Whole Place Preservation, by its very definition, must involve partnerships, as preservationists look outward to find nontraditional allies. Far too often, historians think saving important landmarks or stopping development within a site’s viewshed should be reason enough for the public to heed a call to action. Fortunately in some cases it is, but in many situations the preservation argument alone isn’t sufficient to start a genuine grassroots movement. Looking beyond preservation in its purest form and tying it in to real-world concerns such as increased traffic, higher taxes, school overcrowding, and loss of quality of life can bring people into the fray who have never allied with preservationists before. In the case of Drayton Hall, this intersection of interests proved to be the foundation on which the campaign was built.

Drayton Hall and CCL knew that most residents would oppose Watson Hill if these allies could prove that the development would hurt residents where it counted most—their pocketbooks. So the partners hired University of South Carolina economists who produced an

THE THREAT PUSHED the preservationists and conservationists beyond their traditional partnerships and onto new ground, proving to each group the necessity of the other.
Petroglyph National Monument Connects With Community

While not every battle ends in a victory, even losses can provide lessons. An example of this is recounted by Diane Souder, chief of interpretation and outreach for Petroglyph National Monument. A National Park owned cooperatively by the City of Albuquerque, the State of New Mexico, and the National Park Service, the site battled constantly against unmanaged growth as residential areas illegally encroached on its lands. In 1996 a special appropriations bill went through Congress, removing 8.5 acres of land from the park’s boundary to allow for a four- to six-lane freeway.

“The issue was incredibly divisive,” says Souder. “Homebuilders wanted to open up more lands for development, some local residents wanted shorter commutes to the other side of the river, and others wanted to protect the traditional cultural landscape and monument resources. Because the issue was precedent-setting for all National Park sites, the Sierra Club, The Nature Conservancy, Tribal Councils, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and others worked to stop the road, but lost the battle after seven years.

“In the face of defeat, the Park Service set out to heal the community’s wounds. Before the road issue, our employees were advised not to wear their uniforms out in public. Now they go to schools, business openings, and Indian festivals, and are an integral part of the community. During the summers, they knock on every door in the surrounding neighborhoods as part of our new urban outreach. We also use the incident in our interpretation and educational programs, teaching the concept of stewardship so that when children grow up they will help protect the natural and cultural resources of the Petroglyph and other National Parks and monuments.”

After losing 8.5 acres of land at the Petroglyph National Monument to allow for a new freeway, Park Service employees have stepped up efforts to educate residents about the importance of stewardship to protect the Petroglyph and other National Monuments. PHOTO BY GEORGE MCDANIEL
economic assessment showing that the development would mean higher taxes for everyone in the county. After the results of the study were published, taxpayers associations jumped on the bandwagon to help protect their constituents. Neighborhood associations that had little contact with their historic-site neighbors joined forces, and a true grassroots campaign was born.

Once the community was on board with the anti-Watson Hill agenda, Drayton Hall, CCL, the Historic Charleston Foundation, Middleton Place, Magnolia Plantation & Gardens, Summerville Preservation Society, and others embarked upon a full-fledged grassroots campaign involving print and broadcast media, public hearings, and local rallies. Knowing that the pockets of the developers ran much deeper than those of the local nonprofits who were footing the bill for the campaign, the allies decided that their movement had to be more strategic than simply a negative campaign against this specific development. They needed to be taking steps to protect the Ashley River Historic District in its entirety and in perpetuity. That meant a comprehensive ordinance that would limit the density of development while also providing guidelines on buffers and different uses along the historic corridor.

After more than three years of contentious public meetings the ordinance was passed, to the consternation of the developers and others who saw the immense forests of the region as the perfect place for new high-density development. The ordinance limited density on the Watson Hill site to 825 units for the 3,300 acres of available uplands (the rest being wetlands), which was a far cry from the 5,000 homes originally proposed.

Extensive media outreach was critical to winning supporters for the grassroots campaign to protect the Ashley River Region. Here George McDaniel, director of Drayton Hall, speaks at a press conference.
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THE CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL SUPPORT

The lesson here was clear to the allies in the Ashley River Region: politics count. Despite having “right” on one’s side, if you don’t have the votes on the decision-making council, you lose. Winning political support required long-term political engagement, an education campaign to inform the public about alternatives to suburban sprawl and costs of unmanaged growth, and efforts by nonprofit preservation organizations to build and sustain a constituency for historic preservation.

A SURPRISING TURN OF EVENTS

Finally, in January of 2009, the partners in this fight got some shocking news. The developers of Watson Hill were bankrupt and the bank was moving ahead to foreclose on the property. That meant a public auction, and perhaps a new and even more determined developer. With this newest twist in the case, the allies took immediate action and contacted MeadWestvaco, the previous owner of Watson Hill. The company had since stopped selling its property in the...
Lowcountry and instead embarked upon a new venture to show shareholders increased revenues: It had decided that its bottom line would be better served by keeping its large property holdings and developing them. MeadWestvaco joined forces with local conservationists and worked to develop a master plan for its 70,000-acre property called “East Edisto”—land that happened to be adjacent to Watson Hill. After the Watson Hill developers went bankrupt, MeadWestvaco announced plans to buy back Watson Hill and fold it into East Edisto.

LESSONS LEARNED
Looking back on the entire saga, McDaniel and the other partners in the fight realized that this case study could serve as a valuable model for nonprofits and historic sites across the country, to guide them in addressing similar issues in their own communities.

McDaniel says that one of the most important characteristics of the team at Drayton Hall was its ability to act quickly in response to the Watson Hill threat. “We felt strongly that [Drayton Hall’s] strategic plan should include preservation of the region, so that when issues like this arose, our response to them would be a clear part of our strategy for the site. Instead of asking, ‘Is the Watson Hill issue something we need to respond to?’ we made clear to our staff that this issue was going to become a top priority, and an ‘all hands on deck’ priority at that.”

Added to this was Drayton Hall’s status as a National Trust for Historic Preservation Site. National Trust staff helped the Drayton Hall team articulate the campaign vision, mission, and goals that were necessary to forge common bonds with stakeholders, guide the disparate groups, anticipate obstacles, and mobilize accordingly. Historic sites that may not have the distinct advantage of being part of a national organization can still benefit by working to develop strategic partnerships with local and regional groups that can provide needed expertise and resources to strengthen their planning and advocacy efforts.

Although Drayton Hall took a leadership role, the four-year campaign
evolved and developed along the way, and Drayton Hall had to alter its role accordingly. “Although we jumped into the fray immediately,” says McDaniel, “we quickly realized the importance of adjusting our role as specific instances called for different competencies. This campaign necessitated a multi-leader, multi-pronged approach, and we were changing tack every week. That strategy allowed for a number of different voices to be heard and for a grassroots campaign to emerge. As in life, Watson Hill demanded that we be willing to lead, and also be willing to follow.”

Although this drawn-out campaign was a drain on the nonprofit’s budget, the team at Drayton Hall came to understand its profound and enduring importance: Its value became clear as Drayton Hall came to be recognized as a leader in the community. With one highly publicized campaign, Drayton Hall was able to change the common misconception that preservationists are focused solely on the past.

The larger public saw Drayton Hall helping to negotiate decisions for the community based on the future of the region, and the site was able to connect to constituencies that had previously been regarded as outside of the purview of a house museum. Today, a greater number of stakeholders now view the historic site within the larger context of their community and the region, not separate and apart from it.

“Drayton Hall realized that conservation interests and preservation interests are not mutually exclusive; in fact, in many cases they’re inseparable,” McDaniel recounts. “The Watson Hill threat, now abated, actually has been a blessing in disguise for our site, and has helped us forge a new path forward while many sites around the country are struggling to remain relevant. We established a meaningful place for ourselves within the community and developed relationships with other organizations that are invaluable as we move into Drayton Hall’s next chapter.”

This case study provides a striking model for how historic sites can pursue Whole Place Preservation. It shows the importance and the imperative for historic sites to look beyond their property boundaries and to engage their local communities. Win or lose, context-sensitive preservation can generate new thinking and discussion within the preservation community on how sites can maintain their relevance in the face of declining admissions, federal budget cuts, and a depressed economy. “Drayton Hall was seen as a bit of a renegade a few decades back with the battles we chose to fight,” McDaniel says. “But our examples have become more and more mainstream, and I see sites across the country engaging their communities and negotiating their future like never before. Context-sensitive preservation must become a fundamental part of the mainstream preservation movement as we negotiate the role of these sites in the 21st-century.”

WITH ONE HIGHLY PUBLICIZED campaign, Drayton Hall was able to change the common misconception that preservationists are focused solely on the past.

EMILY C. PACK is the Ashley River Region coordinator at Drayton Hall. Taking a Whole Place Preservation approach, she works for the preservation and conservation of Drayton Hall and its environs as well as the entire Ashley River Region.
Make No Little Plans: Community Planning for Whole Places

ROBERTA LANE

Preservationists spend a lot of time talking about silos. Occasionally we’re speaking literally, about the latest fight to save the grain storage facilities that are sentinels of our countryside. But as often as not, we’re puzzling over proverbial silos, and how best to break out of them to connect with people with similar interests. Preservation combines so many disciplines, and we’re striving to have an influence in all different spheres. We all know there is untapped potential for creativity and new efficiencies in this diversity, if we talk, plan, and work together more routinely. Because we also know how difficult it is to achieve that (and because we lack a new metaphor), we keep working our way out of those silos.

The idea that preservation and conservation should be in closer league is not new. In some places—including most places abroad—it’s standard practice to save places comprehensively, coordinating protection of significant historic, cultural, natural, and social values to nurture more sustainable and livable communities. In more limited forms and instances, comprehensive protection does have a foothold in this country, most obviously as the basis of our national parks and many state parks systems.

But just as preservation contends with fragmentation within the field, it is still common for the natural resource conservation realm to be very disconnected from historic preservation in the U.S. Significant resources of all sorts are lost through this gap.

Community planning is one of the best and simplest ways for people to embark on understanding and caring for places more comprehensively. Community planning takes many forms, but all emphasize a collaborative approach, public input, big thinking, and a long view. The process, at its best, asks a community to take ownership of its future, and to reconcile conflicting or competing priorities.

People love places wholly, and are losing them quickly. Threats such as unmanaged sprawl and climate change are indiscriminate and will affect all the elements that make places special. If we’re focused narrowly on shoring a farmstead’s towering outbuilding, but we’re not working in concert with those who are trying to keep that same farm in productive use, or with the group that wants to save the habitat and watercourse just beyond the fields, we all lose.

Through community planning, preservationists can join the public and our conservation counterparts in celebrating and safeguarding whole places. Many around the country are rising to this challenge with profound results.

PUTTING THE “COMPREHENSIVE” IN COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

The comprehensive plan is the backbone of community land-use planning, setting forth policy and a roadmap toward the locality’s vision of its future. Many states now require or provide incentives for municipalities to develop and regularly update
a comprehensive plan. Clearly, some communities are far better than others in their process and product, and without a commitment to implementation, the plan alone will not get communities on the right track. Thoughtful outreach, broad public participation, and open collaboration are the hallmarks of a plan that’s truly comprehensive, and these elements are especially crucial for ensuring that resource protection provisions of a plan have meaning and lasting influence.

It would be reasonable to expect that comprehensive planning would be built on both comprehensive collaboration and a comprehensive view of place that includes cultural, natural, and social values. Those that rest on this assumption are taking a big risk, though. Unless the work has been done to sensitize a community to the importance and vulnerability of natural and cultural resources, the plan may de-emphasize resource protection—a major missed opportunity.

That said, such plans typically do include sections on natural resource conservation or the environment, often combined with discussions of parks and/or open space. In some cases the treatment of cultural resources, heritage, or neighborhood preservation is included in that same section. Sometimes it occupies its own section; sometimes it’s left out entirely. A community character section may be included to capture a range of issues that includes historic and cultural resources.

In any event, because they are working to minimize the same threats, and to save treasured places, it makes sense for conservationists and preservationists to be in synch at some level through the comprehensive plan process, without regard for section structures and titles. When advocates and community leaders work past defined asset types, and talk instead about whole places of value, they can build enthusiasm for a unified vision of community livability and character that is much more inspiring than asking stakeholders to engage in any one aspect of resource protection for its own sake.

**TRUE COLLABORATION**

For community plan provisions to be effective, the groups developing the sections on natural and cultural resources need to have real diversity of experience and commitment to the process, they need access to expertise in best practices, and they need to involve the public and get input and buy-in specifically on resource protection goals.

A meeting of conservation and preservation minds in this context invites ambitious solutions. If a need for resource surveys or inventories is identified on both sides, the groups can consider whether a cooperative project makes sense. If both realize that funding will be needed for voluntary protection of the most significant and vulnerable resources of each type, they are already situated to work together on a potent funding concept with broad appeal. And if, as is commonly true, both heritage and natural values are threatened by unmanaged growth, they can work together to help the community identify appropriate land-use planning solutions that achieve multiple protection goals.¹

The rewards of this approach are exemplified in the *Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan*, produced by Pima County, Ariz.,

---

which includes Tucson. By the late 1990s there was increasing concern about how to deal with intense growth pressure in a region of treasured history, cultural richness, and highly significant and sensitive natural resources. The County proceeded to convene a large group of experts and embarked on years of public education and participation meetings, ultimately producing an award-winning plan that grounded its land-use recommendations on an in-depth, systematic study of conservation and cultural preservation needs. Among the many fruits of the plan, in 2004 a bond issue of $175 million was overwhelmingly approved by voters, for use in implementing the acquisition recommendations of the plan, which include open space, land conservation, and cultural heritage targets.2

**COLLABORATION AT ALL STAGES**

When thinking broadly about natural, cultural, and social values, there are some key stages in comprehensive planning that can make all the difference: 1) at the outset, in setting the stage for community character and resource protection to be understood and fairly considered in the course of the process; 2) during the public participation phases, while talking to the community about resource values, threats, and protection tools; and 3) in ensuring that resource protection goals are integrated with one another and with the rest of the plan, both during development and finalization of the plan.

Preservationists and conservationists working together early in the process are uniquely able to help raise a community’s aspirations for their plan. When this works, a planning project with humble origins—maybe launched to comply with a state requirement, or to update an obsolete zoning map—becomes a process that uncovers and realizes a shared, cohesive vision for sustaining quality of life in a place over time.

An example of this kind of transcendent plan was created by Routt County, Colo. The county is defined in part by the Yampa Valley, and includes the city of Steamboat Springs and several other historic towns, set among ranches, vast public lands, and mountain ridges. By the 1990s, rapid growth was consuming open space around the county faster than ever before, affecting delicate natural systems. New housing, roads, and sprawling commercial development were creeping in and diluting the rural character and farming heritage of the countryside.

In 2007 the county government embarked on a planning process, *Routt County Vision 2030*, with the explicit goal of discovering and sustaining the values at the county’s “heart and soul.” Supported by the Orton Family Foundation, *Vision 2030* aimed high, and used new community visioning technologies and polling techniques to draw out residents’ hopes for the future, grounded in their specific experiences, challenges, and joys of living in the place.

By focusing intently on the values about which stakeholders felt most strongly, including collecting memories and impressions of life in Yampa Valley, the county government ended up with a plan that has strong emphasis on conserving the interwoven elements that make up community character. While the plan includes a section on agricultural and open space issues, one on heritage, and another on sustainability, it captures the commonalities among these

---

**COMMUNITIES HAVE TO GATHER and analyze all kinds of information to properly develop and realize their community visions, captured in a variety of plans and reports beyond the comprehensive plan.**
elements, too, as in a prominent recommendation in the sustainability section that prioritizes reuse of historic and existing built elements to conserve resources.\(^3\)

Building collaboration on resource protection also comes in handy once the community is implementing a comprehensive plan. It’s a disappointing reality that local decision-makers sometimes ignore policies laid out in comprehensive plans, failing to support the community values articulated in the plans and undermining the public’s faith in its leadership and in planning as a tool. It’s in the interest of everyone who supports a comprehensive planning process that the plan be upheld once adopted. When conservationists and preservationists have built a strong coalition in the course of planning, they can provide a much more powerful and united voice against divergence from the plan down the line.

Whether they are building a case to get resource protection included in the comprehensive plan at all, working to ensure that the included sections have vision and depth, or pushing for the plan to be put into action, advocates for both land and historic places will be more effective when they stand together for the communities’ most sensitive and significant sites as whole places.

**BEYOND COMPREHENSIVE PLANS: DEVELOPING DATA AND DETAILS**

Communities have to gather and analyze all kinds of information to properly develop and realize their community visions, captured in a variety of plans and reports beyond the comprehensive plan. These range from broad-based regional studies down to plans that address in detail the treatment of specific places, such as preservation plans for individual districts or sites.

Regardless of the scope of the plan, there can be benefits to taking a holistic approach to protecting a place. One reason historic preservationists and land conservationists might consider working together on these plans is that we have analogous approaches to understanding the resources of concern in a given area. The land conservation movement has put great emphasis, in recent years, on pursuing strategic protection of the most sensitive and critical land areas, which starts with surveying and mapping those places. Preservationists too, of course, start with survey work, but in some places...
we have some catching up to do before we will be able to put our own GIS-based local map layers of historic resources into the mix along with GIS-based data of our land conservation counterparts.

In Jefferson County, W.Va., the Conservation Fund and Freshwater Institute worked with the county planning commission and community members through 2008 to generate a Green Infrastructure Assessment, including mapping and prioritizing the most valued natural and cultural heritage resources throughout the county. The process allowed the public to participate in and understand the survey work, and gave leaders an integrated picture of the county’s greatest gems.4

**LEADING THE PLANNING CHARGE**
By leading community planning efforts, nonprofit advocacy organizations can have a profound impact on the future of the communities they serve. The Land Trust for Tennessee launched the Duck River Highlands Project to facilitate a far-reaching public consideration of whole places. The Duck River region is replete with historic farmsteads, country churches, and a vital ecosystem. Around every bend, it’s clear that the land was shaped by history, and history by the land.

Rather than leave out an important part of the region’s story, the land trust worked with area residents to survey and assess both natural and historic resources, and then develop options for protecting them. Supported in part by a grant from the Tennessee Historical Commission, the project’s 2005 findings and recommendations have guided subsequent protection work of the land trust, as well as area land-use planning efforts.5

Meanwhile, on the shore of the Hudson River in New York, rapid development threatened to erode the historic character of a nationally significant landscape. The American victory in the Revolutionary War hinged on the defeat of General Burgoyne at the Battle of Saratoga in 1777. With the intact battlefield landscape and surrounding historic and scenic resources under threat,
Saratoga P.L.A.N. (Preserving Land and Nature) reached out to promote coordination among the many concerned community groups arrayed along the length of the Old Saratoga corridor.

The Old Saratoga on the Hudson project focused on waterfront revitalization, viewshed and farmland protection, and creation of parks and trails to ensure public access to the area. With funding from the state and from the American Battlefield Protection Program, Saratoga P.L.A.N. inventoried the significant historic and scenic sites in the region and developed a preservation plan for protecting them and their landscape context.6

**PLANNING FOR PLACES IN THE BALANCE**

When the fate of an important place is uncertain, and there’s a fair amount of time in which to act, advocates can move toward a big save by organizing a community planning effort. In many cases, the planning process provides the perfect framework for building a coalition, raising public awareness of the threat, and involving the community in developing alternatives. The scope of the project should embrace all the elements of the place that inspire the community’s regard.

A coordinated approach can help small communities turn large and complex resource challenges into remarkable opportunities. The Badger Army Ammunition Plant in Sauk County, in south-central Wisconsin, was opened in 1942 and now occupies more than 7,000 acres in this rural prairie region. When the U.S. Army announced plans to close the facility and transfer ownership, community members rose to the challenge of finding a use for some of its resources which would benefit the public. Authorized by the Sauk County Board of Supervisors in 2000, and with involvement of the Ho-chunk Nation, area municipal leaders, preservationists, conservationists, and a wide range of community members, the Badger Reuse Plan was produced, and the Sauk Prairie Conservation Alliance created.7 Just this summer, transfer began in accordance with the plan, as 2,000 acres were acquired for conservation as a state park.

Dorothea Dix State Hospital sits on a campus of more than 300 acres in Raleigh, N.C. With the hospital closing at the end of 2010, a grassroots effort to save the property has united those keenly interested in the reuse of the historic hospital structures with conservationists and parks advocates focused on turning its grounds into an urban oasis. To mobilize the community and block concepts that would allow private development on much of the campus, the Friends of the Dorothea Dix Park worked with a cross-section of groups to produce a plan that would preserve the whole campus as a park, a plan that has become the rallying cry for the coalition of advocates.

**PLANNING FOR THE NATION’S BEST**

Our National Heritage Areas provide one of our most successful models for addressing whole places through community planning. The management planning process that begins after a National Heritage Area is authorized can really be viewed as community planning for natural and cultural resources, writ large. To develop its management plan, each National Heritage Area is charged with doing public outreach and gathering input, using resource surveys to understand the assets, and formulating a plan to educate the public and to promote the area’s tourism and recreation sites.
A 180-mile stretch through Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia contains one of the country’s richest concentrations of nationally significant and deeply compelling scenic, historic, and natural places. Known as the Journey Through Hallowed Ground for the area’s historic battlefields and solemn sites, it is also one of the fastest-growing parts of the country. As threats to and losses of this historic landscape have dogged the region, a partnership among localities, grassroots groups, preservation and conservation agencies and organizations, and many others grew to raise awareness of the area as a cohesive heritage tourism destination, as well as an endangered place.

The corridor was listed by the National Trust for Historic Preservation as one of America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places in 2005. Yet its future is uncertain, as proposals are made in the area for everything from an electricity transmission corridor to a casino. In 2008, though, the corridor was designated a National Heritage Area, giving rise to a management plan process that, at last, asked communities to help envision the future of the place in its remarkable entirety, including conservation and preservation strategies.

CONCLUSION
Both preservationists and conservationists are working to understand, promote, and protect irreplaceable assets, for a livable, sustainable world. We’re also contending with the same threats. With common goals and common obstacles, we’re smarter and more successful when we plan together.

By viewing places as whole systems and addressing threats more effectively, these planning efforts do more to reinforce growth management, heritage tourism, and economic revitalization goals, as well. Because we’re talking about places in the same way people actually see them, we are able to connect with others on a new level. And not incidentally, in planning with conservationists, we’re learning from one another about precious resources and the tools and approaches needed to protect them.

ROBERTA LANE is the senior program officer and regional attorney in the National Trust’s Northeast Office.

1 Some of the planning mechanisms that appear in comprehensive plan recommendations allow communities to advance planning priorities very affirmatively. Tools such as Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs and growth boundaries are highly valuable, but also complex, and they can have unintended consequences if they’re developed without adequate care and foresight. Unless these types of programs are designed with protection of historic and natural resources in mind, they could negatively affect them. An established working relationship between preservation and conservation interests means they can work together to ensure that programs like these direct growth in ways that will generally benefit both heritage and natural values, rather than burdening either.

3 Routt County Vision 2030, March 2009.
5 Duck River Highlands Project, Land Trust for Tennessee, 2005.
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