

BRIEFING STATEMENT

PREPARED FOR: NWRS LEADERSHIP TEAM

DATE: 30 May 2018

TITLE: Priority Heritage Assets--De-Mystifying our Historic Buildings

ISSUE: Over ¼ of the FWS portfolio (2890 buildings) is now 50 years of age or older! Buildings 50 years of age or older trigger review under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). At least 75% of these buildings are at a point where their integrity is beginning to fail.

BACKGROUND: Under the NHPA, FWS, as stewards of this trust resource, is responsible to determine if heritage assets are historically significant **and** have the potential to be useful to the agency mission and in what capacity. To date, our consideration of heritage assets has been lacking and not adequately addressed in DOI guidance for Real Property (Asset Priority Index and Attachment G) resulting in only a small number of such assets being part of our 5 year planning.

STATUS/KEY POINTS: A new way to consider historic buildings is needed, one that is complementary to the Asset Priority Index process, but that establishes a priority standing for heritage assets within the Service. This ranking process will clarify for field stations managers and Regional Staff:

- historic buildings that are Priority Heritage Assets--those that warrant investment and that will return that investment in the form of re-use for Service-related functions, education and/or interpretation and,
- those historic buildings that, after proper due diligence, can be considered for deconstruction and/or materials re-use (harvesting materials from a deconstructed historic asset for use in a Priority Heritage Asset).

ACTIONS: Regional leadership is encouraged to direct their RHPOs to (1) identify Priority Heritage Assets from the Region's asset list (a draft assessment tool is attached; a new SAMMI module for historic preservation will launch later this summer), and (2) discuss those assets with the pertinent station managers to foster a conversation that will, ultimately, de-mystify, or provide clarity, as to the potential historical significance of these assets, the value they can add to the overall mission of the field station, and how making such a determination will enable us to better meet our compliance and stewardship responsibilities under the law.

PREPARED BY: Eugene Marino, Federal Preservation Officer, USFWS HQ

Attachment

**UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Priority Heritage Assets (PHA)
Ranking Worksheet**

This worksheet is intended to help Regional Historic Preservation Officers (RHPOs), in consultation with Managers and Facilities Staff, rank priority heritage assets within the Service. **Priority Heritage Assets** (PHAs) are defined as buildings and structures that have been determined to be eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places and have a high potential to be productively reused, engage partners and the community, and help fulfill the mission of the field station and Service.

This worksheet uses six elements to rank PHAs through the use of a weighed final score. Heritage Assets attaining scores of at least 70 out of 100 possible total points are considered "**Priority Heritage Assets**" and qualify for heightened Service attention and funding; and should be included as part of the Service 5 year plan.

Those assets with a score less than 70, continue to be heritage assets and will require the accompanying compliance. Also, because situations can change on the ground, these assets may rise to the level of Priority Heritage Asset during subsequent ranking and review.

Asset Name: _____	RPI #: _____
National Register Historic District Name: _____	
Region: Station: _____	Photo(s)/location topo map attached _____
Form reviewed by:	
___ Station Manager. Name: _____	Date: _____
___ Facilities Manager. Name: _____	Date: _____
___ Area Supervisor. Name: _____	Date: _____
Form completed by RHPO. Name: _____	Date: _____

1. Unique Example (UE): Can the heritage asset be considered architecturally unique to this region?

Choose one answer. (100 pts max)

Score: _____

Background: This element examines a heritage asset's architectural uniqueness in the geographic area covered by the region--not just on Service land.

- The asset is a rare and very important type. *100 pts*
- The asset is a great example of its type. *75 pts*
- The asset is one of only a few examples of this type. *50 pts*
- The asset is not unique; many other or better examples exist. *25 pts*
- The asset is a very common example of its type. *0 pts*

<i>Justification:</i>

2. Community Connections (CC): Does the surrounding community retain strong connections to the heritage asset?

Choose one answer. (100 pts maximum)

Score: _____

Background: This element examines how strong the local community identifies, connects, and interacts with the heritage asset. Evidence of connections include: heightened community pride and history, media interest, good accessibility/visibility, and great research or tourism use/value.

- The asset demonstrates exceptional aspects of community connections. 100 pts
- The asset demonstrates high aspects of community connections. 75 pts
- The asset demonstrates moderate aspects of community connections. 50 pts
- The asset demonstrates low aspects of community connections. 25 pts
- The asset demonstrates no aspects of community connections. 0 pts

Justification:

3. Effort Sustainability (ES): Are efforts to preserve this heritage asset sustainable?

Answer both parts and add scores together. (100 pts maximum)

Score: _____

Background: This element examines to what degree the heritage asset has been identified as a priority to the station and its partners, what resources have been applied to the asset already and the likelihood that additional station and outside resources will continue to be applied.

Part 1

- There is an active Friends group or other partner organization interested in the preservation of the asset. 25 pts
- There is no active Friends group or other partner organization interested in the preservation of the asset. 0 pts

Part 2

- Preservation of the asset has been identified as a high priority by both the station and its partners, and significant level of financial and other resources have already been invested in its preservation. 75 pts
- Preservation of the asset has been identified as a moderate priority by both the station and its partners, and a moderate level of financial and other resources have already been invested in its preservation. 50 pts
- Preservation of the asset is considered a low priority by both the station and its partners, and only a low level of resources have already been invested in its preservation. 25 pts
- Preservation of the asset is not considered a priority by either the station or its partners, and virtually no resources have been invested in its preservation. 0 pts

Justification:

4. Mission Potential (MP): Does the heritage asset have the potential to contribute to the Big 6 missions of the Service?

Put in a point value for all that apply and add together. (100 pts maximum) Score: _____

Background: This element examines the heritage asset's ability to contribute to one or more of the Big 6 Missions: Hunting, Fishing, Wildlife Observation, Photography, Environmental Education and Interpretation.

- The asset has the potential to contribute to Hunting and/or Fishing. *25-75 pts*
- The asset has the potential to contribute to Wildlife Observation. *25-75 pts*
- The asset has the potential to contribute to Photography. *25-75 pts*
- The asset has the potential to contribute to Environmental Education. *25-75 pts*
- The asset has potential to contribute to Interpretation. *25-75 pts*
- The asset doesn't have the potential to contribute to any of them. *0 pts*

Justification:

5. Preservation Viability (PV): Is the preservation of the heritage asset a viable option?

Choose one answer. (100 pts maximum)

Score: _____

Background: This element examines the practical likelihood that the heritage asset can be used for its original purpose, adapted to a new purpose, stabilized/mothballed with the idea that reuse could occur sometime in the future, or only preserved as a ruin.

- The asset is currently in use and actively maintained by the station. *100 pts*
- The asset could serve its original or a new purpose with minimal repairs. *80 pts*
- The asset retains a high degree of structural and physical integrity and could be repaired and adapted for use if currently mothballed. *60 pts*
- The asset could be stabilized/mothballed for eventual reuse. *40 pts*
- The asset could only be preserved as a structural ruin. *20 pts*
- The asset is in poor physical condition and cannot be reused/stabilized. *0 pts*

Justification:

6. Situation Urgency (SU): Is there an urgent need for action to preserve the heritage asset?

Choose one answer. (100 pts maximum)

Score: _____

Background: This element examines the urgency of taking action to preserve the heritage asset at the time of this evaluation.

- The asset is being actively degraded, and requires action within 6 months if it is to be preserved. 100 pts
- The asset is endangered, and requires action within 6-12 months if it is to be preserved. 75 pts
- The asset is threatened, and requires action within 1-2 years if it is to be preserved. 50 pts
- The asset is vulnerable, and requires action within 2-5 years if it is to be preserved. 25 pts
- The asset is stable, and requires no action within 5 years. 0 pts

Justification:

FINAL TALLY:

To determine the score for an individual PHA, follow the equation below:

- (#1 UE score _____ x .10) = _____ +
- (#2 CC score _____ x .20) = _____ +
- (#3 ES score _____ x .20) = _____ +
- (#4 MP score _____ x .20) = _____ +
- (#5 PV score _____ x .20) = _____ +
- (#6 SU score _____ x .10) = _____ =

_____ **FINAL SCORE** (100 points max)

March 2018