

chapter 2

proposed concept

The 37 current National Heritage Areas, while similar in many respects, differ considerably in their focus, project goals, common partnerships, and management according to the needs and resources of their respective communities. It is important that local residents and communities, as well as officials of the National Park Service and members of Congress, understand the specifics of what is being proposed for the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area. This chapter will discuss the underlying principles of the proposed Area, explain the development and intended application of general guidelines for future grant awards and projects, describe long-term goals, and describe the future management entity and a conceptual financial plan for the proposed Area. The watershed concept for the boundary is also explained.

PRINCIPLES

The National Heritage Area program of the National Park Service is based on innovative differences from other types of federal land designations for the purpose of resource conservation.

Rather than being top-down, mandatory, and involving land set-asides or use restrictions, this type of designation is based on grass roots organization, voluntary preservation, and does not involve property or land-use regulation. The concept of a Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area is based on the following common principles of National Heritage Areas: heritage education, voluntary preservation, security of property rights, local management.

Heritage Education

A deeper understanding and appreciation of the region's cultural and natural legacy can be achieved, in part, through heritage education. In addition to nurturing a sense of continuity and connection with historical and cultural experiences, heritage education instills a stronger "sense of place," and encourages residents to consider their past in planning for the future. In a National Heritage Area, heritage education fosters a stewardship ethic that leads to community-based, voluntary resource preservation.

Voluntary Preservation

A fundamental principle of the National Heritage Area concept is that conservation efforts are most successful when the people who live in and around heritage resources and who carry on cultural traditions are the primary people identifying the priorities of their particular community and initiating preservation actions voluntarily. Participation by private property owners or practitioners of traditional lifestyles is always voluntary. The primary function of a National Heritage Area is to provide assistance to communities, groups, landowners, and other stakeholders to help them achieve their goals of resource and lifestyle preservation, promotion, and interpretation. Priorities are identified through an active public process.

Security of Property Rights

The National Heritage Area concept recognizes the importance of private lands, and that property owners are the primary planners of land use. Designation does not affect private property rights, property taxes, zoning, or the right to renovate or remove existing buildings on private property. Like other National Heritage Areas, specific language is included in the draft legislation for the proposed Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area (see Appendix X) stating that the Area will have no regulatory authority and it will be precluded from using federal funding to acquire real property or an interest in real property. Statements regarding the Area's lack of effect on private property rights and public land-use regulations will also be included in the future management plan. Important points on this issue include the following:

- ◆ National Heritage Areas are not National Parks and are not considered units of the National Park Service and therefore have no regulatory authority
- ◆ Most National Heritage Area legislation prohibits the use of the designation to change zoning or other land-use regulations and these provisions are included in the draft legislation for the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area
- ◆ Property owners within a National Heritage Area are not required to permit public or government access to their lands
- ◆ The designation of a National Heritage Areas has no effect to either strengthen or weaken any type of regulation either prohibiting or allowing the demolishing of old buildings on private properties, selling or subdividing properties, or from developing properties
- ◆ National Heritage Areas do not increase liability for a property owner in the event someone is injured on their property
- ◆ National Heritage Areas do not add additional regulations to the public lands permitting process for grazing, logging, hunting, or other purposes
- ◆ National Heritage Areas do not restrict or limit a tribe from protecting cultural or religious sites on tribal lands

Local Management

The Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area will adhere to the National Park Service requirement that it be managed by a local entity with broad representation from the region. The primary goal of the organization that will manage the

proposed Area will be to achieve a balanced diversity in terms of geography, cultural background, and professional background and interest for its board members, staff members, and any advisory groups or committees. Ideally, the board of the management entity will have representatives from each of the six counties and three tribes. Other sub-sectors of the general population to include would be representatives of state, local, and tribal governments, the ranching and agricultural community, the arts community, historic preservation and environmental conservation interests, education, and tourism businesses such as lodging, restaurants, and attractions.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

During the first round of community Working Group meetings, participants were asked four questions:

- (1) What do you like about your community now?
- (2) What do you dislike about your community now?
- (3) What do you want for your community in the future?
- (4) What do you not want for your community in the future?

Each participant wrote as many responses to each of these questions as they wanted, each on a separate piece of paper. Then, all of the papers expressing “likes” for the current community were grouped together, then all of the papers expressing “dislikes” for the current community were grouped together, and so on. Participants were then divided into four smaller groups and asked to group the total number of responses for one of the four questions into categories. This exercise took place at five

meetings in five different locations across the watershed, resulting in a total number of 76 categories of responses for the four questions. Most categories were unique to particular Working Groups in particular locations, but seventeen categories were repeated two or more times across the five meeting locations. Those categories that appeared two or more times were deemed to be representative of common sentiments shared by communities throughout the watershed. The categorized responses to the four original questions provide a solid framework to which the future management entity can refer when making decisions about the grant awards, projects, and the future direction of the proposed Area. For example, future staff and board members can ask, “Is the project described in this grant application likely to support what people like about their community currently or want for the future, or does it address some issue that they currently do not like or do not want for the future?” The categorized responses that appeared two or more times during the course of five meetings and have now become general guidelines for the future Area are as follows:

- (1) *What do you like about your community now?*
 - ◆ Outdoor activities and recreation
 - ◆ Beautiful landscapes
 - ◆ Cultural heritage and diversity
 - ◆ Rural and small town atmosphere
 - ◆ Sense of community
- (2) *What do you not like about your community now?*
 - ◆ Uncontrolled growth
 - ◆ Destruction of environment
 - ◆ Drugs and crime
 - ◆ Lack of jobs and economic opportunities

- (3) *What do you want for your community in the future?*
- ◆ Trails and parks
 - ◆ Facilities/infrastructure
 - ◆ Environmental planning and protection
- (4) *What do you not want for your community in the future?*
- ◆ Unmanaged/uncontrolled growth
 - ◆ Chain stores
 - ◆ Destruction of natural resources
 - ◆ Pollution
 - ◆ Social ills (intolerance; loss of community, diversity, or heritage)

GOALS

Building upon these principles and general guidelines, establishment of a Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area can support the care and promotion of heritage and nature resources in accordance with community wishes without affecting property rights. A local management entity with broad representation of the region's stakeholders will select and assist voluntary efforts to preserve, restore, and interpret the heritage and nature resources that make this region unique. Opportunities for partnerships and funding for these activities will also increase. The National Heritage Area will coordinate these activities in accordance with the nationally distinctive heritage themes explained in Chapter 3.

Goal 1: Development and Increase of Heritage Tourism, and a Resulting Boost in Economic Revenues and Value of Local Lifestyles

A National Heritage Area designation for the Little Colorado River Valley will

increase local, national, and international recognition of its unique historic treasures, cultural traditions, scenic landscapes, diverse wildlife, and other heritage and nature resources. This increased awareness will result in the desire for more people to travel to the region to explore and learn for themselves. The increased awareness will also raise the perceived value of those resources among local residents, which will, in turn, create a greater sense of pride among residents for their community. The flight of the younger generation from rural places to urban centers is a well-documented pattern in modern society. The move is often for the economic opportunities larger cities offer. With a boost in revenue from tourism, more jobs will be available in local communities. Because heritage tourism is based on resource preservation rather than resource extraction, this type of economic development is sustainable, long term, and will also benefit future generations of residents. Heritage tourism also focuses on the authentic realities of a particular place, and therefore the host community does not need to change itself and its character to accommodate tourist expectations.

GOAL 2: Additional Source of Funding for Locally Important Projects Pertaining to Cultural Education and Resource Conservation

Rural communities, with their smaller populations, cannot compete for grants as well as larger communities can. They have fewer people with expert skills in a specific discipline to consult on a grant application and they have fewer local residents with substantial wealth to make philanthropic gifts to the community. Yet, their cultural education and resource conservation

needs are the same as those who live in larger cities. With approximately 65% of the population of the Little Colorado River Valley living in rural communities of less than 20,000 people, and the vast majority of those living in communities below 6,000 people, the opportunity to distribute financial resources to rural regions is guaranteed. Since the federal funds of the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area will be available only to communities in the watershed, the rural communities will have a more equal chance of obtaining these funds without the competition from large urban centers. Designation as a National Heritage Area will make the region eligible for 50-percent match funding of up to \$1 million annually over a period of 15 years. This federal seed money has proven to be an important catalyst for raising other funds for local projects.

GOAL 3: Increased Ability to Effectively Network with Multiple Organizations on a Regional Scale and Pool Resources to Complete Tourism, Educational, and Conservation Projects

The Little Colorado River Valley is large, yet it is connected by geography, history, and culture. The efforts of one community are returned many times over when neighboring communities also participate. For example, the invasive species tamarisk chokes the river banks. It prevents native willows and cottonwoods from growing and, subsequently, deprives native birds and animals of suitable habitat and food. Tamarisk also requires much more water than native vegetation, thereby over-tapping an already limited resource in the West. If one community removes the tamarisk from their jurisdiction a small improvement

is realized, but if multiple communities remove tamarisk the effect is many times greater. Likewise with tourism, one small community might be able to attract a tourist for a few days. But if neighboring communities work together, the tourist might stay in the region a full week or more. The money the tourist spends stays within the region and benefits more local businesses. Most chambers of commerce and tourism promotion organizations in the Little Colorado River Valley already cross-promote to a certain degree, but their scopes do not include the entire watershed. The National Heritage Area will have the unique focus of the entire watershed and be well-positioned to link communities with similar goals or corresponding resources and needs together to complete projects more effectively. National Heritage Areas also work with all sectors of a community – government, private businesses of all types, civic organizations, state and federal agencies, and educational institutions – and are therefore able to facilitate partnerships among groups that may not usually work together.

GOAL 4: Increased Support for Local, Rural Economies

The last decades of the 20th century were a time of great change for rural communities. The traditional economies of agriculture, logging, and mining upon which most rural economies were built declined severely and, in some cases, collapsed completely. Towns have been looking for alternatives ever since. Tourism is certainly one option for rural communities and the National Heritage Area's role in that industry has already been explained in Goals 1 and 3. A number of existing National Heritage

Areas have focused on downtown and local economy revitalization whether it pertains to tourism or not. Examples include the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor's Market Towns Initiative, the Path of Progress National Heritage Route's Progress Fund, and Wheeling National Heritage Area's Adaptive Reuse Study, and this is a goal the proposed Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area can pursue as well. Often the restoration of natural and cultural resources results in jobs during the restoration and continued jobs once the resource has been rehabilitated. When historic buildings are renovated, new business often move in creating jobs and increasing the overall economic stability of the community.

GOAL 5: Expanded Opportunities and Resources for Volunteer Stewardship of Natural Resources and Elements of the Region's Heritage

Public lands in the Little Colorado River Valley contain many incredible natural resources and sites of cultural importance, but they do not contain them all. Significant archaeological sites, historic structures, places of cultural importance, and unique wildlife habitats, to say nothing of continuous open space, cross into private lands as well. Often families want to preserve and protect the landscape they have grown to love for the benefit of the community and for future generations. Sometimes private property owners are willing to allow public access to particular resources such as trails along river banks or archaeological sites. Yet, they may not know how to do so or where to turn for advice and, equally importantly, funding. The National Heritage Area can address such needs by offering

technical assistance for the preservation of particular resources and providing funding for related costs.

GOAL 6: Balanced Preservation and Promotion

While a National Heritage Area can help develop tourism facilities in locations that want them, it can also aid efforts to restore and protect sensitive places. Communities that do not want higher numbers of visitors may choose not to be promoted even though the National Heritage Area may still work with such communities on educational or resource conservation projects. Applicants for tourism development grants will be required to show broad community support to receive assistance. Some of the economic benefits of a National Heritage Area designation can be invested in minimizing tourism impacts on the very resources that attract visitors, and they can also be used to protect places with sensitive cultural meaning or fragile resources that need limited or restricted visitation.

FUTURE LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY AND CONCEPTUAL FINANCIAL PLAN

The management entities of existing National Heritage Areas can be categorized into several types. The following comparisons are based on information obtained about the organizational structures of 15 of the 27 National Heritage Areas designated before 2006. In this sample, there are four types of management entities: (1) federally appointed commissions; (2) locally appointed commissions; (3) departments of public universities; and (4) nonprofit corporations. In all of these types of management entities,

representatives of the National Park Service serve in non-voting (ex officio), advisory roles.

Federally Appointed Commissions

Several existing National Heritage Areas are managed by federally appointed commissions. Their operations are administrated by National Park Service staff and some operate under management plans prepared by the National Park Service. The number of commissioners for these management entities is usually between 15 and 30. Commission appointments are usually based on recommendations by Congressional delegations, and are designed to ensure representation of local municipalities, state agencies, business interests, economic development, tourism, historic preservation, outdoor recreation, and private landowners. Some of these commissions have formed nonprofit, 501(c)(3) corporations to build partnerships and to guide programs.

Examples

Blackstone Valley National Historic Corridor (Massachusetts and Rhode Island)

- ◆ Designated in 1986, second National Heritage Area in the country
- ◆ Managed by a 19-member, bi-state, federally appointed commission
- ◆ National Park Service staff administers operations and implements interpretive Programs

Cache La Poudre River Corridor (Colorado)

- ◆ Designated in 1996
- ◆ Managed by a federally appointed commission

- ◆ “To guide programs,” commission designees formed a nonprofit, with 12 board members representing local governments, agricultural interests, and a state water conservation district

Cane River National Heritage Area (Louisiana)

- ◆ Designated in 1994
- ◆ Managed by a federally appointed commission, with 19 members representing municipalities, the state, business/tourism, preservation, hunting, river use, cultural heritage, and private landowners

Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor (New York)

- ◆ Designated in 2000
- ◆ Managed by a federally appointed, 27-member commission, with appointments based on recommendations by the governor and the region’s Congressional delegation

Essex National Heritage Area (Massachusetts)

- ◆ Designated in 1996
- ◆ Managed by an 85-member, federally appointed commission representing municipalities, business, tourism, preservation, education, and environmental interests (26 additional members are state and federal legislators serving ex officio)
- ◆ An 18-member board of trustees represents local chambers of commerce, economic development, conventions/tourism, colleges, arts, nature conservation, museums, historic preservation, and private corporations
- ◆ A 23-member executive committee oversees operations

Locally Appointed Commissions

Both National Heritage Areas that fall into this category have state appointed or certified management organizations whose members represent a diverse group of local interests.

Examples

Lackawanna Heritage Valley State and National Heritage Area (Pennsylvania)

- ◆ Designated in 2000
- ◆ Managed by a county-appointed commission with a 6-member board of directors representing the county, colleges, business, heritage destinations, historic preservation, economic development, and residents
- ◆ Advised and assisted by several committees: Lackawanna Heritage Valley Roundtable (heritage attractions, tourism, preservation), Lackawanna River Heritage Trail Management Committee (parks, recreation, business, boroughs, citizens), Education Alliance (no information)

National Coal Heritage Area (West Virginia)

- ◆ Designated in 1996
- ◆ Currently developing management plan
- ◆ Management plan recommends that the National Coal Heritage Area be managed by a state-appointed commission in partnership with a new nonprofit representing various interests; some members would overlap

Departments of Public Universities

One existing National Heritage Area is managed by a department of a public university. The department is tax

exempt, and funds are managed by the university foundation.

Example

Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area (Tennessee)

- ◆ Designated in 1996
- ◆ Operations administrated by staff of the Center for Historic Preservation at Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU), a university department which also serves as the clearinghouse for federal funding; center funds are administrated and invested by the MTSU Foundation
- ◆ Center is advised by a 25-member Board of Advisors representing the state, counties, preservation, nature conservation, heritage destinations, and tourism. Board members are appointed based on recommendations from the governor, state tourism agency, and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
- ◆ A 4-member executive council of the Board of Advisors includes representatives of the governor, state tourism agency, SHPO, and the Center for Historic Preservation

Nonprofit Corporations

The most common management entities are nonprofit corporations with 501(c)(3) status with the Internal Revenue Service. These usually operate as public charities rather than private foundations [the two types of 501(c)(3) organizations] because: (1) they receive substantial portions of their funding from governmental units, publicly supported organizations, and the general public; and (2) they receive more than one-third of their financial

support from contributions, membership fees, and gross receipts from activities related to their tax-exempt functions, and normally receive less than one-third of their funding from investments. These nonprofits typically have boards of directors (or boards of trustees) of twelve to sixteen members, with executive committees of five and seven members, that oversee operations. Interests represented by board members often include counties, municipalities, state agencies, tourism, economic development, historic preservation, nature conservation, and residents. Board members usually participate in several planning committees. These nonprofits are usually assisted by advisory commissions, councils, or committees with broad representation of local interest groups, including counties, municipalities, tribes, state agencies, businesses, economic development, education, tourism, heritage attractions, arts, historic preservation, nature conservation, outdoor recreation, and private landowners.

Examples

Ohio & Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor (Ohio)

- ◆ Designated in 1996
- ◆ Managed by a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) corporation with a 15-member board of directors representing four counties, city planning departments, parks, economic development, and tourism (National Park Service ex officio)
- ◆ A 5-member executive committee oversees operations
- ◆ Management entity partners with two other nonprofits on programs
- ◆ Assisted by several advisory committees with broad representation of local interest groups

Path of Progress National Heritage Tour Route (Pennsylvania)

- ◆ Designated in 1988
- ◆ Originally managed by a 21-member federally appointed commission
- ◆ Supporting legislation renewed in 1998
- ◆ Federally appointed commission now serves as the funding entity
- ◆ Now managed by a nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation with a 6-member board of directors
- ◆ Nonprofit management entity also has a for-profit arm

Quinebag and Shetucket River Valleys National Heritage Corridor (Connecticut and Massachusetts)

- ◆ Designated in 1994
- ◆ Managed by private, nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation with a 16-member board representing local organizations and state officials
- ◆ Board members elected annually by membership
- ◆ Members participate in five planning committees
- ◆ Partners include the National Park Service, Connecticut Humanities Council, state historic commissions, state environmental protection and transportation agencies, and local economic development organizations
- ◆ Has several active committees with broad citizen participation

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District (NHA) (Virginia)

- ◆ Designated in 1996
- ◆ Originally managed by a federally appointed commission
- ◆ Now managed by a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) corporation with a 23-member board of trustees representing varied interests, including the state, counties,

municipalities, other nonprofits, and residents

- ◆ The nonprofit has the authority to provide federal funding to help local groups acquire Civil War sites; the only National Heritage Area with such authority

Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area (Iowa)

- ◆ Designated in 1996
- ◆ Managed by a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) corporation with a 12-member board of trustees representing municipalities, counties, colleges, parks, agricultural equipment manufacturers, preservation, and residents
- ◆ Advised by a non-voting committee of prominent Leadership Advisors representing the state, municipalities, businesses, and universities
- ◆ Receives recommendations for project funding from a 15-member Partnership Council representing heritage destinations, preservation societies, universities, farm bureau, and lodging

Wheeling National Heritage Area (West Virginia)

- ◆ Designated in 2000
- ◆ Managed by a nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation with 12 board members representing city, county, and state
- ◆ A 9-member foundation helps with fundraising
- ◆ Management plan recommends creation of a 20-30 member Community Advisory Council

Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area (Arizona)

- ◆ Designated in 2000
- ◆ Managed by a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) corporation with an 11-member

board of directors representing the city, county, state, tourism/economic development, historical societies, historic preservation, agriculture, residents, and the National Park Service (ex officio)

- ◆ A 7-member executive committee oversees operations; members include representatives of the city, tourism/economic development, historical society, agriculture, and residents
- ◆ A large advisory commission represents a broad range of community interests

Future Local Coordinating Entity for the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area

The concept for the proposed Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area's management entity follows the non-profit model used by the majority of existing National Heritage Areas. The Little Colorado Heritage Partnership (LCHP) will incorporate as a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) corporation chartered in the State of Arizona by June 2008. The organization will start with a small Board of Directors drawn from the diverse geographic, cultural, and personal expertise attributes that are represented by the multiple Working Groups members that have participated in this feasibility study.

This Board will be responsible for planning, fundraising, and staff hiring. The initial board will review the general plan and options outlined in this draft document and will have input into the final version of this feasibility study. This will ensure congruence between the organizational structure and goals presented here and the goals of the newly appointed LCHP Board.

An important goal of the proposed LCHP board is to ensure equitable representation of jurisdictions, interest groups, and cultures within the proposed boundaries of the National Heritage Area. Eventually, a smaller Executive Committee will be elected from among the board members to oversee operations and provide direction to staff. The staff will implement programs and coordinate the activities of the National Heritage Area. The Board of Directors will be advised and assisted by a relatively large Partnership Advisory Council whose members represent a broad range of local interests.

Board of Directors

In June of 2008, an Arizona not-for-profit entity, the Little Colorado Heritage Partnership, Inc., will be incorporated. The initial Board of Directors will consist of individuals who have demonstrated a strong commitment to the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area through their participation in Working Group activities. Representation will come from each of the five working groups, thereby helping to cover the varying interests from throughout the region of the proposed National Heritage Area. The primary responsibility of this initial board is to review and help revise the draft Feasibility Study. Board members will also draft criteria for board membership and will recruit new board members. They will also help promote the heritage area concept within the Little Colorado watershed. The board will also begin preparing an application for tax exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. That application will be submitted in early 2009.

Initial Board of Directors

- ◆ Members from the five Working Groups advocated the proposed National Heritage Area and who represent a broad spectrum of local interests
- ◆ Will apply for 501(c)(3) status
- ◆ Recruit new board members

The initial Board of Directors is to transition to a larger board with a structure that equitably represents the counties and tribes within the proposed boundaries of the National Heritage Area, as well as a composition which reflects the cultural diversity of the Little Colorado Valley. The planned structure to achieve this goal is a board with 16 members (15 voting members and a non-voting National Park Service representative). Board members will include a representative of the National Park Service (the Superintendent of Petrified Forest National Historical Park or an appointee, serving in an ex officio role), a representative of the State of Arizona and the State of New Mexico (appointed by the Arizona State Parks Department and New Mexico State Parks Department, respectively), representatives of four counties (appointed by the respective county Boards of Supervisors), three Native American nation representatives (appointed by the tribal governments of the Hopi Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, and the Navajo Nation), and six at-large members representing some combination of the following interests: municipalities, Native American tribes, tourism/economic development, ranching, agriculture, historic preservation, nature conservation, and culture/arts.

In this structure, the full board will meet at least quarterly, with primary functions to include planning,

fundraising, and staff hiring. Meetings may be held via conference call to reduce the burden of travel. Officers will be elected annually. Six members of the board will be elected to serve as an Executive Committee that will meet monthly to oversee operations and provide direction to staff (see below). The board will be advised and assisted by a large Partnership Council representing a broad spectrum of local interests (see below).

Pre-designation tasks for the Board of Directors include: (1) continued public outreach; (2) communication with the legislators sponsoring the designation bill; (3) organization of local support for the designation bill; (4) initiation of some programs to demonstrate the potential effectiveness of the Partnership, and to raise the profile of the proposed National Heritage Area; (5) fundraising to support these activities; and (6) hiring of staff to coordinate these activities, following the necessary fundraising. After designation, the most important board tasks, initially, will be to identify the scope of work and to perform a review role during preparation of the management plan.

Structure and Roles of Board of Directors

- ◆ 16 members (15 voting members)
 - 1 Coconino County (appointed by Board of Supervisors)
 - 1 Navajo County (appointed by Board of Supervisors)
 - 1 Apache County (appointed by Board of Supervisors)
 - 1 McKinley County (appointed by Board of Supervisors)
 - 1 State of Arizona (appointed by Arizona State Parks)
 - 1 State of New Mexico (appointed by New Mexico State Parks)

- 1 National Park Service (non-voting)
- 1 Hopi Tribe (appointed by tribal government)
- 1 Pueblo of Zuni (appointed by tribal government)
- 1 Navajo Nation (appointed by tribal government)
- 6 at-large members representing the following interests: municipalities, Native American tribes, ranching/agriculture, tourism/economic development, historic preservation, nature conservation, culture/arts

- ◆ Elects a 6-member Executive Committee that meets monthly to oversee operations and provide direction to staff
- ◆ Meets at least quarterly
- ◆ Conducts planning, including completing the required management plan during first three years of designation
- ◆ Continues public outreach
- ◆ Communicates with legislators sponsoring designation bill
- ◆ Organizes local support for designation bill
- ◆ Initiates programs
- ◆ Conducts fundraising
- ◆ Identifies scope of work and performs review role for management plan
- ◆ Hires staff
- ◆ Receives recommendations from the Partnership Advisory Council for funding and other support of projects and programs (see below)

Staff

The staff of the local coordinating entity will identify possible funding sources, prepare grant proposals, coordinate fundraising, conduct public outreach, liaison with legislators, help build and support partnerships, develop and maintain a website, and develop and implement programs. The goal is to hire the first staff in 2009 to

begin some of these activities prior to designation. After designation, the staff will coordinate preparation of the management plan.

Structure and Roles of Staff

- ◆ Positions will be funded by a combination of donations from local governments, businesses, and foundations and matching funds from annual Congressional appropriations to the National Heritage Area
- ◆ The goal is to hire the first staff person in 2009
- ◆ Writes grant proposals
- ◆ Coordinates public outreach
- ◆ Coordinates fundraising
- ◆ Serves as liaison with Congressional legislators
- ◆ Develops content for website
- ◆ Develops programs

Rationale for Local Coordinating Entity Plan

Input from stakeholder meetings and a large number of supporting entities and individuals indicate strong support for the concept of a new local organization that will develop and manage the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area. The unique purpose of this organization is to serve as the local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Area. This mission will require a very focused approach to planning and management over the long term.

While representatives of local governments will be involved, the need for this management entity to be broadly representative of local interests requires that it operate independently. The local coordinating entity should be designed to operate outside the

influence of the often-changing political environment to be as responsive as possible to the needs of local residents and interest groups. Operating as a separate nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation, the management entity can most effectively approach individuals, corporations, foundations, and government funding sources for both operating and programmatic funds. An independent nonprofit will also be able to collaborate effectively with other entities in the region—government agencies, other nonprofits, and private foundations. The organizational structure of the management entity outlined here—including a medium-sized Board of Directors, a small Executive Committee, staff positions with specified roles, and an inclusive Partnership Advisory Council—will allow for efficient planning and operations responsive to the needs and inputs of a broad spectrum of local stakeholders.

Conceptual Financial Plan

This conceptual financial plan for the proposed Little Colorado Valley National Heritage Area begins by defining two phases that are essential for achieving the transition from this Feasibility Study through to the completion of a management plan for an established heritage area. This section then addresses a number of areas critical to ensuring its long-term economic sustainability:

- ◆ capability to fund—through both earned and unearned income
- ◆ operating budgets for the next two phases of heritage area development
- ◆ funding strategy
- ◆ federal match funding

Phasing

The initial concept of a National Heritage Area for the Little Colorado River Valley emerged from community meetings in Springerville and Snowflake, Arizona, that were held in late 2003. Thus, the completion of this Feasibility Study in late 2008 will represent the culmination of five years of gradual development of that concept. It is helpful to consider the completion of this Feasibility Study as the close of the initial phase of the proposed Area's development. It is also important to clearly define the next two phases of the process. The review of this study by the Secretary of the Interior and the passage of legislation by Congress to create the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area are the critical elements of the next phase, which ends with achieving designation. The subsequent phase after designation is focused on completing a management plan. Those two stages are briefly outlined, because the basis for structuring a financial plan for the LCHP.

Phase 1: Achieving Designation (2009 and 2010)

The Feasibility Study was funded by an Arizona Heritage Fund grant and private support obtained by the Center for Desert Archaeology. It is proposed that the next phase move forward as a formal partnership between the LCHP, the diverse interest groups and municipal and tribal governments of the proposed National Heritage Area, and the Center for Desert Archaeology. The momentum that has been gained through the process of preparing this Feasibility Study can easily be lost if there is not continuity of personnel and the dedication of key individuals to invest substantial time to work toward

achieving designation. The Center is able to offer half-time services of its Heritage Programs Coordinator as well as provision of administrative and other support services during the two year duration of Phase 1.

Phase 2: Completion of a Management Plan (2011-2012)

A management plan is a key requirement that must be completed by the local coordinating entity, the LCHP, after the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area is designated by Congress. The management plan is a detailed presentation of the goals of the Area. There must be comprehensive lists of resources that will be protected, enhanced, or interpreted, and their relationships to the themes of national significance must be clearly stated. The specific strategies to be employed to achieve educational, economic, and preservation goals must be identified. Of critical importance is the business plan of the local coordinating entity and the documentation that the plan was developed through broad community outreach and participation. The present Feasibility Study has initiated the process that will come together in the management plan. Given the amount of progress already achieved, it is estimated that the management plan could be completed in 18 months. The Secretary of Interior would respond to that plan within six months. These two time elements are the basis for the two years allocated for achievement of an approved management plan.

Preparation of a management plan would require federal funding. It is assumed in the phasing outlined here that other activities related to development and implementation of the program of the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area

would also take place throughout both Phases 1 and 2.

Capability to Fund

The underlying motivation for this effort to establish a Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area has been the potential benefits to the many communities of varying size that are located throughout the watershed. For that reason, a key element of the initial funding strategy for the LCHP is to seek a baseline of five years of support from these many communities and their associated municipal governments. These funding requests would be proportional to the size of the community and would be subject to annual renewal. The LCHP will submit an annual report detailing accomplishments, spending, and identifying specific goals for the upcoming year. Thus, there will be a strong element of accountability and a requirement that these local dollars are achieving goals that benefit the local communities.

Grants will also comprise a key element of the funding for the LCHP. There are many opportunities for grants from federal and state sources as well as from private foundations. Because the one-to-one matching fund requirements for an established Area must come from non-federal sources, priority will be given to seeking non-federal grants where that is appropriate. Thus, the Arizona Heritage Fund will be a high priority candidate for grants. The State of New Mexico offers small grants for historic preservation through its State Historic Preservation Office. The key to successful grant writing is to ensure that there is a close match between the goals of the funding agency and the needs of the LCHP. It will be very important that the LCHP develop staff

with a record of successful grant writing.

Memberships will be a minor, but very important, source of income for the LCHP. A business membership will be developed for enterprises that conduct heritage or nature based activities within the boundaries of the Area. These could be bed-and-breakfast operations that feature historic buildings or other historic themes, or they could be ranches that offer opportunities for tourists to participate in ranch life. The LCHP would actively promote such enterprises through a website and heritage tourism literature, and such businesses would pay a higher level membership fee to the LCHP. The second form of membership would focus on interested supporters, from businesses to families to individuals. They would pay a reasonable annual fee and receive a regular newsletter and other nominal benefits.

Low levels of earned income are anticipated in the second phase of developments, after additional staff members have been hired. This is expected to be in the form of sales of heritage or nature related books or calendars that would also serve to expand awareness of the rich resources of the Area. There is potential for significant expansion of earned income in subsequent phases of heritage area development. Those opportunities will be addressed in the management plan and will be essential to achieving long-term sustainability for the National Heritage Area.

Private and corporate donations will be an additional source of support, however, it is expected that these will require time to develop. The LCHP will need to establish its tax exempt status and to develop a track record of

Table 2.1. Budget summary for Phase 1 and Phase 2.

| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Income | | | | |
| Non-federal | 100,000 | 100,000 | 201,000 | 196,000 |
| In-kind | 20,000 | 20,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Federal | - | - | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Total | 120,000 | 120,000 | 431,000 | 426,000 |
| Expenses | | | | |
| Employees | 62,500 | 67,500 | 183,750 | 195,000 |
| Other | 30,000 | 29,000 | 216,800 | 132,800 |
| Grants | - | - | - | 60,000 |
| Total | 92,500 | 96,500 | 400,550 | 387,800 |

success. It is expected that the LCHP board and staff will be able to achieve at least low levels of private and corporate support initially, however, a position devoted to fund raising and community relations is expected to be a necessity to build private and corporate donations into a significant source of support for the LCHP. That position is not anticipated in the two phases of development that are considered in this document.

Proposed Operating Budgets for Phase 1 and Phase 2

Phase 1 is the two-year period following completion of this Feasibility Study and prior to achieving designation as a National Heritage Area. No federal funds are available during that time period, and it is a critical time in the development of the National Heritage Area effort. This is the time when it is essential that the local communities that will ultimately benefit from the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area provide financial support. Furthermore, even after designation has been achieved, initial efforts during Phase 2 must focus on completion of a management plan. A management plan approved by the Secretary of the Interior is essential

to initiate the 15-year, up to \$10 million support cycle for a new Area. Thus, it is strongly recommended that the local communities and county governments of the Little Colorado River watershed make pledges of five years of financial support to the LCHP. Simplified budgets are displayed in the following table for Phase 1 and Phase 2, and more detailed budgets are included as Appendix XX.

Personnel Plan for Phases 1 and 2

This plan assumes that there will be one full-time employee during Phase 1 with expansion to three employees during Phase 2. The personnel are briefly described.

Phase 1 Program Manager: Ideally, this position would be filled by Linda Marie Golier, the Heritage Programs Coordinator for the Center for Desert Archaeology, who has led the effort to create this Feasibility Study. The Center can detail Ms. Golier to the LCHP for the two years of Phase 1. The Center can cover half of her payroll and benefits costs if other non-federal sources can cover the other half of those costs. Ms. Golier's substantial experience with this project would ensure that the transition to this

important stage of the overall effort does not result in any loss of momentum. Key tasks for Phase 1 relate to continued building of support for the National Heritage Area effort and the initiation of program activities of broad benefit across the entire Little Colorado watershed.

Phase 2 Executive Director: The Executive Director must have a diverse skill set in order to effectively manage relationships with the Board of Directors, the LCHP staff, and with collaborating partners. The Executive Director should be responsible for carrying out the policies and program direction provided by the Board and must advise the Board on issues and opportunities that influence the organization's ability to meet its mission goals. In particular, the Executive Director must work closely with the Board to develop sources of income that will contribute to the long-term sustainability of the LCHP. Previous experience and demonstrated success as an Executive Director is highly desirable.

Phase 2 Program Manager: This position will work closely with the Executive Director in order to implement specific programs related to education, interpretation, preservation, or heritage tourism development. Preparing and administering grants and taking the lead on public communications through both a newsletter and the LCHP web site are expected responsibilities. Continuing to demonstrate the community benefits of the National Heritage Area and to develop relationships with potential donors are also elements of this job.

Phase 2 Administrative Assistant: A half-time or three-quarter-time administrative assistant will be an important addition during Phase 2.

This will allow the Executive Director and Program Manager to be more focused on their core responsibilities as this individual will provide office administration, technical support, and clerical services.

This core staff, if filled with highly qualified individuals, should be able to carry out the basic work of the LCHP. In combination with a skilled and engaged Board of Directors, the LCHP will be able to efficiently and effectively serve as the local coordinating entity for the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area.

Federal Match Funding

The potential to bring federal funding to assist in the process of promoting heritage and nature tourism and to provide the opportunity to create a grant program to benefit specific projects within the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area is a very important element of this program. It is the intention of the proposed LCHP to create a competitive program through which local communities, projects, nonprofits, and other qualified organizations can access the match funding that will eventually be appropriated to the National Heritage Area from Congress through the National Park Service. The LCHP grant program will be guided by its approved management plan with regularly updated 5-year strategies developed with input from public meetings and the Partnership Council. The LCHP will set criteria for eligibility, funding amounts, types of projects to be funded, and monitoring and evaluation processes.

The grants program is anticipated to begin in the second year of Phase 2, with a small grants program for projects up to \$10,000. This will help to

provide immediate benefits for roughly six to ten projects that can meet eligibility and matching fund requirements. This need to expand the availability of funding within this region has been identified consistently by stakeholders throughout the proposed heritage area. Expansion of this grants program will be addressed specifically in the management plan prepared during Phase 2.

Summary

This Conceptual Financial Plan for the proposed Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area addresses the needs of the NHA and its local coordinating entity, the Little Colorado Heritage Partnership (LCHP). It also outlines the roles of the various potential funding sources and lays out a strategy to ensure the economic sustainability of the Area. Fully adopting and implementing this Financial Plan will allow the LCHP to ensure that the distinctive landscapes and resources of the heritage area are recognized, protected, enhanced, and interpreted to improve the quality of life for residents, and also to ensure opportunities for public appreciation, education, enjoyment, and economic sustainability.

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES

The proposed boundaries of the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area encompass between 26–27,000 square miles in northeast Arizona and northwest New Mexico. The boundary is natural. It is the watershed boundary of the Little Colorado River and its tributaries with the exception of three minor alterations (the inclusion of the entire San Francisco Peaks landform and the exclusion of extremely small parcels in

San Juan County, New Mexico and on the White Mountain Apache Reservation in Arizona) as described in Chapter 1. As will be shown in Chapter 3, the river provided a unifying force for centuries of human habitation. The high mountains and mesas surrounding most of the watershed's edges, and the unique landforms within its boundaries, led to the development of human lifestyles that differ from regions that surround it. Native Americans developed specialized crops and farming techniques in response to the climate and soil conditions. The timing and intensity of Spanish colonial settlements was quite different in the Little Colorado River Valley as compared to the Rio Grande River Valley, its neighbor immediately to the east. Logging played a major role in the late 19th century development of several towns, but virtually no logging took place in regions to the south of the watershed, especially in Arizona. The region's topography and climate facilitated easier east-west travel than could be found through the Rocky Mountains to the north or the hotter deserts to the south. This travel corridor, roughly along the 35th parallel, would time and again play a significant role in what happened in the region. The Little Colorado River watershed unites what is at first glance a very diverse region into a cohesive, inter-related landscape.

The watershed boundary marks an area that is a source of identity for many residents, is a coherent natural and cultural landscape, and has sufficient nature and heritage resources to support a National Heritage Area designation. The boundary is not regulatory and designation will have no effect on private property rights, zoning, property taxes, or government and agency jurisdictions. An analogy

for a Heritage Area is an “enterprise zone,” in which an area has been designated for voluntary participation to obtain benefits.

Another analogy would be Resource Conservation & Development Districts operated through the Department of Agriculture. Resource Conservation & Development Districts are geographically defined regions that received federal dollars and staff to engage with local leaders and landowners to conduct project primarily related to land and water resource management and improvement. Projects within the proposed National Heritage Area boundary will be eligible for federal funding and other assistance from the National Heritage Area.

ROLES OF DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS AFTER DESIGNATION

Some existing and new groups and institutions, as well as a unit of the National Park Service, have participated in the designation process. Three of these will be involved in the management of the National Heritage Area after designation. The following summarizes their roles.

Petrified Forest National Park

- ◆ Created by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1906 as Petrified Forest National Monument; achieved National Park status in 1962
- ◆ Park currently consists of 93,533 acres, but a boundary expansion approved in 2004 will increase the boundaries to 218,533 acres as lands are purchased or gifted

- ◆ Contains the Painted Desert Inn, built in 1924, renovated by Mary Colter with murals by Fred Kabotie in 1947, and designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1987
- ◆ Serves as required National Park Service partner for the development of the feasibility study and future management plan of the proposed Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area
- ◆ Will provide comments and input to National Park Service testimony about the feasibility study and management plan
- ◆ May manage annual Congressional appropriations to the National Heritage Area through amendments to the Cooperative Agreement which describe the purposes of each year’s funding (*Note: this funding structure is under review at this time and may change according to Congress’s decisions*)
- ◆ Will provide a non-voting, ex-officio member to the board of the Little Colorado Heritage Partnership
- ◆ Will assist in the process for National Register nominations in the National Heritage Area
- ◆ Will provide expertise about geology, paleontology, and natural and cultural resources to the National Heritage Area and its partners

Little Colorado Heritage Partnership, Inc.

- ◆ A newly-created non-profit that will serve as the coordinating entity for the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area
- ◆ Board will consist of individuals that represent the geographic and cultural diversity of the region
- ◆ Will likely develop a small paid staff
- ◆ Will have a major fundraising role

- ♦ Will be responsible for administering federal appropriations through a re-granting program
- ♦ Will evolve as the needs and capabilities of the National Heritage Area develop over time
- ♦ May provide one non-voting, ex-officio member to the board of the Little Colorado Heritage Partnership, Inc. during the initial stages of the National Heritage Area's development

Center for Desert Archaeology

- ♦ Secured the funding and personnel to complete the feasibility study