

DRAFT

Butte-Silver Bow Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan
Ad-Hoc Committee Process and Schedule
(March 6, 2013)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This draft proposal outlines the **framework, process** and **schedule** for establishing an ad-hoc committee to work collaboratively to create a Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan (CHPP) for Butte-Silver Bow, a requirement of maintaining our Certified Local Government (CLG) status with the National Park Service (NPS) and State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) as a National Historic District. While development of the CHPP is a primary focus, the need for this draft proposal was prioritized/expedited in large part by a need to properly plan and coordinate two sources of funding, passed by the BSB Council of Commissioners in the current FY12-13 budgetary cycle: Historic Building Stabilization Fund (\$200,000) and Vacant Building Inventory Fund (\$75,000). This process and the resultant CHPP will greatly improve assurances that these significant public funds – as well as all future funds, both public and private – be spent efficiently and strategically. The major expected outcome(s) of implementing the components of this proposal (in addition to those previously stated herein) are:

- Establishment of a process and prioritization of Butte-Silver Bow’s vast number of inventoried, historic “registered” properties (~4,000 public and private structures/properties).
- Development of an inventory/inventory database system for identifying and tracking vacant buildings (public and private/historic and non-historic) in Butte-Silver Bow.
- Establishment of better awareness/education and communication, coordination and cooperation between and among Butte-Silver Bow’s multiple stakeholders relative to Historic Preservation and Community/Economic Development and Enrichment.
- Improve compliance with federal, state and local requirements and/or ordinances, as well as certainty and support for development interests in Butte-Silver Bow, particularly as it relates to our historic district and its properties.

FRAMEWORK

For a number of reasons and issues, there remains a divisive relationship in Butte-Silver Bow as it relates to its citizens and stakeholders regarding historic preservation. The best way to improve these relationships and to insure a productive outcome of this proposal is to commit the ad-hoc committee operating procedures to the consensus-based decision making model. This model is described as follows:

Consensus-Based Decision-Making

A consensus based decision-making process is an effort in which affected parties (stakeholders) seek to reach agreement on a course of action to address an issue or set of related issues. In a consensus process, the stakeholders work together to find a mutually acceptable solution. Each consensus process is unique because the parties design their agreement to fit their circumstances. However, successful consensus processes follow several guiding principles: *Consensus Decision-making* - Participants make decisions by agreement rather than by majority vote.

Inclusiveness – To the extent possible, all necessary interests are represented or, at a minimum, approve of the decision.

Accountability - Participants usually represent stakeholder groups or interests. They are accountable both to their constituents and to the process.

Facilitation - An impartial facilitator accountable to all participants manages the process, ensures the ground rules are followed, and helps to maintain a productive climate for communication and problem solving.

Flexibility - Participants design a process and address the issues in a manner they determine most suitable to the situation.

Shared Control/Ground Rules - Participants share with the facilitator responsibility for setting and maintaining the ground rules for a process and for creating outcomes.

Commitment to Implementation - All stakeholders commit to carrying out their agreement.

Elements of a Consensus Based Decision:

- All parties agree with the proposed decision and are willing to carry it out;
- No one will block or obstruct the decision or its implementation; and
- Everyone will support the decision and implement it.

Perhaps the most important component of this process for insuring its desired outcome(s) is the Facilitation piece. An impartial facilitator experienced in the consensus-based framework is essential and likewise, an important role to be contracted with a portion of the funds available; the need for this contract can be discussed and/or qualifications/requirements for professionals wanting to be considered for selection.

Ad-Hoc Committee

A group of ten (10) individual citizens representing multiple stakeholders (i.e. historic preservation, private building owner, development, etc.) will be selected and appointed by the Chief Executive, with input on selection provided by BSB Historic Preservation/Planning, Community

Development/Enrichment and the Council of Commissioners. A public call for applications will be released via the media to solicit citizen input. Commitment to both the consensus-based framework and to attend all meetings is paramount criteria in the selection of ad-hoc committee members.

In addition to the ad-hoc citizen members and facilitator, the committee will be supported at all meetings by representatives of the local government (Historic Preservation, Community Development, Planning/Superfund, Community Enrichment), as well as state (SHPO) and/or federal (NPS/DOI) agencies, according to their availability. These individuals will not take part in the consensus discussions, but will be there to monitor the process and to provide guidance/support/information upon request of the Ad-Hoc committee members/facilitator.

Meetings

The meeting framework (process/schedule follows in subsequent sections) includes:

- one kickoff/orientation meeting, followed by
- two (2) working meetings per month for six (6) consecutive months (a total of 12 working meetings) and concluded with
- one conclusive meeting to draft the plan. The draft plan will be presented to the HPC and Council for approval.

As it relates to the framework of the working meetings (second bullet), the intent of this bi-monthly schedules is two-fold: 1) educational and 2) action-oriented. The first of each month's monthly meeting will be educational and specific subject-oriented. This meeting will involve a presentation (open to the public) by an expert, expert group or panel of experts on the specific subject (e.g. preservation technology, economic development of historic preservation). Because the expert(s) will be from out of town/state, it is proposed to maximize the benefit of their time and expertise. The expert(s) will give a public presentation(s) on his/her/their area of expertise on Friday evening (or other day/night arrangement); this event will be open to the public. The next day, the expert(s) will engage the ad-hoc committee in a working/information session to apply their specific expertise to Butte's historic preservation issues. The ad-hoc committee will meet a second time in the month to further apply (without the expert present) the newly acquired information/perspective to drafting a specific section(s) of the draft plan. This bi-monthly meeting framework (one expert-led educational meeting; one working meeting) will be followed for six months according to specific subjects (proposed subjects to be covered are below).

PROCESS

The following is a proposed order and list of items to make up the BSB Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan:

- Identify individuals or groups that should be included on the Ad-Hoc Committee.
- Identify possible facilitators and release a RFP/RFQ; establish preliminary budget for process
- Identify Topics and subsequent applicable Experts/Expert Groups or Panel to present at each monthly educational meeting. The following is a list of suggested topics:
 - Guidance/Requirements of Drafting and Implementing Comprehensive/Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plans
 - Effects of Infill/Renovation vs. New Sprawl Construction

- The Economic Development of Historic Preservation
- Preservation/Restoration Technology. *Commentary: We have the opportunity to serve as a preservation/restoration laboratory where new ideas, materials, and professional designs are openly embraced and utilized to create new restoration/preservation strategies, technologies and JOBS..*
- Prioritization/Categorization of Historic Resources/Districts
- Role of Government/incentives – Smart Growth, URA, Historic Building Stabilization Funds, Tax Credits, property tax abatements, Grant Funding, etc.

SCHEDULE

The following is a proposed month-by-month action-oriented schedule:

March 2013 Open call for and selection of committee members (10) from stakeholder groups (i.e. private sector building/business owners; preservation/restoration groups and community; labor/contracting; citizens at large); Development and advertisement of RFP/RFQ for Facilitator

April 2013 Hire Facilitator
Organize meeting schedule/hold orientation meeting
Schedule presenters for each meeting

May 2013 1st set of meetings

June 2013 2nd set of meetings

July 2013 3rd set of meetings

August 2013 4th set of meetings

September 2013 5th set of meetings

October 2013 6th set of meetings

November 2013 Final working meeting for Draft Plan completion

December 2013 Presentation of Draft Final Plan to HPC and COC