



**STATE OF ARIZONA  
AGENCY HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
COMPLIANCE  
PERFORMANCE REPORT**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016**

Prepared by the  
State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)

# Arizona State Parks

# 2015 REPORT ON STATE AGENCY PERFORMANCE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

## INTRODUCTION

Arizona Revised Statutes §41-861 through §41-864 (or the State Historic Preservation Act) direct state agencies to: preserve historic properties under their ownership or control; consider the use of historic properties for agency responsibilities; establish a program to locate, inventory, and nominate properties to the Arizona Register of Historic Places; insure that properties are not destroyed or substantially altered by state action or assistance; make appropriate documentation in accordance with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) standards if a property is to be destroyed or altered; and seek review and comment from the SHPO on agency plans. The terms "historic property" or "historic properties," as cited within the State Historic Preservation Act, refer to properties that are eligible for, or listed on, the Arizona Register of Historic Places.

This report provides a summary of the performance of state agencies in compliance with these state statutes. The information provided was compiled from an agency self-evaluation questionnaire designed by the SHPO (**Appendix A**) for FY 2015-2016. Table 1 (**Appendix B**) lists the 20 agencies that responded to the survey questionnaire.

## **A.R.S. 41-861 AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES**

The chief administrator of each state agency is responsible for the preservation of historic properties, which are owned or controlled by the agency. Prior to acquiring, constructing or leasing buildings for purposes of carrying out agency responsibilities, each agency shall consider the use of historic buildings. Each agency shall undertake any preservation necessary to carry out this article in a manner consistent with the preservation of historic properties, the duties of the agency and professional standards, which the state historic preservation officer recommends. The chief administrator of a state agency may designate a full-time employee to coordinate the agency's activities under this article.

Agencies were asked if they had incorporated historic preservation into their internal planning. All 20 agencies responded to this question, and a total of 80% (n=16) of the agencies indicated that they had incorporated historic preservation in their agency planning. This is a slight decrease from last year's survey. When queried if they had included historic preservation in their agencies' plans, 13 of the 20 agencies (65%) responded affirmatively; this figure is virtually static from last year's survey results

(63%). General reasons given for not incorporating historic preservation compliance into an agency's general planning processes indicated that the agencies believed that this endeavor did not apply to them, because they do not "own, control or reside in" any historic properties.

A total of 65% (n=13) of the respondents indicated that historic preservation was included in agency policies, procedures, or regulations, again, virtually static with last year's results. A total of 11 agencies (55%) stated that they had incorporated historic preservation into their applications or agreements. This figure represents an 8% increase in positive responses when compared to last year's survey (47%).

Agencies were asked if they had designated an employee to coordinate the agency's historic preservation responsibilities. Responses (**Appendix C, Table 2**) indicate that 80% (n=16) of agencies had designated such an employee; this figure represents an 4% decrease from last year's survey results. Many of the agencies that responded in the negative stated that they believed the statute was not applicable, and thus did not need to have a dedicated staff person to oversee their agency's historic preservation requirements. Among agencies that had designated a historic preservation coordinator, only 13% (n=2) indicated that the employee was committed full-time to preservation activities, also a decrease from last year. When asked how many of these agencies also had additional staff devoted to historic preservation compliance, eight (50%) responded in the positive.

In an effort to ascertain if agencies were hiring qualified individuals to direct their historic preservation activities, agencies were asked if these coordinators met the Arizona State Museum (State of Arizona) standards or the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Standards for history, architecture, or archaeology. Of the 16 agencies with a dedicated employee, only 8 hired professionals that met these qualifications. This figure represents an increase relative to the figures from FY 2014-2015, but still suggests that agencies are slow in acquiring professionals that are knowledgeable in the areas of expertise needed to adequately comply with the State Historic Preservation Act. Some agencies stated that they did not feel the law was applicable to them because they do not manage any historic properties, and thus hiring qualified preservation professionals was not required of them. One agency stated that they do not have the funding available to hire and train dedicated staff.

When asked how many historic preservation projects or activities they conducted, sponsored, funded, etc. during FY 2015-16, 18 agencies responded. Of these, 72% (n=13) responded that they had between 1 and 5 projects/activities, 22% (n=4) had between 11-50 projects, and one agency had between 51-100 projects.

Table 3 (**Appendix D**) summarizes agency use of historic period buildings. When asked if they had considered the use of historic properties available to them prior to

acquiring, constructing, or leasing buildings for purposes of carrying out their responsibilities, 60% (n=12) responded that they had. When asked if they had acquired, leased or constructed buildings to carry out their responsibilities, a total of 30% (n=6) of agencies indicated that they had; this figure represents only a slight decrease of 2% from last year's survey.

## **A.R.S 41-862 PROGRAM**

**In cooperation with the state historic preservation officer, each state agency shall establish a program to locate, inventory and nominate to the Arizona Register of Historic Places all properties under the agencies ownership or control that appear to meet the criteria for inclusion on the register. Each state agency shall exercise caution to insure that the property is not inadvertently transferred, sold, demolished, substantially altered or allowed to deteriorate significantly.**

Pursuant to A.R.S 41-862, agencies were asked to provide information on their program to locate, inventory, and nominate to the Arizona Register of Historic Places all properties under the agency's ownership or control that appear to meet the criteria for inclusion on the Register. Responses (**Appendix E, Table 4**) stated that 50% (n=10) of agencies had such programs; this represents a slight increase of 8% from last year's survey. However, only 25% (n=5) of the agencies had conducted survey or inventory to identify Arizona Register-eligible properties – a 12% decrease from the previous year. In addition, only two of the agencies had determined at least one property eligible for the Register in consultation with the SHPO, (this is half the number of agencies from last year's survey), and only one agency had actually nominated a property to the Arizona Register during FY 2015-2016.

## **A.R.S. 41-863 RECORDS**

**Each state agency shall initiate measures, in consultation with the state historic preservation officer, to assure that if, as a result of state action or assistance given by the agency, historic property is to be substantially altered or demolished, timely steps are taken to make appropriate documentary recordation with standards which the state historic preservation officer establishes. The agency shall deposit the records with the Department of Library, Archives and Public Records and with the state historic preservation officer for future use and reference.**

A total of 25% (n=5) of the agencies (**Appendix F, Table 5**) provided information on measures that they initiated, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, to make appropriate documentary recordation of any historic properties that were, or will be, demolished or substantially altered due to agency action; this is almost identical with last year's survey results. These agencies provided information on the submittal of these documents to the required archival repository – i.e., the SHPO and/or the Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records. A total of two

agencies included archaeological recordation, three agencies gathered historical information. Three agencies included state level architectural documentation, and one agency undertook documentation meeting the federal standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS). Only one agency indicated that they had not submitted the documentation performed on or for these historic properties to the required archival repository. Two agencies reported that a Register-listed property was destroyed or substantially altered in the past Fiscal Year.

## **A.R.S. 41-864 REVIEW OF AGENCY PLANS**

**The state historic preservation officer has thirty working days in which to review and comment on any plans of a state agency, which involve property which is included on or may qualify for inclusion on the Arizona Register of Historic Places, including any construction projects, sale, lease or acquisition of historic properties, to insure that the prehistoric, historical, architectural or cultural significant values will be preserved or enhanced.**

As per A.R.S. 41-864, agencies were surveyed on whether they solicited review and comment from the SHPO on agency plans involving properties either listed on, or eligible for, the Arizona Register of Historic Places, including any construction project, sale, lease or acquisition of a historic property. A total of five (25%) of the 20 agencies that responded stated that they had solicited review and comment by the SHPO on planned agency projects or actions. This figure represents a significant decrease of 17% from last year's responses.

Three agencies reported that their plans would have, or did have, negative impacts on Register-eligible properties. A total of two agencies indicated that their plans had, or would have, positive physical impacts or enhancements to Register-eligible properties; this is identical to last year..

Tribal consultation can help an agency better inventory, document, and manage prehistoric and historic aboriginal properties. Only four (20%) of the agencies stated that they had consulted with Tribes as per their Tribal Consultation Plans required by Executive Order 2006-14. This percentage is a slight decrease (6%) from last year's response (26%), indicating little change, in general, in the number of agencies consulting with Tribes.

State agencies were asked additional questions regarding their historic preservation activities, planning, and funding. The Statewide Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) produced by the SHPO was updated in 2014; it is available on the SHPO pages of the Arizona State Parks' website, under "Publications." The HPP contains a set of guidelines that reflect a consensus as to the state of cultural resource management and the public's perspective on historic preservation issues. When queried as to

whether they took advantage of this existing guidance document and utilized the HPP, 60% (n=12) of the agencies responded affirmatively (**Appendix H, Table 7**). This figure represents an increase of 7% in the number of agencies utilizing the Statewide HPP when compared with last year's figures. When agencies were asked why they did not use the HPP, they cited various reasons that suggest that they are not familiar with it, or that they felt it was not applicable to them because they did not "own or control property." These responses suggest that they are not aware that the statewide HPP contains information about historic preservation that goes well beyond information just related to compliance with the State Historic Preservation Act.

Agencies provided information (**Appendix G, Table 6**) on the results of project evaluation and review, including any eligible properties negatively impacted or enhanced by agency plans/activities.

- The following **negative impacts** resulting from state agencies plans/projects/actions were described:

#### Arizona State University

ASU demolished one building, the Palo Verde Main Residence Hall. This historic property was demolished after conducting the appropriate historical documentation, in consultation with the SHPO.

#### Arizona State Parks

ASP demolished the historic Pendley Cabin at Slide Rock State Park after consultation with the SHPO.

#### Arizona State Land Department

Various projects on State Trust lands impacted eligible archaeological sites. These impacts were mitigated through data recovery and consultation with SHPO and other relevant consulting parties, such as Tribes.

- The following agencies described an **enhancement** of a historic property:

#### Arizona State University

Exterior rehabilitation was performed at the historic Phoenix Downtown Post Office, resulting in continued use of the building while preserving its historic character. Exterior rehabilitation work was also conducted on Old Main and the University Club. Additions to Gammage Auditorium were completed to increase the number of restrooms and to improve ADA access through the installation of two elevators. Consultation continues on plans for future University development at the prehistoric Midvale Site on the Polytechnic Campus – this site is a Traditional Cultural Property to the Gila River Indian Community and thus ASU is conducting tribal consultation, as

well as consulting with SHPO regarding preservation and data recovery work.

ASU also undertakes internal education/coordination with Facilities Development and Management Project Managers to insure that properties over 50 years old are evaluated for their eligibility and managed in accordance with the State Historic Preservation Act.

#### Arizona State Parks

Repairs, improvements, and stabilization efforts were conducted at various State Parks throughout the state.

ASP also coordinates, and participates in, the Arizona Site Steward Program, utilizing these valuable volunteers to monitor for impacts to cultural resources on ASP lands. The presence of Site Stewards at these sensitive heritage properties helps to curtail vandalism, looting, dumping, and other adverse impacts.

#### Arizona Department of Administration

ADOA put a new roof on the Carnegie Library Center in downtown Phoenix.

- Participation in other positive historic preservation opportunities:

#### Arizona Game and Fish Department

The AGFD has multiple, professionally qualified archaeologists on staff who mark archaeological site boundaries so that the sites will be avoided by project activities. They also create buffer zones around archaeological sites to enhance their protection, and the AGFD hires additional professional archaeologists when needed to survey and/or monitor sites and project areas.

#### **Arizona Site Steward Program**

Similar to last year's survey, when asked if they participated in the Arizona Site Steward Program during FY 2015-2016, only 25% (n=5) of the agencies stated that they take advantage of this valuable program for protecting significant cultural resources that they own or manage. However, this is an increase of 9% from the previous year, when only three agencies stated that they were utilizing the Site Steward Program.

#### **Grants for Historic Preservation Needs and/or Proactive Activities**

Identical to last year, only one of the state agencies that responded to the survey applied for any grants or funding in FY 2015-2016 that could aid them in implementing historic preservation endeavors. Arizona State Parks obtained a grant from the National Park Service to undertake rehabilitation at historic buildings.



## **Agency Training**

Throughout FY 2015-2016, the following training opportunities were offered by the SHPO and/or cooperating agencies and partners (e.g., the National Preservation Institute). A total of nine agencies indicated that they had attended some of these trainings; this is an increase from last year's survey results (n=4), potentially indicating that more agencies are seeing the importance of obtaining this valuable training for their staff that is involved in historic preservation activities.

### Training Sessions at the Historic Preservation Conference, Phoenix

Four respondents indicated that they attended this Conference and participated in the following sessions:

- A Conversation with the SHPO
- Sustainable Preservation of Historic Settings and Landscapes
- Current Issues in Historic Preservation

### Other Training Opportunities Attended

- Work Session: Government to Government Consultation with Tribes (coordinated by the SHPO) (Two attendees)
- National Preservation Institute (NPI) seminar on an introduction to the National Historic Preservation Act/Section 106 (Two attendees)

### Requests for Future Training Opportunities (in order of frequency of request):

- #1 Tribal issues and consultation
- #2 Compliance with the State Historic Preservation Act
- #2 Identification and evaluation of historic properties
- #2 Arizona Antiquities Act Compliance (includes state permitting requirements through the Arizona State Museum and use of the AZSITE database)
- #3 Compliance with National Historic Preservation Act/Section 106
- #4 Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation
- #4 How to nominate a property to the Arizona and National Registers of Historic Places
- #5 Historic building maintenance and rehabilitation: Common maintenance and rehabilitation techniques (adobe, brick repointing, reroofing, etc.) for facilities maintenance staff

At the end of the survey, agencies were given the opportunity to provide any additional information on their historic preservation programs and activities that were not covered by the survey questions, including any special achievements and/or awards. One agency, AGFD, responded that they were going to be hiring a second field archaeologist to assist with their compliance responsibilities.

## SUMMARY

When compared to previous years' surveys, the 2015-16 survey responses do not show a decrease in the amount of historic preservation work conducted by state agencies, as has been the pattern in the past. Responses indicate a slight, albeit almost static, increase in the number of agencies that are integrating historic preservation into their planning endeavors at many levels, and that are using the statewide Historic Preservation Plan (HPP). The increased use of the HPP is especially important, as the SHPO believes that utilization of the HPP can assist agencies in their historic preservation planning. Arizona's HPP was generated by the SHPO and incorporates the results of professionally-administered public surveys, as well as input from state and federal agencies, tribes, preservation organizations, and others. As statements of public policy in historic preservation, the HPP serves as a general-level guide for decision-making throughout the state, rather than as compilation of all that is known about the state's cultural resources. The Arizona HPP is important in:

- Identifying current and emerging historic preservation issues throughout the state;
- Establishing the vision, mission, and priorities for the SHPO;
- Identifying preservation goals for integrating historic preservation into broader planning and decision-making at local, regional, and state levels; and
- Identifying preservation partners and how their contributions are needed to accomplish the HPP's objectives, as well as compliance with state and federal historic preservation laws.

Levels of hiring dedicated staff positions to coordinate agencies' historic preservation responsibilities appear to have decreased slightly from last year's survey results. Additionally, most of these jobs are part-time or less, and are not filled by individuals that meet state and/or federal professional standards in history, archaeology, or architecture. Many agencies reported that their lack of dedicated staff was driven by the paucity of historic properties under agency ownership or control. Indeed agencies that manage programs (e.g., Housing, Agriculture) rather than land may have a more limited need for professional preservation assistance than agencies that manage lands, buildings and rights of ways (e.g., ADOT, AGFD, ASLD and ADOA). Employment of qualified staff to oversee an agency's historic preservation planning and activities is critical to assisting agencies in their compliance with the State Historic Preservation Act, and in preventing inadvertent damage to historic properties. The data from this survey indicate that SHPO should investigate options for enhancing training and providing consultative services to agencies that lack dedicated staff. With regard to staff training, agencies can take advantage of the multiple training venues on historic preservation laws and issues that are offered throughout the year, many of which are free of cost.

Awareness of the importance of utilizing and protecting Register-eligible/listed cultural properties, when possible, does not appear to have grown much through FY 2015-2016. The number of agencies with programs to locate, inventory, and nominate historic properties to the Arizona Register of Historic Places, depending upon the types of projects they undertook, funded, permitted, regulated, etc., increased slightly by 8% from the previous year. Again, depending on the type of actions undertaken, fewer agencies conducted surveys to identify historic properties, and fewer agencies actually determined at least one cultural resource as ARHP-eligible. As a result, there was a concomitant decrease (16%) in the number of agencies consulting with the SHPO for technical advice and expertise.

Only two agencies reported that they had conducted projects that enhanced Register-eligible/listed properties; this number represents a decrease by three agencies from last year's survey results. Additionally, few voluntary or proactive historic preservation endeavors were noted by the agencies that responded to the survey. It is possible that stronger efforts to seek out relevant grants can help agencies fund historic preservation needs; currently, only one agency was successful in obtaining a historic preservation grant. On the positive side, there was a 9% increase in the number of agencies utilizing the Arizona Site Steward Program administered by Arizona State Parks. This stewardship program is valuable for protecting significant cultural resources.

With regard to agencies' compliance with Executive Order 2006-14, on Tribal consultation, FY 2015-2016 saw a slight decrease in the number of state agencies engaging in Tribal consultation efforts with regards to historic preservation planning activities. Again, many agencies felt that this was only necessary if they owned a cultural property that was important to Tribes, whereas many Tribes are interested in learning about agency plans and/or actions that can adversely impact properties that have religious and cultural significance to them, regardless of whether or not an agency owns or controls those cultural resources. The recent establishment of the Governor's Office on Tribal Relations (GOTR) will undoubtedly have a positive effect in promoting state agency engagement in proactive consultation with the tribes with regard to not only historic preservation issues, but also with regard to agency planning and programming writ large. The GOTR is charged with assisting state agencies in implementing tribal consultation and outreach activities. SHPO will continue coordinating with GOTR to ensure that historic preservation planning is integrated into agencies' consultation policies.

In an effort to help agencies better understand, and comply with, the State Historic Preservation Act, staff of the State Historic Preservation Office is always available to

provide training on this statute. These trainings are provided at no cost to the agency, and can be tailored to assist specific agencies in their compliance responsibilities.

## Appendix A

### State agency survey questionnaire conducted through Survey Monkey:

1. Has your agency incorporated historic preservation into your agency planning?
  - 1.a. If yes, is historic preservation incorporated in: Agency plans? Agency policies, procedures, or regulations? Stipulations in applications or agreements? Other?
  - 1.b. If not, why not? (please specify)
2. Pursuant to A.R.S. 41-861 has your agency designated an employee to coordinate the agency's historic preservation responsibilities?
  - 2.a. If not, why not? (please specify)
  - 2.b. If yes, how much of this designee's work time is devoted to historic preservation activities?
  - 2.c. Please provide contact information of designee.
  - 2.d. Do you have additional staff devoted to historic preservation activities?
  - 2.e. Does this designee or any other staff, who are designated to work on historic preservation activities, meet the State of Arizona's standards or the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Standards for history, architecture, or archaeology?
  - 2.f. If not, why not? (please specify)
3. Approximately how many historic preservation projects/activities did your agency undertake this year that involved compliance with the State Historic Preservation Act?
4. Pursuant to A.R.S. 41-861, has your agency considered the use of historic properties available to the agency prior to acquiring, constructing, or leasing buildings for purposes of carrying out agency responsibilities?
  - 4.a. If not, why not?
  - 4.b. Did your agency acquire, lease, or construct buildings to carry out agency responsibilities in the last year?
  - 4.c. If yes, list any properties and their addresses that are 45 years or older that were acquired or leased in the last year.
5. Pursuant to A.R.S. 41-862, does your agency have a program to locate, inventory and nominate to the Arizona Register of Historic Places all properties under the agency's ownership or control that appear to meet the criteria for inclusion on the Register?
  - 5.a. If not, why not? (please specify)
  - 5.b. Did your agency conduct surveys or inventories to identify Arizona Register listed or eligible properties in this last year?
  - 5.c. If not, why not? (please specify)
  - 5.d. Did your agency, in consultation with the SHPO, determine any properties eligible for the Arizona Register or National Register in this last year?
  - 5.e. If yes, please list the properties. Archaeological sites should have site numbers and historic period properties should have addresses.
  - 5.f. Did your agency nominate any properties to the Arizona or National Registers in the last year?
  - 5.g. If yes, please list the properties. Archaeological sites should have site numbers and historic period properties should have addresses.
6. Pursuant to A.R.S. 41-863, did your agency take measures, in consultation with the SHPO, to make appropriate documentary recordation of any historic properties that were or will be demolished or substantially altered due to agency action?

- 6.a. If not, why not? (please specify)
- 6.b. If yes, what type of documentation? Archaeological (data recovery)? Ethnohistoric or Ethnographic? Historical/archival? State-level architectural? Historic American Building Survey? Historic American Engineering Record? Oral (historical) interviews?
- 6.c. Was the property that was substantially altered or destroyed listed on the Arizona or National Register of Historic Places?
- 6.d. If yes, please provide the name of the property. Archaeological sites should have site numbers and historic period properties should have addresses.
- 6.e. Has the documentation been submitted to the required archival repository? State Historic Preservation Office? Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records? If not, why not?
7. Pursuant to A.R.S. 41-864, has your agency solicited review and comment from the State Historic Preservation Officer on any agency plans that involve properties that are included on or may qualify for inclusion on the Arizona Register of Historic Places, including any construction projects, sales, permits, licenses, grants, leases or acquisitions of historic properties? If yes, please discuss.
- 7.a. If not, why not? (please specify)
- 7.b. Were any properties eligible for or listed on the Arizona or National Register of Historic Places negatively impacted by agency plans/actions?
- 7.c. Were any properties eligible for or listed on the Arizona or National Register enhanced by agency plans/actions?
- 7.d. Did any of your projects involve consultation with Indian Tribes in compliance with Executive Order 2006-14? If yes, please discuss.
8. Does your agency utilize the State Historic Preservation Plan produced by the SHPO?
- 8.a. If not, why not? (please specify)
- 8.b. The Arizona Site Steward Program is a free volunteer program coordinated by Arizona State Parks to help agencies protect and preserve Arizona and National Register properties through site/property monitoring and education. Does your agency participate in the Arizona Site Steward Program?
- 8.c. Has your agency applied for historic preservation grant funding in the last year to assist with acquisition, identification, evaluation, nomination, rehabilitation, or education activities?
- 8.d. If yes, did you receive funding?
- 8.e. If yes, from which of the following funding sources did you receive funding: (check all that apply). Grants from Tribes? Save America's Treasures? Historic Preservation Fund? Other?
- 8.f. Funding was awarded for (check all that apply): Protection/security? Survey/inventory? Assessment? Rehabilitation (buildings)? Nomination? Acquisition? Educational programming? Stabilization (archaeological sites)? Other?
- 8.g. Amount of funding?
9. List any other proactive activities undertaken by your agency or your contractor to protect, preserve or enhance Arizona Register listed or eligible properties.
10. If anyone from your agency has attended any of the following trainings offered by the SHPO and cooperating organizations/agencies in the last year, please indicate which training (check list).
- 10.a. If you attended the 2016 Historic Preservation Conference in Phoenix, which of the presentations listed below did you attend? (check list)

11. Please check any additional training needs. (check list)
12. Please provide any additional information on your agency's historic preservation program and activities not covered by the above questions, including special achievements and awards.

## Appendix B

**Table 1. Agencies that responded to the questionnaire.**

Arizona State Library, Archives, & Public Records (ASLAPR)
Northern Arizona University (NAU)
Arizona Historical Society (AHS)
Arizona Department of Real Estate (ADRE)
Arizona State Land Department (ASLD)
Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC)
University of Arizona (UA)
Arizona Department of Corrections (ADC)
Arizona Power Authority (APA)
Arizona Department of Health Services/State Hospital (ADHS)
Arizona Department of Housing (ADH)
Arizona Department of Agriculture (ADAG)
Arizona Game & Fish Department (AGFD)
State Mine Inspector (State Mine)
Arizona State Parks (ASP)
Arizona State School for the Deaf & Blind (ASDB)
Arizona State University (ASU)
Arizona Department of State (State)
Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA)
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ)



## Appendix C

Table 2. Employees designated to coordinated historic preservation activities.

Agency	Designated Cultural Resource Staff	Time	Other Staff	Staff Meeting Historic Preservation Professional Standards	Approx. Number of Projects/ Activities in 2014-15
ASLAPR	N		N		
NAU	Y	Part Time	N	N	1-5
AHS	Y	Part Time	Y	Y	1-5
ADRE	Y	Part Time	N	N	1-5
ASLD	Y	Full Time	Y	Y	51-100
ACC	Y	Part Time	N	N	1-5
UA	Y	Part Time	Y*	Y	1-5
ADC	Y	Part Time	N	N	1-5
APA	Y	Part Time	N	N	1-5
ADHS	Y	Part Time	N	Y	1-5
ADH	Y	Part Time	N	N	1-5
ADAG	N		N	N	11-50
AGFD	Y	Full Time	Y	Y	11-50
State Mine	N				
ASP	Y	Part Time	Y	Y	11-50
ASDB	Y	Part Time	Y	N	1-5
ASU	Y	Part Time	N	Y	11-50
State	Y	Part Time	Y	N	1-5
ADOA	Y	Part Time	Y	Y	1-5
ADEQ	Y	Part Time	N	N	1-5

N = No

Y = Yes

Blanks (not answered)

\*UA has a 7-member Historic Preservation Advisory Commission

## Appendix D

**Table 3. Summary of agencies' use of historic buildings.**

<b>Agency</b>	Considers the Use of Historic Buildings	Acquired, Leased or Constructed Buildings	Historic Property Acquired or Leased
ASLAPR	N	N	
NAU	Y	Y	1
AHS	Y	Y	2
ADRE	Y	N	
ASLD	Y	N	
ACC	N	N	
UA	Y	Y	3
ADC	Y	N	
APA	N	N	
ADHS	Y	N	
ADH	N	N	
ADAG	N	N	
AGFD	Y	Y	4
State Mine	N	N	
ASP	Y	Y	5
ASDB	N	N	
ASU	Y	Y	6
State	Y	N	
ADOA	Y	N	
ADEQ	N	N	

1 = South Beaver School, Flagstaff

2 = Gregg Cabin, Flagstaff

3 = Cracchiolo Ranch, Cornville

4 = Planet Ranch, Mohave County

5 = Evans House, Phoenix

6 = Grant Street Studio and First Avenue properties in Phoenix

Blank in column 3 = Not applicable



## Appendix E

**Table 4. Agency activities to locate, evaluate, and nominate properties to the Arizona Register of Historic Places.**

Agency	Agency Program to Locate and Evaluate Properties	Conducted Surveys in 2014-15	Consulted with SHPO on Eligibility of Properties	Properties Nominated to the Arizona Register in 2014-15
ASLAPR	N	N	N	N
NAU	N	N	N	N
AHS	Y	N	N	N
ADRE	Y	N	N	N
ASLD	N	Y	N	N
ACC	Y	N	N	N
UA	Y	N	N	N
ADC	Y	N	N	N
APA	N	N	N	N
ADHS	Y	N	N	N
ADH	N	N	Y	N
ADAG	N	N	N	N
AGFD	Y	Y	N	N
Mine	N	N	N	N
ASP	Y	N	N	
ASDB	N	N	Y	1
ASU	Y	Y	N	N
State	N	N	N	N
ADOA	Y	Y	N	N
ADEQ	N	N	N	N

1 = Superintendent's House, Tucson

Blank (not answered)

## Appendix F

Table 5. Documentary recordation of properties altered or demolished.

Agency	Documented Properties Destroyed or Altered	Type of Documentation	Property Listed on Arizona or National Register of Historic Places	Documentation Submitted
ASLAPR	N			
NAU	N			
AHS	N			
ADRE	N			
ASLD	N			
ACC	N			
UA	N			
ADC	N			
APA	N			
ADHS	N			
ADH	Y	HABS	Y	
ADAG	N			
AGFD	N			
Mine	N			
ASP	Y	State-level Architectural	Y	SHPO
ASDB	Y	Historical-Archival	N	SHPO
ASU	Y	Archaeological/Historical-Archival/State-level Architectural	N	SHPO
State	N			
ADOA	Y	Historical-Archival/State-level Architectural	N	SHPO
ADEQ	N			

Blank = No response

## Appendix G

Table 6. Results of consultation with SHPO & Tribes on agency plans/projects.

Agency	Consultation on Agency Plans	Positive Impacts on Historic Properties	Negative Impacts on Historic Properties	Consultation with Indian Tribes
ASLAPR		N	N	N
NAU	N	N	N	N
AHS	N	N	N	N
ADRE	N	N	N	N
ASLD	Y	N	Y	Y
ACC	N	N	N	N
UA	N	N	N	N
ADC	N	N	N	N
APA	N	N	N	N
ADHS	N	N	N	N
ADH	N	N	N	Y
ADAG	N	N	N	N
AGFD	Y	N	N	Y
Mine	N	N	N	N
ASP	Y	Y	Y	Y
ASDB	N	N	N	N
ASU	Y	Y	Y	Y
State	N	N	N	N
ADOA	Y	N	N	N
ADEQ	N	N	N	N

Blank (no answer)

## Appendix H

**Table 7. Agencies utilizing the State Historic Preservation Plan produced by the SHPO.**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Used HPP when Considering and Consulting on Agency Plans</b>
ASLAPR	N
NAU	N
AHS	N
ADRE	Y
ASLD	Y
ACC	N
UA	Y
ADC	Y
APA	N
ADHS	Y
ADH	N
ADAG	N
AGFD	Y
Mine	Y
ASP	Y
ASDB	Y
ASU	Y
State	Y
ADOA	Y
ADEQ	N

*This document was compiled by the State Historic Preservation Office, Arizona State Parks.*

*For more information call 602-542-4009.*

## **Arizona State Parks**

23751 N 23rd Ave, Suite 190  
Phoenix, Arizona 85085

[www.AZStateParks.com](http://www.AZStateParks.com)

Reservations (520) 586-2283

Info & TTY (602) 542-4174

Fax (602) 542-4180

*Equal Employment Opportunity  
Agency. This document is  
Available in alternate formats.  
Contact the ADA Coordinator  
at (602) 542-4174*

