GEORGIA’S STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN 2012–2016:
PARTNERING FOR PRESERVATION

Historic Preservation Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, 2012
ON THE COVER:

Clockwise from top left: Ribbon cutting ceremony celebrating the rehabilitation of the historic Waynesboro High School (a contributing structure in the National Register listed Waynesboro Historic District) into senior residences; Participants from This Place Matters conference in Augusta visit the Lucy Craft Laney Black History Museum; HPD staff at Hardman Farm; Members of the Georgia Chapter of DOCOMOMO (Documentation and Conservation of buildings, sites and neighborhoods of the Modern Movement) visit Savannah’s Benedictine Military School, completed in 1964; Society for Georgia Archaeology sets up booth at DNR’s annual CoastFest activity, Brunswick. (Photos by HPD staff, except bottom left, courtesy of Michael Shirk)
CREDITS

Editor
Karen Anderson-Córdova

Principal Authors
Karen Anderson-Córdova
Richard Cloues
Bryan Tucker

With Contributions from
Dean Baker
David Crass
Carole Moore

Historic Preservation Planning Team
Karen Anderson-Córdova
Dean Baker
Leigh Burns
Richard Cloues
David Crass
Candy Henderson
Bryan Tucker

Layout and Design
Jennifer Evans Yankopolus

Photography
Jim Lockhart, Charlie Miller and HPD staff
unless otherwise noted

Note: The quotations throughout, including those on page 88, were taken from responses to the 2012-2016 Georgia State Historic Preservation Plan public input survey conducted in 2010-2011.
Acknowledgements
This publication has been financed in part with federal funds from the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, through the Historic Preservation Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources. The contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of the Interior, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products or consultants constitute endorsement or recommendation by the Department of the Interior or the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. The Department of the Interior prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, or disability in its federally assisted programs. If you believe you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility, or if you desire more information write to: Office of Equal Opportunity, National Park Service, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC 20240.
CONTENTS

SECTION I: ACTION PLAN

INTRODUCTION
3 Accomplishments from the Previous Plan

A SNAPSHOT OF GEORGIA
15 Population Trends
17 Population Changes
18 Housing Trends
20 Transportation Trends
21 Agricultural Trends
23 Tourism Trends
24 Current Trends in Heritage Tourism
26 Emerging Trends in Tourism
27 Trends in Government
32 Growth and Development Strategies
35 Partnerships
36 Conclusion

MISSION, VISION AND GOALS
38 A Vision for Historic Preservation in Georgia
39 Goals, Objectives and Strategies

SECTION II: GEORGIA’S HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

GEORGIA’S HISTORIC PROPERTIES
52 An Overview of Georgia’s Historic Properties
60 Historic Properties in Georgia
64 What Makes a Property “Historic?”

GEORGIA’S ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROPERTIES
70 The Paleoindian Period
71 The Archaic Period
72 The Woodland Period
74 The Mississippian Period
75 Early European Colonization
SECTION III: THE PLANNING PROCESS

DEVELOPING THE PLAN

83 Public Participation
89 Conclusion

91 REFERENCES CONSULTED
SECTION I: ACTION PLAN
Georgia has a strong preservation constituency that works in partnership to protect our irreplaceable historic places. Like all of the United States, Georgia faces challenging economic realities that have had and will continue to have an impact on the lives of most, if not all, of its citizens. Working together and pooling scarce resources is now even more important. Preservationists need to once again assess where we are, adjust our course, evaluate the choices we have made, and envision a better future. We need to reaffirm our vision of community, shared experiences, and shared heritage. It is a vision that blends treasuring our past with developing a new course for the future. It is a vision that includes people from all walks of life joining forces to protect and use historic places and make Georgia a better place to live, work and play.

Planning for our future must include planning for the preservation and protection of our heritage. Why? Historic places and cultural patterns tell the story of who we are, those who came before us and whom we are becoming. Historic places are tangible evidence of Georgia's history. They give us a sense of place and a compelling reason to protect our history and share it with others. Historic places enhance the quality of people’s lives, they provide a continuous source of information about the past, and they can be studied, interpreted, rehabilitated and used to benefit present and future generations of Georgians and of people who visit our state. Historic preservation also creates much needed jobs, and has positive benefits to the environment by utilizing existing resources, thereby contributing to a more sustainable future.

Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Plan 2012-2016: Partnering for Preservation is the guiding document for the state historic preservation program administered by the Historic Preservation Division (HPD) of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GDNR). Our state plan covers the years 2012 through 2016. It follows the previous plan, Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Plan 2007-2011: Building a Preservation Ethic, and builds on its firm foundations. Our state plan also draws from GDNR’s strategic planning initiative. This
initiative is a department-wide vision to protect and enhance Georgia’s natural and cultural resources as well as develop a state-wide conservation ethic.

...
shipwreck survey continued to develop in the following ways. A major contribution was locating, in 2009, what may be the Union gunboat USS Water Witch near the mouth of the Little Ogeechee River south of Savannah. This was the result of a partnership among GDNR, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the National Civil War Naval Museum at Point Columbus.

- The Georgia Underwater Archaeological Field Survey (GUAFS) also carried out a combined terrestrial and underwater archaeological survey of the colonial port town of Sunbury. The remote sensing survey identified well over 100 targets of interest in St. Catherine’s Sound. Just as importantly, staff identified the colonial period wharfs in the marsh, which are surrounded by extensive artifact deposits. This marked the first systematic survey of this abandoned town, which once rivaled Savannah as a port of entry and was a center for privateering during the Revolutionary War.

- In spring of 2010, HPD partnered with Georgia Southern University and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to investigate a Civil War prisoner of war camp at Magnolia Springs State Park. To date the archaeologists have uncovered evidence of the original stockade and a wealth of personal items once owned and used by the prisoners including bullets, a tourniquet buckle, and a pipe with a soldier’s teeth marks. The public announcement of the discovery was jointly organized by GDNR, USFWS, and Georgia Southern University. A number of local media outlets, as well as PBS, NPR, CNN and the Associated Press were on hand to report on the proceedings and interview the participants. This project provided an excellent opportunity for outreach; over 1000 people are estimated to have attended the event making this one of the largest public archaeology events ever held in the state. In September of 2011 the team was awarded the Secretary of the Interior’s Partners in Conservation Award for their efforts.

- Another HPD/University partnership produced a detailed study of a portion of the Pickett’s Mill battlefield which is regarded as one of the best preserved Civil War battlefields in the country. Although the battle of Pickett’s Mill is considered to have been a minor engagement in the Atlanta Campaign of 1864, it was quick, decisive, and bloody. Despite this, there are detailed military records as well as well-preserved Confederate and Union earthworks, Civil War era roads, a Union field hospital, and military mass graves located within the park. The availability of historical records and the good preservation of the site were important factors for Dr. Terry Powis of Kennesaw State University.
when investigating the battlefield in 2006 and 2007. In addition to the excavation of two historic structures, portions of the main battlefield were tested using metal detectors which resulted in the recovery of a number of military artifacts including hundreds of Minie balls and a few personal items such as Confederate belt buckles. The data and report produced in the course of this work have allowed for better management and interpretation of this important resource.

- Archaeologists from the University of Kentucky mounted a series of successful field school investigations on Sapelo Island, which is managed primarily by the GDNR. The investigations resulted in the identification of a very large Mission Period Guale Indian site which may be that of the mission Santa Josef de Sapala. Guales and Spanish took refuge at Santa Josef after the primary mission in Georgia, Santa Catalina de Guale, was raided by approximately 300 Westo Indians under the sub rosa leadership of English political leadership in Charles Town, South Carolina.

- Archaeologists from the University of Tennessee-Chattanooga (UT-C) carried out field school surveys of every major plantation site on Sapelo Island, resulting in an impressive comparative dataset that is unique in Georgia. In 2011 the UT-C crew discovered the site of the 1820s light keepers house on Sapelo, which had been destroyed by a hurricane in the 1890s. Later that year the same crew moved their investigations to Ossabaw Island, also under GDNR administration. Their investigations revealed the remains of a plantation house that was burned by Loyalists near the end of the American Revolution. Plans were put in place to incorporate historic preservation components into this field school for 2012.

- HPD’s Archaeology Section was recipient of a $10,000 grant from the University of Arizona and The Digital Archaeological Record (tDAR). tDAR is an international digital archive and repository that houses data about archaeological investigations, research, resources, and scholarship. tDAR provides researchers new avenues to discover and integrate information relevant to topics they are studying. Users can search tDAR for digital documents, data sets, images, GIS files, and other data sources form archaeological projects spanning the globe. For data sets, users also can use data integration tools in tDAR to simplify and illuminate comparative research.

Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties

- Georgia remains one of the highest ranked states in the number of listings in the National Register of Historic Places. In 2006, Georgia had 1,932 National Register listings and 65,677 con-

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

The tangible reminders of our heritage give us a sense of place and orientation in an increasingly global world.
By September of 2011, Georgia National Register listings increased to 2,051 and 75,791 contributing resources. Among the highlights this planning cycle was the state’s 2,000th listing in the National Register, the Waynesboro Historic District in Burke County, in March of 2009. Another highlight was the multiple property National Register thematic nomination for Georgia’s Rosenwald schools.

- During the past five years, the number of surveyed historic buildings in HPD’s computerized database increased from 76,151 to 94,168. This increase was due in large measure to the continuation of the innovative “FindIt” field survey partnership with the Georgia Transmission Corporation (an electrical utility company) and the Center for Community Design and Preservation at the University of Georgia’s School of Environmental Design. As part of its Section 106 compliance activities, the Georgia Transmission Corporation (GTC) is providing 10-year funding for an expanded field survey program. Surveys are carried out by the Center for Community Design and Preservation, and survey data is recorded in HPD’s web-based geographical information sys-
• GNAHRGIS was enhanced to take full advantage of new database and mapping capabilities. The update was funded by a Transportation Enhancement grant administered by the Georgia Department of Transportation’s Office of Environmental Services with an in-kind match and programming services provided by the Information Technology and Outreach Service of the Carl Vinson Institute of Government at the University of Georgia. Enhancements included expanded data categories, special provisions for recording field survey data collected through Section 106 surveys and retention of “legacy” survey data in a readily accessible “archive” when previously surveyed properties are resurveyed.

• The Garden Club of Georgia’s Historic Landscape Initiative continued. The Garden Club of Georgia, HPD, the Cherokee Garden Library at the Atlanta History Center, and the National Park Service Southeast Regional Office are current partners in the identification of the state’s historic landscapes. The project priority remains updating the status of gardens and open spaces listed in *The Garden History of Georgia: 1733-1933*; however, the identification of historic cultural landscapes not listed in the publication has also been encouraged. The Cherokee Garden Library handles the administration of the landscape initiative and serves as the repository for all survey data collected. As of March 2011, 137 historic landscapes have been documented. Out of approximately 160 gardens and landscapes listed in *Garden History of Georgia*, about 50 remain to be surveyed.

• Considerable strides were made in the identification and evaluation of Georgia’s mid-twentieth century buildings. Consensus guidelines for documenting and evaluating Ranch Houses were developed by HPD, GDOT, GTC, and various consultants. These national-award-winning guidelines are now being used for National Register nominations as well as Section 106 reviews. Recent National Register nominations include an individual nomination for the California Contemporary-style Joseph and Mary Jane League House in Macon, designed in 1950 by Jean League Newton, a historic district nomination for Savannah’s first modern mid-century suburb, “Fairview Oaks-Greenview,” and a historic district nomination for the nation’s foremost mid-century African American suburb, Collier Heights, in Atlanta. HPD also worked closely with graduate students in the Heritage Preservation Program at Georgia State University who conducted a first-ever in-depth study of mid-20th-century houses in DeKalb County. DeKalb was among Georgia’s fastest growing

**Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?**

_The past informs the present and the future. Human beings need connection to those who came before as well as to those present._

Cover of the publication “The Ranch House in Georgia, Guidelines for Evaluation”, a collaboration among HPD, the Georgia Department of Transportation, the Georgia Transmission Corporation, and various consultants. This publication is available on HPD’s website, www.georgiashpo.org.
counties in the two decades following World War II and contains a large number and great variety of mid-century houses. HPD also documented mid-20th-century school buildings in Georgia with special attention on the “equalization” school phenomenon through which the state attempted to avoid desegregating its public schools by building hundreds of new schools for African American students. Most recently, HPD also launched an initiative to study mid-century storefronts including those on newly constructed buildings as well as remodeled storefronts on older buildings.

**Preservation Grants and Tax Incentives**

- Georgia continued to be a leader in promoting federal and state preservation tax incentives. Although the recent economic downturn affected the number of certified tax projects completed in Georgia, Georgia still ranks in the top 15 among states in the number of certified projects. In addition, in May of 2008 Georgia’s General Assembly made changes to the 2003 State Income Tax Credit for Rehabilitated Historic Property. The HB 851 amendment offered a credit equal to 25% of qualified rehabilitation expenses, removed the previous $5,000 cap and provided for a maximum cap of $100,000 for residential properties and $300,000 for income-producing properties. The amended law came into effect in January 2009. It spurred great interest in the tax credit programs and resulted in an increase in the number of applications.

- In an effort to promote the new state tax credit as well as Georgia’s other tax incentives programs, HPD has averaged at least 15 presentations a year to homeowner associations, local historic preservation commissions, local governments, non-profits, and real estate associations.

- Georgia’s preservation grants program continued to assist in the recognition and rehabilitation of many of Georgia’s historic properties. Since 2007, 29 projects have been awarded almost $321,386 through the Georgia Heritage Grants Program (including those funded through the historic preservation license plate); 49 projects have been awarded $405,713 through the Historic Preservation Fund/Certified Local Government Grants.

- The state-funded Georgia Heritage Grant Program provides bricks-and-mortar grants to local governments and non-profits for rehabilitation of historic properties listed in the Georgia and National Register of Historic Places. Beginning in SFY2009, historic preservation license plate sales became the sole funding source for the Georgia Heritage grant program. The first Georgia Heritage matching grant funded with license plate revenue was
awarded in December of 2008 (SFY2009) to the Tybee Island Historical Society for rehabilitation work on the Tybee Island Theatre. Since the $20,000 grant to the Tybee Island Historical Society, $96,685 in license plate revenue has been awarded to eight other projects.

- The need to find additional sources of funding for preservation projects became particularly important during the last state planning cycle. HPD applied for and received two matching grants from the Preserve America program. The first grant, completed in 2009, focused on the preservation of Georgia’s historic cemeteries and their heritage tourism potential. The results included:
  1) the publication *Preserving Georgia’s Historic Cemeteries*;
  2) the conference *Eternal Places: Discovering Georgia’s Historic Cemeteries*; and
  3) subgrants to five Preserve America communities (Macon, Kennesaw, Rome, Roswell, and Washington) for various cemetery projects. The preservation activities carried out as a result of this grant spurred additional funds for cemetery projects in partnership with the Georgia Department of Economic Development (GDeD). The second Preserve America grant, completed in 2011, focused on community landmark buildings and heritage tourism. The results included:
  1) the publication of *Heritage Tourism Handbook: A How-to-Guide for Georgia*, in partnership with the GDeD;
  2) the conference *History and Heritage Tourism: Discovering Georgia’s Community Landmarks*;
  3) the publication of *Preservation Primer: A Resource Guide for Georgia*;
  4) easier accessibility of heritage preservation driving and walking tours from communities across the state on HPD’s website; and
  5) subgrants to nine Preserve America communities for various community landmark and heritage tourism projects. The GDeD also provided additional monies to fund a small grant program for historic theatres.

Publications and Outreach

- Reliance on electronic media to communicate the preservation message increased in the past five years. Many preservation organizations have acknowledged the importance of the web as a tool to facilitate public access to programs and provide up-to-date information on a variety of preservation services. A significant milestone was the July 2011 launch of HPD’s new and improved website. It is an important educational tool that provides a wealth of easily accessible information. In addition to the weekly electronic newsletter, HPD instituted other social media improvements, including a Facebook page, a Twitter page, and a monthly electronic publication *Preservation Posts*. Written by HPD staff, *Preservation Posts* provides more detailed articles on
a variety of preservation subjects. All these social media improvements offer increasing opportunity to present preservation-related information to a much wider audience.

- HPD’s African American program continued to make major contributions to the preservation of Georgia’s African American resources. As of June 2011 the Rosenwald school initiative has documented 51 schools as part of a national effort to preserve these segregation-era historic resources. The African American Education and Rosenwald Schools in Georgia historic context was completed and posted on HPD’s website, and a Multiple Property Documentation Form to expedite National Register nominations for Rosenwald Schools was prepared and approved by the National Park Service. The program began a new project to identify African American equalization schools, and as of June 2011 has documented 97 schools. African American programs have been partners in the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission and contributed to the African American Heritage Guide developed by the Tourism Foundation of the GDEcD.

- HPD launched a new education and outreach initiative in coordination with other divisions in the GDNR. The purpose of this initiative is to integrate HPD’s preservation ethic message with the wider conservation message of the Department and to broaden the scope of Georgia’s preservation constituency. As part of this initiative, HPD revised its logo and public presentation templates, and prepared new outreach and presentation materials, including banners, posters and education-oriented materials for children and young adults. HPD staff increased outreach efforts by participating in public activities such as the annual Coastfest; the Decatur Old House Fair; and State Parks and Historic Sites days at the Capitol.

Carver Elementary School, former African American equalization school in Dawson, Terrell County.

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

My understanding of how my community functioned historically makes me feel a part of something interesting and worthwhile and eager to share that with future generations.
• In September of 2010, HPD published an economic study of the impact of historic preservation in Georgia. Prepared by PlaceEconomics, *Good News in Tough Times: Historic Preservation and the Georgia Economy*, this well received study documents how historic preservation in Georgia is spurring investment, attracting visitors, revitalizing downtowns, and effectively leveraging scarce resources. According to the study, during the last ten years over 10,000 jobs have been created through the rehabilitation of historic structures and 5,100 net new businesses have opened their doors in Georgia Main Street and Better Hometown cities across the state.

• HPD’s education and public assistance efforts increased to meet the public demand for information on Georgia’s historic cemeteries. As mentioned in the section on grants, HPD published the booklet *Georgia’s Historic Cemeteries*, which was distributed to the interested public free of charge and also posted on the website.

• HPD focused on preservation issues relating to community landmarks and heritage tourism, and, as mentioned in the section on grants, published the booklet *Heritage Tourism Handbook: A How-to-Guide for Georgia*, and co-sponsored a conference *History and Heritage Tourism: Discovering Georgia’s Community Landmarks*, held in March of 2010 in Warm Springs, Georgia.

• HPD’s partnerships increased during this past planning cycle. HPD staff regularly presented on a variety of preservation topics at conferences, meetings and trainings of many organizations, including: The Georgia Municipal Association, The Georgia Department of Community Affairs-Office of Downtown Development, GDEcD, The Fanning Institute of the University of Georgia, and the Georgia Downtown Association. HPD participated in the Main Street Institute, the Georgia Downtown Conference, and Georgia’s Downtown Development Authority Training to reach the broader audience involved directly with local communities across Georgia. HPD staff also partnered with the Tourism Division of GDEcD in resource teams that focus on individual communities to provide direct assistance for tourism development. In supporting these efforts, historic preservation has become an integral part of tourism and economic development strategies at the local level.

• HPD also promoted and assisted more than twenty local, regional and statewide preservation non-profit organizations throughout Georgia. Many of these organizations, including Historic Augusta, Inc., Thomasville Landmarks, and DOCOMOMO Georgia, offer training in conjunction with HPD staff. HPD also assisted preservation non-profits by promoting their events on HPD’s website calendar, and by direct participation in many of Discovery Day at Camp Lawton, the site of a Civil War prisoner of war camp located in Magnolia Springs State Park was a pivotal education and outreach initiative among HPD, Georgia Southern University, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and GDNR’s State Parks and Historic Sites Division.
these events as well. In 2010 HPD partnered with the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation (The Georgia Trust) to re-engage with historic preservation non-profits throughout the state, by co-sponsoring a successful preservation summit meeting in Macon. In 2011 HPD again partnered with The Georgia Trust to co-sponsor the first Statewide Historic Preservation Conference since 2005. Held in Macon, and highlighting the recent update on Georgia’s historic preservation economic benefits study *Good News in Tough Times*, the conference attracted nearly 165 participants from across the state.

- More than 74 historic family farms were commemorated through the Centennial Farm program, bringing the total number of Centennial Farms in Georgia to 401 as of October 2011.

### Preservation Planning

- HPD reconfigured its Certified Local Government Program (CLG) These services were formerly coordinated through the University of Georgia’s College of Environment and Design, which also administered all CLG training. The new program was centralized in HPD. Multiple training opportunities were offered in partnership with a wide variety of state and local partners including the Carl Vinson Institute of Government, Downtown Development Associations, the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (GDCA), and the Georgia Alliance of Preservation Commissions in an effort to reach new audiences, and CLG grants have been used in part to facilitate participation by cash-strapped local governments. Eight new communities were certified in the current planning cycle, for a statewide total of 83 certified local governments as of June 30, 2011.

- As part of the Preserve America grant for heritage tourism and community landmarks, HPD produced a publication entitled *Preservation Primer: A Resource Guide for Georgia*, highlighting preservation planning tools and strategies, as well as case studies and historic resource information from across the state to assist local communities in preserving and managing their historic properties.

- The State Stewardship program, which requires state agencies to identify and protect state-owned and/or-administered historic properties, made strides as well. Of special note is the historic preservation initiative of the Board of Regents, University System of Georgia. Twelve campuses have completed preservation plans as part of the university system’s master planning process.

- Hundreds of county and city governments have completed comprehensive plans that include a historic preservation component. In addition to this planning practice, regional commissions across Georgia began developing regionally important resource plans.
that include historic and archaeological resources. Regional preservation planners throughout the state have assisted communities and contributed in these endeavors.

- HPD’s environmental review and compliance program worked closely with federal, state and local agencies to insure the successful implementation of federal stimulus projects with streamlined Section 106 reviews. HPD also completed major consultations with the Army and the Navy for the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) closures of Ft. McPherson, Fort Gillem and the Navy Supply School in Athens.

Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Plan 2012-2016: Partnering for Preservation builds upon the accomplishments of its predecessor. Its guiding principle is the protection of all of Georgia’s historic properties, from archaeological sites in the earth or underwater to the structures, houses, buildings, objects, landscapes and traditional cultural properties that encompass our built environment, through enhanced partnerships that will maximize the benefits of scarce financial resources. The plan acknowledges the importance of a vision where all of Georgia’s citizens are committed to the preservation of our shared heritage.

HPD has adopted this plan as a statement of policy direction and as a commitment to action for the protection and use of Georgia’s valuable historic properties. Because it represents the views and priorities of preservationists throughout Georgia who participated in its development, Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Plan 2012-2016: Partnering for Preservation can provide common direction for all organizations and individuals who support the preservation of our historic places.
As the 21st century continues to unfold, historic preservation remains an integral part of the social, economic and political landscape of the nation, as well as the state. The preservation of historic properties is just one of many quality of life issues that Georgia faces. Historic resources are affected by political, social and financial trends.

Although the general trend of urbanization has slowed in the past few years, Georgians remain concerned about unplanned growth and urban sprawl. There is also growing concern about rising unemployment, the slump in the housing market, and declining revenues. Rural areas of the state face the added challenges of disinvestment and declining population. However, the increasing importance of sustainability as a way to spur investment and protect the environment gives historic preservation an opportunity to present the many positive aspects of maintaining existing historic properties and investing in communities. Georgians look to historic preservation as a tool to help maintain sustainable communities and bring about sensitive, smart development. Economic studies indicate the positive impact of historic preservation in job creation, added wealth, and increased investment in small and large communities alike. It is important to consider the overarching movements that affect Georgia as a whole so that historic preservation programs can be geared to respond in the most effective manner.

This chapter discusses the following trends and their effects on historic preservation: population, housing, transportation, agriculture, tourism, and government. It also discusses planning and growth strategies that can help to address these trends and their effects on the preservation of Georgia’s historic and archaeological resources.
Population trends

In 2010, Georgia’s population was 9,687,653, an increase of 18.3 percent from the 2000 census, nearly twice the 9.7 percent national average for population growth. This population places Georgia ninth amongst the fifty states in population size. Georgia’s total population is expected to increase to 10,843,753 by 2020. More than half of Georgia’s population is located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Statistical Area, with a regional population of 5,268,860, growing from the 2000 Census total of 4,247,981. The five most populous cities for the decade are Atlanta, 420,003; Augusta, 200,549; Columbus, 189,885; Savannah, 136,286; and Athens-Clarke County, 116,714. Atlanta grew by 0.8 percent since the 2000 Census. Augusta-Richmond County grew by 0.4 percent, Columbus grew by 1.9 percent, Savannah grew by 3.6 percent, and Athens-Clark County grew by 1.5 percent.

Although Georgia’s population is getting older, Georgia is still one of the youngest states in the nation. The population of Georgia residents 65 and older from the 2010 US Census Bureau is at 10.3 percent, noticeably less than the national percentage of 12.4 percent. In contrast Georgia’s population under 18 stands at 26.3 percent, still noticeably more than the national average of 24.3 percent.

The trend of increased diversity in Georgia’s population continues. African American population rose 25.6 percent, to make up 30.5 percent of the state population. Other minority populations saw an even greater percentage increase, although they currently make up a much smaller percentage of the state’s total population. In the decade from 2000 to 2010, Hispanic population spiked 96.1 percent, making up 8.8 percent of the total state population. In this same period, Asian population increased 81.6 percent, forming 3.2 percent of the state population. In the 2010 Census, Georgia’s white population grew only 8.6 percent, making up 58.7 percent of the state population.

Continued Growth in Suburban and Urban Georgia

Georgia has seen impressive growth and the distinctions between urban and suburban areas are becoming blurred. More of the state is becoming metropolitan, and even smaller urban areas are expanding. Georgia currently has 15 metropolitan areas covering 70 of Georgia’s 159 counties. In addition, the US Census has identified 22 micropolitan statistical areas. These are areas centered on cities with populations between 10,000 and 50,000.

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

Historic preservation is one of the most cost-effective ways to increase economic activity in areas where significant public investment already exists. Preservation is green, fiscally conservative and builds quality of life, creating a physical sense of place in an increasingly disconnected world.
The vast majority of recent population growth and development has occurred in suburban and exurban areas of the state, especially around the city of Atlanta. Recent population trends indicate that current developed areas will continue to grow and become denser. This population change can be seen in the population growth for the City of Atlanta and the traditionally developed and historic areas that are now part of greater suburban Atlanta. The shift can also be seen in suburban areas, formerly rural, revitalized through programs such as the Livable Centers Initiative. The improvements to these areas can encourage the preservation of historic structures and districts. They can also result in the loss of historic properties through higher-density or “upscale” redevelopment.

Growth in Rural Georgia

Although the urban counties in Georgia have experienced considerable growth over the past twenty years and are projected to continue to grow in the future, there are some areas of Georgia that are experiencing a decline in population. These areas are concentrated in the southwestern and central-eastern part of the state. These areas face an uncertain future because of lack of employment opportunities and low levels of services. As working-age people continue to leave, large numbers of older residents remain. The continued rapid decline of Georgia’s non metro areas, especially the county seats and market towns that thrived in an era of smaller scale agriculture, face very uncertain futures. With the decline in families with children requiring larger houses in these areas, and the accessibility and affordability of land, the viability of large numbers of historic homes and structures in smaller towns throughout the state may be in question.

The northern rural areas of the state and the counties along the Atlantic coast continue to experience major growth. This growth may impact the historic rural environment of these areas. The mountainous northern areas possess both scenic beauty and are located near the regional economic centers of Atlanta and Chattanooga. The north Georgia mountain counties of Pickens and Dawson are projected to experience more than 75 percent growth in the next ten years. Gilmer, Lumpkin, Towns, Union and White counties are expected to increase more than 30 percent. Georgia’s expanding military installations such as Kings Bay Naval Base in Camden County and the continuing expansion of Fort Benning near Columbus may extend some beneficial population growth to the surrounding more rural communities.
Continually growing metropolitan areas will not see the rapid and widespread changes in the landscape that had been seen in the past decade. Growth in Georgia’s metropolitan areas will continue, but at a much slower pace. This development will still place additional pressure on existing infrastructure. While the rapid pace of growth and development most recently seen before 2008 will not return for some time, continued growth and an increased population will still need clean water, sewers, new roads and other transportation options and utilities. These population shifts and development pressures often come at the expense of natural areas, open space, historic landscapes, buildings and archaeological sites. It is possible to foresee a future where greater population density encourages new development that follows the pattern of traditional and historic walkable communities, but that transition is probably beyond the five-year timeline of this plan.

Pedestrian-friendly urbanized areas, with higher concentrations of historic resources like the formerly rural but now suburban central business districts and in-town neighborhoods will experience increased development pressures. Historic properties at the greatest long-term risk are those in declining rural areas. With little economic activity, historic buildings in these smaller communities or rural countryside face neglect, high vacancy rates and abandonment. If any interest is shown in these buildings, it is often for their salvage potential or for relocation. Looters that are tempted by high resource prices to strip historic structures of copper wire and plumbing or the growing market for artifacts threaten archaeological sites in isolated areas. Other threats to historic resources come from deferred maintenance, abandonment, or new development requirements.

Georgia’s larger cities, including Savannah, Atlanta and Macon, are attracting people who want to live in an urban setting. Many people are tired of the commute from the suburbs to jobs in the cities and want to experience a more urban way of life. As the costs of commuting, both in terms of time spent commuting, energy costs and the lack of physical activity, increase, the trend toward urban living will continue. People are buying and rehabilitating historic housing and occupying adapted warehouses, offices and mill buildings. The use of existing historic resources is a major factor in this urban renaissance. Many developers of historic rehabilitation projects are taking advantage of the Federal Investment Tax Credit and State Property Tax Abatement programs. However, the tendency to transport the scale of suburban living to historic in-town communities can have the unintended consequence of de-
HOUSING TRENDS

The preservation issues related to housing must be divided into three areas, rural, suburban and urban. Each of these generalized areas throughout the state face similar problems on differing scales. The most apparent areas affected are urban and suburban, most notable in and around the Atlanta metropolitan areas but also seen in Macon, Augusta, Albany, Columbus and Savannah. The change to rural residential environments is not nearly as dramatic but the changes made over the next five years will have long-lasting effects to Georgia’s natural and agrarian landscapes.

The continued growth of the Atlanta region, anticipated to absorb approximately 2.5 million residents over the next ten years from other states and from other parts of Georgia, will see continued alteration of the surrounding region shifting from rural to suburban. The lack of new modes of transportation and continued escalation in fuel and energy prices will also have a major impact on development patterns with the continued densification of areas already considered urban and the introduction of urban development patterns into areas originally considered and constructed as suburban areas. Traditionally developed less-dense historic areas may be affected by this trend.

Urban Redevelopment

In-town areas will undoubtedly continue to see a shift in the development pattern affecting neighborhoods that originally developed from the 1920s to the early 1960s as bungalow and ranch house communities. These established neighborhoods have seen their share of home demolitions. However, the more complex change is a new hybrid type of home, where large additions are built atop and around the original house. These additions greatly increase and often more than double the original square footage of these historic homes. The pressure for resale values of this in-town redevelopment results in new homes that imitate the style of the original and surrounding homes, but not the original scale and context. The vast number of these changes to homes in historic areas obviously removes these established neighborhoods from consideration as historic districts and threatens the integrity of existing National Register districts. The collapse of home values and the new trends toward sustainability and energy savings may help to...
counteract the appeal of these larger homes and thereby decrease the threat to the integrity of existing historic districts.

Suburban Development
Suburban development has shifted somewhat in style if not in pattern. The Craftsman style originally seen in the 1920s has become popular for new developments throughout the state. Like the re-developing intown neighborhoods, these houses share only an exterior appearance but certainly not scale or development pattern. There have been some attempts, most notably by the Atlanta Regional Commission, to develop focal points for the suburban Atlanta region through the Livable Centers Initiative. The improvement and redevelopments involved with this program have begun the process of creating more traditional downtown areas throughout the Atlanta region. However, the major concern in areas converting from rural to suburban is keeping some context of the rural past by preserving historic resources that convey a sense of what the rural landscape was like before the greater metropolitan areas absorbed it.

Rural Development
The preservation of rural areas and landscapes is probably the most urgent. The development of a preservation ethic in less developed areas can help in shaping growth whether it is in the Atlanta region, surrounding Athens or moving inland from Savannah and the coast. Younger generations are moving away from rural areas and farming either by choice or the lack of economic options. Once a property has been subdivided, it is extremely difficult to replace or improve upon the resulting development. Decisions made today will affect communities for decades or even centuries to come. Increased demand for walkable communities connected to a larger number of transit options will most likely have a beneficial impact on historic resources. However, the less-sustainable style of development that consumes huge chunks of rural and agrarian land, created without consideration of the natural and historic landscape, may be significantly less desirable in the near future. Methods need to be developed to address the cumulative impacts of development. State and federal agencies are beginning to take these impacts into consideration. An example of the growing awareness of the interconnectedness of development patterns on health, well-being and resource consumption is the integration of development standards through the partnership for sustainable communities between the federal departments of transportation, and housing and urban development.

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?
So much of our environment (built and natural) has been destroyed. It’s important to keep as much of what’s left as possible.
Rehabilitation Issues

Aside from the larger considerations of development that threaten historic resources with demolition or loss of integrity, the continued preservation of historic homes is complicated by trends that are not new but are currently receiving greater recognition. These include misconceptions about energy efficiency and “upgrading” of historic materials and the lack of practitioners of traditional building trades and skills. Often “drafty” historic wood windows are replaced with vinyl assemblies and plaster and lath walls are removed to enable the addition of insulation throughout a house. Historic features are sometimes perceived as being wastes of time and money rather than worthy of proper repair for their inherent durability and historical value. Wide advertising of new “maintenance-free” and super-efficient building products has furthered this perception. Some of these products, such as elastomeric and ceramic paints billed as low maintenance applications for historic wood siding, have not been adequately time-tested for potential negative effects to historic materials. In conjunction with these concerns is the shrinking number of skilled craftsmen able to repair historic features. As modern building techniques and materials have resulted in a different set of standard construction skills, the teaching and application of traditional skills have fallen by the wayside. If a homeowner or contractor cannot easily locate skilled craftsmen, it should be expected that easier, and perhaps inappropriate, methods of renovation will be undertaken. There is a chance that as the concepts of preservation and sustainability become more integrated into the culture that there will be a renaissance in craftsmanship and trades work.

TRANSPORTATION TRENDS

Transportation Enhancements

The expiration of the SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users), without a replacement transportation bill, leaves open the question of what the federal transportation funding priorities will be and at what level they might be funded. The recent funding round for Transportation Enhancement projects in Georgia ensures that there will be funding for some significant preservation-related transportation projects over the next five years. The majority of funding for enhancements in Georgia occurs in areas that are either in historic districts or near resources that are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Transportation Enhancement funding is the largest single financial resource for preservation and related ac-
tivities in the nation. Current indications are that the new transportation bill pending Congress’ authorization may include significant changes in transportation enhancement funding, but it is difficult to determine what the final outcome will be. Any changes that significantly reduce or eliminate these funds would certainly have a significant impact on preservation-related activities not only in Georgia but throughout the United States.

Local Transportation Alternatives
As energy prices continue to rise the demand for alternatives to automobile transportation will continue to increase. Another option often discussed is tram, trolley, or fixed-lane bus service. While these may be similar to commuter rail, their development is oriented to a local scale with more frequent stops serving neighborhood areas rather than regional centers. These options differ in actual vehicle and hardware technology but are similar in their potential to reinforce the traditional development pattern of dense, walkable, commercial and residential districts linked by mass transportation. The first installation of this type of transit is about to begin construction in downtown Atlanta, and travel through the historic Fairlie-Poplar, Sweet Auburn and Edgewood historic districts. The development of these types of systems is a two edged sword for historic structures. The immediate benefit would be the reinvigoration of historic districts and areas developed before the post-World War II rise of the automobile and its effect on land planning and development. The potential drawback would then be that the land values in these areas would rise to the point that larger structures could replace historic buildings. Most likely, any of these effects would take longer than five years to surface.

Agricultural Trends
Agriculture remains Georgia’s largest industry, with the state’s gross farm income over $7 billion. Crop diversification has increased; however, poultry, cotton and peanuts remain the state’s chief agricultural products along with pecans, rye, peaches, and fresh market tomatoes.

As Georgia’s population grows and urban centers sprawl into the countryside, the state’s farmland is threatened. From 1982-2007, Georgia converted less than a quarter acre of agricultural land for each new person added in total population. While this statistic seems encouraging, Georgia has still lost a considerable amount of farmland. During the same period, Georgia has lost over 647,100 acres of prime farmland to development, according to the

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?
It is what makes Georgia unique and attractive to tourist and visitors that provides economic development opportunities.
National Resources Inventory. According to the 2007 survey data, Georgia supports 47,846 active farms with 10,150,539 acres currently being farmed.

Farms comprise approximately 28 percent of Georgia’s land area. With the loss of farmland (and the resulting impact to the food supply) also comes the loss of cultural landscapes and historic resources. Identification of these resources is crucial. In 2001 HPD and the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) funded the context study Georgia’s Historic Agricultural Heritage. This provided an overview of the importance of agriculture throughout the state’s history and identified associated types of historic buildings, structures, landscapes, and archaeological sites. In addition to identifying these resources, tools are needed to assist in their preservation. The Centennial Farms Program continues to recognize the importance of maintaining historic family farms. Recent legislation, such as the Georgia Land Conservation program and the Georgia Land Conservation Tax Credit, should provide more assistance, but more incentives are needed.

Another area of concern is the sale of acreage used for timber production. Most of this land is in private ownership, and there is no assurance that cultural resources will be protected when property changes hands. Again, the importance of identifying resources, promoting their significance to property owners, and developing incentives, such as easements, to encourage their preservation are critical steps in their long-term protection.

Panoramic view of Brim Farm, a centennial farm in Terrell County. The Centennial Farms Awards Program helps to document and commemorate Georgia’s agricultural heritage, and its importance to Georgia’s economy and way of life.
Economic Impact
Tourism is one of the world’s largest industries and is essential to a community’s economic vitality, sustainability, and profitability. In Georgia, tourism is the state’s second largest industry after agriculture, and heritage tourism is its fastest-growing segment. In recent years, tourism has accounted for more than $21 billion per year spent in Georgia and a total estimated economic impact of $33.67 billion annually. Tourism impact numbers from 2010 include:
- Direct domestic expenditures of $18.9 billion
- Direct international expenditures of $2.1 billion
- Domestic and international travelers spent over $21 billion
- Combined expenditures generated 233,800 jobs within Georgia
- Combined expenditures generated $1.6 billion in tax revenue for state and local governments

Heritage Tourism
The 2010 Heritage Tourism Handbook: A How-To Guide for Georgia, observes that the “historic and cultural resources associated with people, events, or aspects of a community’s past give that community its sense of identity and help tell its story. These resources are the most tangible reflections of a community’s heritage. History can and should be used as a selling point for a community. The recognition of an area’s historic resources can bring about neighborhood revitalization, increased and sustainable tourism, economic development through private investment, and citizenship building.”

According to the Georgia Department of Economic Development (GDEcD), Georgia is ranked as the 8th most visited of all states, but is among the top five states for heritage tourism. The heritage tourist is interested in visiting destinations with a distinctive sense of place. Georgia has much to offer the heritage tourist: Civil War battlefields, African American and Native American historic sites, house museums, antebellum plantations, historic downtowns, military forts, gardens, lighthouses, presidential sites, courthouses, railroad depots, and more.

Studies by the Travel Industry of America, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Louis Harris, Inc., and Decima Research reveal the following characteristics of today’s heritage tourist:
- Well-educated
- Older
- Cosmopolitan
- Interested in authenticity
- Generous spenders

The historic Windsor Hotel, rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation using historic preservation tax credits, is an important heritage tourism asset in Americus, Sumter County.
A 2009 study conducted by Mandala Research for the U.S. Cultural & Heritage Tourism Marketing Council, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Commerce, revealed that 78 percent of all U.S. leisure travelers enjoy cultural and/or heritage activities while traveling, which translates to 118.3 million adults each year. Cultural and heritage travelers spend an average of $994 per trip and contribute more than $192 billion annually to the U.S. economy.

Heritage tourism can preserve a wide range of historic properties at all levels—local, regional, and state, and can also contribute to historic preservation by keeping history and historic properties in the public eye. An important challenge is protecting historic and archeological sites while giving tourists the authentic experience to understand the significance of historic places and sites. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has identified five basic principles that make heritage preservation programs successful: focus on authenticity and quality, preserve and protect resources, make sites come alive, find the fit between your community and tourism, collaborate and form partnerships.

Historic preservation makes heritage tourism possible, and heritage tourism supports preservation. The National Register of Historic Places nominations offer the facts and documentation to tell the real story of a place’s people and its past. Preservation tax incentives encourage private investment in historic properties that support heritage tourism, such as shops, restaurants, and bed and breakfast inns.

CURRENT TRENDS IN HERITAGE TOURISM

The Civil War Sesquicentennial
April 2011 marked the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the Civil War, commemoration of which will continue through 2015. Georgia tourists will find a vast array of historic sites and other attractions associated with the Civil War including battlefields, forts, markers, houses, relief maps, monuments and statues, museums, mills, churches, depots, cemeteries and grave sites, bridges, forts, parks, ferries, courthouses, prison sites, plantations, arsenals, and lighthouses. The 2010 publication Crossroads of Conflict: A Guide to Civil War Sites in Georgia provides a comprehensive and informative list of these sites. These Civil War sites and other pertinent information, including upcoming news and events, are also available on GDEcD’s official Civil War website.

There also are a number of special Civil War related trails in Georgia, many of which are listed in the Crossroads of Conflict.
book and state of Georgia Civil War website described above, but several have their own websites and include: the Atlanta Campaign Heritage Trial, the Blue & Gray Trail, the Chickamauga Campaign Heritage Trail, Georgia’s Antebellum Trail, and the March to the Sea Heritage Trail.

The Civil Rights Movement
The growing interest in African American tourism destinations has encouraged their preservation and development, and this trend is expected to continue. Several significant Civil Rights Movement sites across Georgia are now open to visitors and include: Dorchester Academy in Liberty County, the Martin Luther King Jr. National Historic Site in Atlanta, Mt. Zion Albany Civil Rights Institute, and Ralph Mark Gilbert Civil Rights Museum in Savannah.

National Heritage Areas
The United States Congress designates National Heritage Areas. They are a regional collaborative effort that includes residents, businesses, and government joining together to preserve, promote and celebrate the heritage and culture of a region. Heritage areas move beyond the boundaries of local governments and specific local identity to thematically link multiple cultural landscapes. Designation of National Heritage Areas comes with limited technical and financial assistance from the National Park Service (NPS). Georgia has three designated national heritage areas: the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area, Georgia’s first national Heritage Area, the Arabia Mountain National Heritage Area, and the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor.

National Scenic and Historic Trails
The non-profit group American Trails has designated the years 2008-2018 as the “Decade for National Trails,” leading to the 50th anniversary of the National Trails System Act in 2018. This Act opened the door to federal involvement in trails of all types, from city centers to remote backcountry. Almost all trails in the country have benefited from the Act and many trail initiatives over the last 40 years can find their roots in it. The NPS, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, USDA Forest Service, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers play key roles in administering and managing these trails, while the Federal Highway Administration has been an important source of funding for them. Today the National Trails System totals over 60,000 miles in all 50 states. According to the National Trails System Annual Report for FY 2009, “These trails offer unmatched quality of life experiences in outdoor recreation, education, scenic transportation, and access.
to the precious natural and cultural resources that define us as a Nation. And, essential to all these efforts is an unwavering, impressive, and ever growing cadre of volunteers.”

National Historic Trails are designated by Congress and include extended trails that closely follow a historic trail or route of travel of national significance. Designation identifies and protects historic routes, historic remnants, and artifacts for public use and enjoyment. There are over 5,343 miles of 19 National Historic Trails in the U.S., including one in Georgia, the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail.

National Scenic Trails are designated by Congress and include extended trails that provide maximum outdoor recreation potential and for the conservation and enjoyment of various qualities — scenic, historical, natural, and cultural — of the areas they pass through. There are 11 National Scenic Trails in the U.S., including one in Georgia, the Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

National Recreation Trails may be designated by the U.S. Secretary of Interior or the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture to recognize exemplary trails of local and regional significance. Nearly 1,100 trails throughout the U.S. are available for public use and, ranging from less than a mile to 485 miles in length, have been designated as NRTs on federal, state, municipal, and privately owned lands. Georgia features 16 National Recreation Trails, including the famous William Bartram Trail, the Silver Comet Trail, and the Anna Ruby Falls Trail. These trails can help preserve historic rail resources and connect historic communities.

EMERGING TRENDS IN TOURISM

The tourism industry has developed into many specialty “niche” markets. Below are some of the newest types of tourism that increasingly will attract visitors in the years 2012-2016.

Ecotourism is a form of low-impact, small-scale tourism that involves visiting natural areas, ranging from urban environments to remote wilderness, to observe wildlife and plants. Activities may include hiking, climbing, road cycling, horseback riding, river rafting, kayaking, zipline-riding, bird-watching and more.

Ecotourism can provide incentives to preserve natural areas, including archaeological sites, and by its small-scale nature, has less of a potential to impact historic properties.

Agritourism involves any agriculturally-based operation or activity that brings visitors to a farm or ranch. Activities may include buying organic produce and meat, navigating a corn maze, picking apples or pumpkins, feeding animals, staying at a B&B farm, or vis-
iting living history farm museums. Agritourism can provide added revenues that may help maintain the viability of historic farms.

_Edu-Tourism_ is travel to a location for the purpose of formal or informal learning. Activities may include participation in short- or long-term academic programs, conferences and seminars, sabbaticals, and student exchange programs.

This niche certainly overlaps with heritage tourism by bringing a more educated public to areas with historic properties they may wish to explore.

_Urban Tourism_ is travel to revitalized inner-city and other urban areas. For many cities urban tourism is their number one industry, generating not only rising income but also underpinning many rehabilitation projects. Activities may include visiting museums and art galleries, historic sites and districts, theaters and cinemas, concert halls, nightclubs and casinos; attending festivals, sports events, conventions and other organized events; or simply shopping and eating in unique restaurants.

**TRENDS IN GOVERNMENT**

**Forty-five Years of Federal Preservation**

The year 2011 marked the 45th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The impact of this act on the nation’s historic landscape is monumental: a historic preservation program in every state of the union, hundreds of thousands of historic properties identified and protected, millions of private dollars invested in the adaptive reuse of historic properties, thousands of archaeological sites studied, and communities all across America invested in their downtowns and residential neighborhoods.

Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the federal government provides support for preservation through legal protection, creation of a national preservation system, educational programs, technical assistance, tax incentives and funding through the Historic Preservation Fund. As state revenues have decreased due to the economic downturn of the past four years, this support is critical to preservation efforts throughout Georgia.

**Federal Support for Preservation**

The financial support for the Historic Preservation Fund has increased (35 million in FFY2006 to 46 million in FFY2011 distributed among all fifty states and territories). However, due to current economic conditions and the discussions surrounding the federal deficit, this trend may not continue during this planning cycle.

**Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?**

_It is important because of the intrinsic and economic value of the historical resources to individuals and the community._
Additionally the federal government maintains support for historic preservation in other ways. Through the investment and low-income tax credit programs, the Internal Revenue Service allows investors to receive a tax credit on the rehabilitation of historic income-producing property. These tax credit programs have stimulated private investment in historic properties throughout Georgia, and in many cases have provided low-income housing.

NPS provides technical information about preservation issues to the states and public. It also administers a system of national park units, many of which are historic sites. In Georgia, NPS administers ten national parks, eight of which were designated for their historic significance. The NPS also administers the Save America’s Treasures Program, which until FY2011 provided matching grants for the rehabilitation or restoration of nationally significant properties (National Historic Landmarks or nationally significant National Register properties). The Department of Housing and Urban Development, through its Community Development Block Grant program, provides millions of dollars to Georgia that can be used for rehabilitation of sub-standard housing units and other historic preservation projects. The federal Department of Transportation, through its reauthorized Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), includes funding for transportation enhancements that can include acquisition and rehabilitation of transportation-related historic properties. Transportation enhancements projects in Georgia have resulted in a considerable investment in historic preservation and this trend is expected to continue under future iterations of this Act. However, this is hard to determine in the current economy. The implications of a trend towards less federal support for preservation are considerable. The preservation challenge of the next five years will be to find a way to maintain these programs and funding sources while at the same time forging new partnerships with the private sector.

Preserve America
The White House and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (an independent federal agency that advises the president and Congress on historic preservation issues) initiated the Preserve America program in September 2003. Neighborhoods and cities throughout the country that are interested in historic preservation can apply to become a Preserve America community and receive recognition and grants for a variety of preservation and heritage tourism projects. By May of 2011, thirty-seven communities in Georgia received this recognition. A February 2010 report issued by the Preserve America Program indicated $624,457 in match-
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Our heritage makes the difference between a distinctive and unique place, and a network of strip malls and chain stores.
partnering for preservation

Grants awarded to Georgia Preserve America communities and Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Office. Federal funding for these matching grants was discontinued in FFY2011, and it remains to be seen whether the trend in applications for Preserve America community status will continue. As part of the Preserve America Initiative the president signed Executive Order 13287. The executive order directs federal agencies to report on their activities under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This includes finding new uses for federally owned historic properties and partnering with state and local governments to find compatible uses for federal surplus properties. The federal agency reports are available in the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s (ACHP) website.

Military Base Redevelopment

In many cases, federal ownership of historic properties can result in their protection. When the federal government no longer needs these properties, new uses need to be identified to insure their future viability. The Department of Defense’s Legacy Program helps to preserve historic resources located in military bases. The Base Realignment and Closure 2005 legislation resulted in the closure of various military facilities in Georgia. The Naval Supply Corps School in Athens-Clarke County was transferred to the University of Georgia in April of 2011. Fort Gillem, in Clayton County, and Fort McPherson in the City of Atlanta, Fulton County, closed in September of 2011. In compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Navy and Army, respectively, consulted with HPD (Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Office) and other consulting parties to develop memorandums of agreement that stipulate treatment of historic properties. Finding new uses for historic properties in these military bases as redevelopment takes place will continue to be a challenge that will require input from preservationists throughout the state.

Other Federal Preservation Related Initiatives

The issue of sustainability and energy efficiency and how it relates or can effect historic preservation has gained in importance. Executive Order 13514, “Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance,” requires federal agencies to prepare a Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan (SSPP). The ACHP has included in its SSPP actions that it will take to promote historic preservation as a sustainability tool and assist other agencies as they meet their sustainability goals under this new directive. As part of its SSPP, the ACHP has created a Task Force on Sustainability and Historic Preservation, whose member agencies

The Hiram-Butler House, built in 1880, serves as the office and education facility for the Smith-Gilbert Gardens, owned and operated by the City of Kennesaw, Cobb County. The City received a Preserve America Community Landmark grant to develop a new website for the gardens.
will provide guidance on how to fully integrate historic preservation into federal agencies’ policies and programs addressing sustainability. Additionally, NPS has produced updated guidelines on energy efficiency and the rehabilitation of historic properties: *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*. Another important federal initiative is America’s Great Outdoors, which strives to enhance the public’s appreciation and use of the outdoors, including the nation’s historic and cultural sites. The report, entitled “America’s Great Outdoors: A Promise to Future Generations,” unveiled on February 16, 2011, includes as one of its goals to protect America’s historic and cultural resources.

**State Funding**
The decline in state government funding earmarked for historic preservation that began in 2001 has accelerated since 2008. The most significant impact is the decline in state revenues. HPD has suffered a 40 percent state budget reduction since SFY2008. Another large impact continues to be on the Georgia Heritage grant program, which provides matching funds for Georgia communities to rehabilitate their historic resources. From a high of $500,000 awarded in SFY2002, the Georgia Heritage grant program dropped to $100,000 for SFY2006, and to $0 in SFY2008 and thereafter. The new historic preservation license plate authorized by the state legislature allowed for limited funding for the Georgia Heritage grant program in SFY2009, 2010 and 2011. However, a shortfall in state revenues for HPD resulted in the rescission of the Georgia Heritage grant cycle for SFY2012. The state allocation to support historic preservation planning in 11 regional commissions that had remained at the SFY2001 level of $238,000 through SFY2008, decreased to $209,881 in SFY 2009, $163,000 in SFY2011, and to $45,000 in SFY2012. This currently translates into $4,000 a year for each region which significantly impacts the ability of these regions and HPD to provide historic preservation planning services at the local level. Funds allocated to the University of Georgia for preservation assistance to local governments, which had remained level at $42,000 a year, were eliminated in SFY2010. In addition, HPD has lost seven staff positions since 2008. One positive outcome was the amended state tax incentives tax credit which became effective in January 2009. By providing added state tax incentives for the rehabilitation of historic properties, it increased interest in the program and spurred much needed private investment.
Other State Preservation Related Initiatives

The Georgia Department of Community Affairs (GDCA) assists local communities through its Better Hometown and Main Street programs. Historic preservation is an integral component of both programs. GDCA also assists communities with numerous preservation projects through its Local Development Fund. GDCA strengthened the historic preservation component of local comprehensive plans by requiring historic preservation to be addressed in a broader fashion through quality growth assessments and character areas. This results in better integration of historic preservation into the larger comprehensive planning process. GDCA also provides limited funding for regional commissions to assist communities in preservation planning activities.

In addition, new GDCA rules require Georgia’s regional commissions to identify “regionally important resources” and develop regional resource plans that will protect and manage identified resources. Chapter 110-12-4 of GDCA’s rules defines Regionally Important Resources, as “any natural or cultural resource identified for protection by a Regional Commission following the minimum requirements established by the Department.” Preservation planners and other planning staff in the regional commissions have solicited public input to identify regionally important historic and archaeological resources. The inclusion of historic and archaeological resources within the broader context of managing environmental resources and landscapes of regional importance bodes well for their consideration and protection. For example, the Atlanta Regional Commission’s Plan 2040 Regional Resource Plan states that the plan will be used to “…coordinate activities and planning of local governments, land trusts and conservation or environmental protection groups’ activities in the region, and state agencies toward protection and management of the identified Regionally Important Resources.”

In 2005, the Georgia State Legislature passed Land Conservation legislation. Although its purpose is to acquire and protect sensitive lands for conservation, historic properties and archaeological sites will also benefit under this initiative. In the period from 2005 to 2010, according to the Georgia Environmental Finance Authority (GEFA), the state agency charged with administering the Land Conservation Program, 24 projects representing $86,717,923 in private, local, state, and federal investments (grants, loans, and/or tax credits) have protected 14,867 acres of land with significant historic resources.

It is anticipated that the Land Conservation Program will continue to acquire and protect environmentally sensitive lands and archaeological and historic properties.
Local Historic Preservation Commissions and Certified Local Governments

The Georgia Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (OCGA 22-10-40) is the state’s enabling legislation that gives local governments the authority to designate historic properties and establish a design review process for their protection. Through the process of review and approval, a local commission ensures that changes to buildings and their settings respect the historic character of designated districts. The design review board makes citizen-based decisions about the appropriateness of new design and changes to historic buildings. This process protects the historic fabric and visual character of a district as well as its economic value. The number of historic preservation commissions in Georgia and the nation continues to increase. These commissions designate and regulate historic properties under a local historic preservation ordinance. They also provide a focus for local preservation activities. Prior to the Act, Georgia had only seven commissions in 1976, but grew to 90 by the year 2000, an increase of 900%. Although the rate of increase has never matched the 1976-2000 period by 2006 the state had 126 commissions, and by 2011 it had 137. Responding to the diverse and growing needs of preservation commissions in Georgia continues to be a challenge.

Many communities in Georgia with historic preservation commissions have elected to participate in Georgia’s Certified Local Government (CLG) program, choosing to enter into a preservation partnership with HPD and NPS. By passing a preservation ordinance and establishing a local commission that complies with the Georgia Historic Preservation Act, 83 communities in Georgia have made a commitment to actively protect their historic properties through this effective partnership. This partnership establishes a relationship among local governments and the state and federal agencies carrying out historic preservation programs. CLGs benefit from this status by receiving technical assistance and by being eligible for grant funds passed through HPD from NPS. Furthermore, CLGs benefit by having a voice in federal preservation decisions, such as nominating properties to the National Register, and participating in the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 process.

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Planning for the preservation of historic resources needs to take into consideration both the areas of growth in the state and the areas where growth has not happened. It also must consider the
increasing diversity of Georgia’s residents and ensure that the benefits of preservation are embraced and enjoyed by all.

**Land Use and Zoning**

Anticipating growth and dealing with its effects requires time, planning and political will. In 2000, only 44 percent of Georgia’s 159 counties had enacted any kind of zoning ordinance. In 2005, 104 (67.5 percent) of the 154 counties in Georgia responding to a government survey reported having zoning ordinances, a significant increase from the numbers reporting in 2000. Although updated numbers are unavailable, most counties experiencing rapid growth have some type of land use controls. Some are incorporating open space design provisions in their zoning ordinances. Land use and zoning ordinances that take historic preservation into account can help preserve a region’s historic properties.

**Comprehensive Land Use Planning**

As required by the Georgia Planning Act of 1989 and GDCA regulations, local governments have produced comprehensive plans that include existing and future land use maps. Statewide planning goals adopted by the GDCA include the preservation and protection of Georgia’s historic resources. Comprehensive plans are required to include consideration of natural and historic resources and to integrate this information into future land use decisions. In addition, recently adopted GDCA regulations for local planning emphasize the identification of character-rich areas and development patterns and an interest in how communities look and feel. Community visioning and involvement is stressed, and implementation measures are required. These activities offer opportunities for historic properties to be taken into account in comprehensive planning.

Producing a comprehensive plan and implementing it is an important step for communities as they prepare to work for the type of future they want. Planning and zoning are not in conflict with growth but are tools for local governments to help them preserve and enhance their quality of life while guiding growth. Preparing and implementing a comprehensive land use plan can be an effective way to achieve both growth management and historic preservation goals.

**Regional Planning**

Under certain circumstances, growth and development pressures are such that a regional perspective on planning becomes desirable. For example, the Georgia coast is experiencing rapid growth. It is also an area of scenic and natural beauty with a wealth of cultural features.
and historic resources. GDCA completed a Coastal Comprehensive Plan for the six coastal Georgia counties: Chatham, Bryan, Liberty, McIntosh, Glynn and Camden in September 2007. The plan involved considerable community input and strives to balance the preservation of natural and cultural assets with the growth pressures in the region. The recently adopted Coastal Regional Commission Regional Resource Plan (March 2011) is the most current regional plan for the Georgia Coast. This plan includes detailed information and maps of the region’s historic properties as well as recommendations for their protection.

The Main Street Approach
The Main Street program targets communities with a population of 5,000 to 50,000, and has been used in Georgia for twenty-five years. It has revitalized many historic communities across Georgia. The Better Hometown program focuses on communities of less than 5,000 inhabitants, and has extended the benefits of historic preservation to small downtown areas throughout the state. Currently in Georgia there are 105 Main Street and Better Hometown state designated cities in these programs.

With declining population and few employment opportunities in rural areas, job creation is a major priority. Many rural communities use historic preservation as a basis for revitalization. Using the Main Street approach, developed by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and administered in Georgia by GDCA, with its emphasis on infrastructure and historic building stock, these communities have brought new businesses, promotions, residents and a sense of pride to once-declining downtown districts. The 2010 economic benefits study commissioned by HPD indicates that 5,100 net new businesses have opened their doors in Georgia Main Street and Better Hometown downtowns. Cumulative job gains and business growth have been steady for a decade in Main Street and Better Hometown communities, and can be expected to continue into the future.

Heritage Tourism Development
Increasingly in Georgia, tourism is the main economic development strategy for a community. Heritage and cultural tourism create opportunities for communities to identify, package and market their existing historic assets. Increased tourism can translate into local job creation, additional revenue in the form of property tax, bed tax, and sales tax, as well as the rehabilitation of historic properties. Collaboration among various local governments and state and federal agencies is essential to enhancing and developing local tourism.
The Georgia Tourism Resource Team (AKA Team Georgia) is one such collaboration. To help Georgia communities make the most of their historic, cultural and natural assets, GDNR, GDeCD, and GDCA have joined forces and created a team, whose goal is to help those communities increase tourism. As of June 2011, Team Georgia has visited and prepared a detailed report of recommendations to the communities of Quitman/Brooks County, Rex/Clayton County, Dublin/Laurens County, and Hinesville/Liberty County. Six communities currently are slated to be visited by Team Georgia through the summer of 2012, and there is a waiting list of other communities that have requested these teams. It is anticipated that these teams will continue to assist communities for the next several years.

PARTNERSHIPS

Georgia is fortunate to have strong state and local preservation partners that form the crucial links among the private, public and nonprofit sectors, the basis for Georgia’s broad-based and widely respected preservation programs. Partnering with groups with common goals that can support preservation is fundamental to the way preservation takes place in Georgia. At the local level, preservation organizations, historical and archaeological societ-

The city of Thomasville, located in Thomas County, is one of Georgia’s Main Street program cities. Photo courtesy of the Georgia Department of Community Affairs.
ies, foundations, heritage museums, commissions, neighborhood associations, chambers of commerce, local governments and homeowners regularly join forces to champion preservation causes, to find new uses for historic properties and to develop innovative solutions to difficult challenges. More and more often, individuals, organizations and companies with non-traditional preservation interests—real estate agents, developers, architects, engineers, state and federal agencies, businesses—work hand-in-hand with preservationists to achieve a shared vision for enhancing a community’s quality of life, creating jobs, and strengthening economic development.

Georgia’s universities, many of which have historic preservation and/or public history programs, have trained many professionals and have assisted with preservation projects throughout the state. Universities also train students in other disciplines relevant to the historic preservation field, such as anthropology, archaeology, geography, planning and architecture. They are important partners in identifying and protecting historic resources and in the goal of enhancing the cause of preservation.

Statewide organizations such as HPD, the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, Georgians for Preservation Action, the Society for Georgia Archaeology, the Georgia Council of Professional Archaeologists, the Georgia Civil War Commission and the Georgia African American Historic Preservation Network work hard to communicate and coordinate better with each other. They expanded their relationship with groups such as the Georgia Municipal Association, the Georgia Cities Foundation, Association County Commissioners of Georgia, Legislative Black Caucus, the regional commissions, and the large number of smart growth, land conservation, natural area, transportation, recreation, planning, tourism and historical organizations. None of these objectives can be accomplished without broadening and nurturing preservation partnerships throughout the state.

**CONCLUSION**

Preservationists must constantly strive to strengthen both existing and newly formed partnerships, seek out new ones, and expand incentives for preservation. Preservation’s role as a proven tool and basic component of smart growth initiatives requires reinforcement. Preservation’s integral role in statewide and community comprehensive planning needs reinforcement and encouragement, with more thoughtful attention to historic property needs and potential. State grants and financial incentives at significantly higher levels
are needed to address the increased demand for preservation assistance. Greater recognition is needed that archaeological sites are resources that offer benefits to communities in education, interpretation and tourism. Private homeowners and neighborhood groups must have the tools, technical assistance and information they need to preserve the historic houses that make up 80 percent of Georgia’s historic buildings. Greater appreciation for African American resources and for resources of the Civil Rights era and the recent past is needed. Similarly, businesses, developers, bankers, and commercial associations must recognize the value of preservation, know how to take advantage of financial incentives, and be both sensitive and creative in the treatment of historic properties. Newcomers to the state of Georgia must be made aware of preservation and encouraged to support preservation. Preservationists must insist on good design and high preservation standards. They must also recognize the need to enhance education and training of skilled craftspeople to work on restoration and rehabilitation projects. They must continue to make the case that keeping and using Georgia’s legacy of historic properties not only enhances the collective sense of place and the quality of life but also makes economic sense.

Bottom: The Society for Georgia Archaeology’s Archeo Bus tours the state providing information and hands-on activities about Georgia’s rich archaeological heritage for children and their parents to learn and explore. Photo courtesy of Michael Shirk.
MISSION, VISION AND GOALS

A plan is only useful if it is put into action. A vision of a better future is only a dream unless it is accompanied by ongoing commitment, strategic focus, and hard work to turn the vision into reality. Therefore the heart of Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Plan 2012-2016: Partnering for Preservation is this set of goals, objectives and strategies that are designed to preserve, protect and use Georgia’s historic resources so that they may exist into the future. They respond to the major trends affecting Georgia and their effects on the preservation of Georgia’s historic resources and to preservation stakeholders’ comments gathered through the plan’s public participation process.

A VISION FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN GEORGIA

All Georgians will possess a greater understanding and appreciation of our shared heritage in all its variations. People and organizations throughout Georgia will work in partnership to preserve and use historic places. Georgia’s communities, economy, and environment will be better because of the preservation of historic resources. Historic places will be widely valued as irreplaceable resources that contribute to our heritage, our economy, our neighborhoods, and our sense of who we are as Georgians. Communities and the state will plan for growth and change that respects and includes our historic places. Communities will possess the knowledge, the legal and financial tools, and the authority to decide how preservation and new development will relate to one another. There will still be distinc-

Mission Statement

Promote the preservation and use of historic places for a better Georgia.
tions between city and suburbs, developing areas and countryside. Georgia will be a better place tomorrow than it is today, providing quality communities in which to live, work, learn and play.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

The goals and objectives in this chapter are all considered important. They provide a statewide framework to focus preservation activities throughout Georgia. More specific HPD work items and time frames for implementing these objectives and strategies will be developed as part of HPD’s annual work-plans. Many other preservation partners must plan their own set of actions in order for the goals for preservation to be fully realized. For example, preserving Georgia’s historic resources and building a preservation ethic across the state will require all of us to spread the word about the value of preservation and to encourage and actively seek participation of groups not traditionally members of preservation organizations. Educating the next generation of Georgians about history and preservation is also an endeavor that involves us all. It is by working together as partners that we will come closer to accomplishing our preservation goals.

GOAL 1: PRESERVE GEORGIA’S HISTORIC RESOURCES

Objective 1.A: Identify and evaluate historic resources and facilitate the dissemination of information about them for planning and educational purposes

Strategy 1.A.1: Identify and evaluate recent past historic resources (buildings, structures, landscapes and districts dating from World War II to the early 1960s) so that they can be appropriately integrated into the state’s preservation programs

Action items:
- Prepare an overview of mid-20th-century house types and styles (Ranch Houses, Split Levels, Split Foyers, and Two-Story Houses) including their character-defining features, and post to HPD’s website
- Prepare an overview of mid-20th-century community landmark buildings (post offices, city halls, churches, schools, health clinics) including their character-defining features, and post to HPD’s website
- Prepare an overview of mid-20th-century commercial buildings (free-standing stores, strip shopping malls, banks)

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

It makes a lasting and visible public statement about the values of a community, values that can be passed on to succeeding generations. It’s a ‘quality of life’ statement.
Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

We are grounded by our heritage. Without it we are carried by the wind without direction and unable to come together.

Adel City Hall, located in Adel, Cook County, is an excellent example of a resource of the recent past that has gained historical significance.

including their character-defining features, and post to HPD’s website

• Prepare an overview of mid-20th-century storefront design including designs for new storefront buildings and for re-modeled storefronts on older buildings, and post to HPD’s website

• Identify and evaluate mid-20th-century campus buildings in cooperation with the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia

Strategy 1.A.2: Expand the use of technology to provide better access to information about historic resources to a wider audience and promote a deeper understanding of Georgia’s historic resources

Action items:

• Provide training opportunities for GNAHRGIS (Georgia Natural, Archaeological, and Historic Resources Geographic Information System) users in cooperation with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) and the Information Technology Outreach Service (ITOS)

• Develop and integrate “help” information into GNAHRGIS programming in cooperation with ITOS

• Fully integrate Environmental Review project data including historic resource data and project logging and tracking system into GNAHRGIS

• Fully integrate National Register project data including historic resource data and National Register logging and tracking system into GNAHRGIS

• Incorporate “legacy” survey data into GNAHRGIS in coordination with GDOT

• Test and implement as appropriate new field techniques and technology to enter field survey data directly into GNAHRGIS through the FindIt survey program

• Provide resources on preservation topics through online outlets including HPD website and various social media sites to reach a broader audience

• Implement new technologies, contingent upon funding, to create more interactive experiences with the past

Strategy 1.A.3: Enhance the identification and protection of underwater archaeological resources

Action items:

• Strengthen partnerships with Georgia Department of Natural Resources Coastal Resources Division, Wildlife Resources Division Law Enforcement, Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, Georgia Southern University, East Carolina
University’s Program in Maritime Studies, Florida’s Bureau of Archaeological Research, the Lighthouse Archaeological Maritime Program (LAMP), and avocational archaeology and dive groups throughout Georgia.

- Document and map maritime sites and shipwrecks with the Georgia Statewide Shipwreck Inventory (GSSI) to inform resource managers, coastal planners, and other user-groups who consider maritime cultural resources in their decision-making processes.
- Increase the Coastal Underwater Archaeology Field Station’s capabilities via grant writing, professional publication, improved remote-sensing and conservation equipment, additional marine surface platforms, project specific internships and staffing.

Strategy 1.A.4: Sponsor archaeological research programs on Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GDNR) lands that incorporate the best scholarship for interpretation and management purposes.

**Action items:**

- Actively seek collaboration with colleges and universities, as well as non-profit institutions.
- Develop long term research agendas for ongoing sponsored investigations at Camp Lawton in Magnolia Springs State Park and for archaeological projects on Sapelo and Ossabaw Islands.

HPD archaeologists Chris McCabe, Stephen Dilk, Jennifer Bedell and Dave Crass investigated the Cabretta Inlet Shipwreck on Cabretta Island, part of Georgia’s Sapelo Island Reserve.
Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?
We are like a tree; without roots, we perish.

Kirkwood Historic District, Atlanta, DeKalb County, was listed in the National Register in 2009.

Strategy 1.A.5: *Update and distribute information about historic residential properties in an effective and cost-efficient way*

*Action items:*
- Update existing information about historic houses (types and styles) and their landscaped settings, including new information about mid-20th-century houses and landscapes, and post to HPD’s website

**Objective 1.B: Provide information and guidance about historic preservation techniques and programs to help individuals, organizations and communities preserve historic resources**

Strategy 1.B.1: *Provide additional information and technical advice to guide the protection and preservation of historic cemeteries throughout Georgia*

*Action items:*
- Compile and provide information on the different types of historic cemeteries in Georgia and reformat it for posting to HPD’s website
- Host the Georgia Municipal Cemetery Association Annual Conference in partnership with the Georgia Municipal Cemetery Association and the Georgia Department of Economic Development (GDEcD)
- Attend public meetings and invited lectures to make information about cemetery preservation and protection more accessible to the public

Strategy 1.B.2: *Use easements and covenants to protect historic and archaeological properties*

*Action items:*
- Increase the use of the Georgia Land Conservation Act and demonstrate how it can serve as an economic incentive to preserve both land and historic and archaeological resources

Strategy 1.B.3: *Increase the use of the state and federal preservation tax incentives programs*

*Action items:*
- Review and revise tax incentives program procedures to make them more responsive to applicant needs and capabilities
- Reformulate public information materials to make all aspects of the tax incentives programs (procedures, rehabilita-
Development and distribution clear and simple explanations of the rationale behind the benefits of the rehabilitation standards and guidelines

• Meet with stakeholders to identify areas of concern with the application process, application materials, and the use of the rehabilitation/treatment standards; identify issues that can be resolved, and propose and implement measures to resolve them

• Promote the preservation tax incentives programs and publicize successful projects in partnership with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (GDCA) and GDEcD

Strategy 1.B.4: Address the connection between preservation and sustainability with other GDNR divisions, state agencies, preservation constituents and the interested public

Action items:

• Compile available information pertaining to sustainability and historic preservation into a readily accessible sustainability “library” for staff and public to use

• Identify areas of “concern” regarding the relationship between sustainability and historic preservation and propose ways to resolve them

• Publicize the long-term economic and broad cultural benefits of historic preservation and sustainability

• Add a sustainability component to HPD’s technical assistance programs

Strategy 1.B.5: Develop new training methods for local historic preservation commissions

Action items:

• Re-evaluate the effectiveness (including cost-effectiveness) of traditional training methods (e.g., regional workshops, annual training sessions, statewide conferences, on-site technical assistance), and propose effective training methods in coordination with stakeholders

• Investigate and implement as appropriate new ways of providing training through webinars, interactive websites, and other social media in coordination with stakeholders, including the Georgia Association of Preservation Commissions and the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions
Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

Preserving that which makes Georgia and its communities unique is the foundation upon which economic development, tourism, civic pride and growth management efforts all rest.

The University System of Georgia has many campuses throughout the state that contain significant mid-20th-century buildings. Pictured here is the Williams Center building, located on the campus of Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, Bulloch County. The historic colored porcelain panel and glass window wall systems which are character defining features of this building were carefully repaired as part of its rehabilitation. Photo courtesy of Brian Dressler Photography, Inc.

Strategy 1.B.6: Increase the preservation, continued use, and/or adaptive re-use of mid-20th-century historic buildings

Action items:
- Prepare and distribute guidance material for the preservation, continued use, and/or adaptive re-use of mid-20th-century historic buildings
- Identify specific challenges and areas of concern regarding the application of the Secretary’s Standards to mid-20th-century buildings and propose solutions
- Develop a strategy for the preservation, continued use, and/or adaptive re-use of mid-20th-century campus buildings in cooperation with the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia
- Amend and update “legacy” National Register historic district nominations (dating from the 1960s through the early 1980s) to include early to mid-20th-century buildings that are now historic so property owners can take advantage of preservation tax incentives

Strategy 1.B.7: Provide additional information to property owners to assist them in the preservation of their historic properties

Action items:
- Participate in local activities such as the Decatur Old House Fair in other communities as a way of reaching owners of historic properties with information on appropriate rehabilitation and repair techniques and products
- Develop easy-to-use guidance materials for property owners and make them readily available for use
- Disseminate information about appropriate preservation tools available to historic property owners in partnership with preservation non-profits

Objective 1.C: Identify sources of funding for preservation initiatives

Strategy 1.C.1: Leverage private and Federal grants as sources of additional funding

Action items:
- Identify grants to support projects in historic preservation and archaeology and partner with non-profit institutions and universities to apply for the grants
Strategy 1.C.2: Increase the use of the historic preservation license plate as an important source of revenues and as a means of delivering the preservation message throughout the state

**Action items:**
- Provide information about the historic preservation license plate at public events and through the use of social media
- Provide information about the historic preservation license plate through coordination with preservation non-profits, historical societies and other partners throughout the state

Strategy 1.C.3: Strengthen current and develop new partnerships to collaborate funding for common interest preservation projects

**Action items:**
- Research and catalog available sources of funding for private and public historic preservation projects and activities, maintain an easily accessible “library” of sources of funding for public use
- Extend the current Section 106 programmatic agreement providing mitigation funding for the “FindIt” field survey program for another ten years in cooperation with the Rural Utilities Service and the Georgia Transmission Corporation
- Negotiate with the GDOT to continue the existing personnel agreement providing funding for HPD staff to provide expedited reviews of transportation-related Section 106 environmental review projects
- Identify other agencies and/or organizations where programmatic funding agreements to support expedited reviews of projects would be mutually beneficial

GOAL 2: BUILD A PRESERVATION ETHIC

Objective 2.A: Increase public awareness of historic preservation and its benefits

Strategy 2.A.1: Enhance awareness of historic preservation through preservation partnerships

**Action items:**
- Emphasize the importance of authenticity in marketing historic resources for tourism purposes in partnership with GDEcD and The Georgia Trust
- Strengthen and publicize preservation awards programs in partnership with The Georgia Trust and other preservation organizations

Participants at Decatur’s Old House Fair enjoy exhibits and expert advice on how to maintain and rehabilitate historic properties. Photo courtesy of Decatur Downtown Development Authority.
• Educate Georgia communities about the benefits of the certified local government program
• Expand the Centennial Farm Program to reach a broader farming constituency across the state by strengthening the partnership among HPD, the Georgia Farm Bureau, the Georgia Department of Agriculture, and the Georgia Forestry Commission
• Sponsor the statewide historic preservation conference in partnership with The Georgia Trust and other public and private organizations

Strategy 2.A.2: Build a larger constituency for archaeology

Action items:
• Participate in GDNR activities, including Coastfest and Weekend for Wildlife, that allow HPD to expose the public to Georgia’s world-class archaeological resources
• Develop and implement a public archaeology program that allows the public to participate in archeological investigation in concert with professional archaeologists
• Increase the Society for Georgia Archaeology’s educational efforts by contributing to Archaeology Month
• Provide archaeology-related promotional and educational materials via HPD’s website and social media outlets

Strategy 2.A.3: Expand the constituency for preservation to encompass all areas of the state

Action items:
• Target preservation projects in underserved areas of the state
• Establish historic preservation commissions and certified local governments in underserved areas of the state
• Develop teams to address local preservation issues in a community and measure and publicize preservation outcomes
• Expand the Centennial Farm Program activities to increase participation in the program and provide benefits to award winners

Strategy 2.A.4: Expand the preservation constituency to include non-traditional partners

Action items:
• Research and present data to support the linkage between core preservation tools and the larger issues of sustainability, economic development and tourism, quality of life, community health and education
Objective 2.B: Increase engagement of professionals, students, stakeholders, public officials and the general public in the preservation and use of historic properties

Strategy 2.B.1: Increase educational opportunities for students and professionals in preservation related disciplines

*Action items:*
- Develop internships for students in preservation related disciplines
- Identify student projects that will enhance information about historic resources and help build a preservation ethic in partnership with Georgia universities that offer courses and/or degrees in public history, historic preservation, and archaeology
- Increase support for student and professionals to participate in the statewide historic preservation conference
- Provide information about training opportunities for students in HPD’s newsletters, website and other social media
- Develop a presentation on career building strategies for graduate students in historic preservation, public history and archaeology

Strategy 2.B.2: Encourage the involvement of public officials in historic preservation

*Action items:*
- Utilize certified local government grants to support training needs for local historic preservation commission members and other local staff
- Include preservation education for elected and public officials on a regular basis through partnerships with pertinent state and local authorities

Strategy 2.B.3: Encourage historic preservation planning at all levels of government

*Action items:*
- Provide guidance to communities about preservation planning through partnerships with GDCA, the Association County Commissioners of Georgia and the Georgia Municipal Association
- Support the regional historic preservation planning program as an important and cost-effective way of delivering preservation services to all areas of Georgia
- Establish better contact and coordination with the Georgia Emergency Management Agency and Federal Emergency Management Agency for preservation planning efforts

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you? 
I just hate modern sprawl and sameness.

Participants from Augusta’s 2011 “This Place Matters” Conference in Augusta, Richmond County visit the Lucy Craft Laney Black History Museum.

Management Agency to ensure that historic and archaeological resources are taken into account in agency emergency management plans
• Distribute and publicize the booklet “Preservation Primer: A Resource Guide for Georgia” as a tool for preservation planning at the local level
• Nurture and further develop partnerships with GDCA’s Main Street and Better Hometown programs to emphasize and publicize preservation projects in these communities

Strategy 2.B.4: Encourage diversity in preservation and expand participation of under-represented groups in Georgia’s historic preservation programs

Action items:
• Develop outreach strategies that include younger constituents—through schools, special programs or more general encouragement of community involvement in preservation
• Develop innovative outreach strategies that will enhance the appreciation and preservation of African American historic properties in coordination with African American community leaders
• Initiate a dialogue about historic preservation in Georgia with community leaders of under-represented but rapidly growing groups such as the Hispanic and Asian communities.
SECTION II:
GEORGIA’S HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES
Georgia was founded in 1733 as one of the thirteen original American colonies. Since then, its history and its landscape have been shaped by the activities and interactions of three peoples: Americans of European decent, African Americans, and Native Americans. For two centuries prior to English colonization, the Spanish with their African servants and slaves explored what would later become Georgia. The presence of Europeans and Africans in the “New World” was preceded by thousands of years of Native American occupation.

The 12,000-year history of what we now know as Georgia has left its mark all across the state. Not only in metropolitan areas, where the signs of civilization are everywhere, but also in the most remote mountain valleys, along and in rivers and streams, across vast stretches of field and forest, deep in seemingly inaccessible swamps, on coastal marshes and islands, even underwater off the coast--there is hardly an acre of Georgia untouched by the past.

Physical evidence of Georgia’s history takes the form of buildings, structures, and objects, historic and archaeological sites, historic landscapes, traditional cultural properties, and historic districts. These are Georgia’s historic properties. Preserving these historic properties and the history associated with them is the goal of historic preservation.

AN OVERVIEW OF GEORGIA’S HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Buildings
Georgia’s historic buildings include a wide variety of houses, stores and offices, factories and mills, outbuildings on farms and plantations, and community landmarks.

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) estimates that approximately 250,000 historic buildings exist in Georgia today. About one quarter of them are located in the state’s larger urban areas, about one quarter are in smaller cities and towns, another quarter are in the state’s mid-20th-century suburbs, and a quarter are dispersed across rural areas.
Just 5 percent of Georgia’s historic buildings date from the antebellum period (pre-1861). Less than 3 percent date from the Reconstruction period (1865-1877). About one-third of the state’s historic buildings date from the New South era (1877-1919) with its prosperous cotton agricultural and industrial economy. Another third date from the period between World Wars I and II (1917-1945), with the greatest number dating from the 1920s and fewer from the Great Depression years. The remainder of Georgia’s historic buildings, approximately 25 percent, date from World War II to the 1960s—but this number is expected to increase as more mid-20th-century buildings are identified through ongoing field surveys.

Houses are the most prevalent type of historic building in Georgia. They make up approximately 80 percent of all existing historic buildings. Houses range from large, high-style mansions to small, plain vernacular dwellings. The oldest well-documented house in Georgia continues to be the Rock House in McDuffie County, dating from 1786, although Wild Heron Plantation outside Savannah may predate it by three decades. The newest historic houses in Georgia are mid-20th-century Ranch and Split-Level Houses like those in the Collier Heights National Register historic district on the west side of Atlanta. White-columned antebellum plantation houses are quite rare; the most common type of 19th-century house is the Georgian Cottage, and the most common types of historic houses in the state are early 20th-century front-gabled Bungalows and mid-20th-century Ranch Houses.

Houses with their landscaped yards and associated domestic archaeological resources form a special category of historic property known as “Georgia’s Living Places.” In rural areas, historic houses serve as the centerpieces of farms and plantations. In communities, houses grouped together create historic neighborhoods.

Commercial buildings including stores, offices, and other places of business are the second most numerous type of historic building in the state, but they comprise only about 7 percent of Georgia’s historic buildings. Most of them tend to be concentrated in communities, often forming cohesive business districts or “downtowns,” although some like the country store are found in sparsely settled rural areas and others like the corner store are situated in residential neighborhoods. Common commercial buildings include one- to three-story small-town “storefront” buildings, larger city business blocks, and urban skyscrapers.

Industrial buildings in Georgia are not numerous, constituting only 2 percent of all surveyed buildings, yet they represent some of the largest, most highly engineered, and most economically important historic buildings in the state. They include factories,

Why is the preservation of Georgia's heritage important to you?

I want it preserved for future generations, so that those that follow us will have an insight into the strength, perseverance and historical significance of their ancestors.

The W. T. McArthur Farm House, located in the McGregor Community, Montgomery County, is an example of a house with its historic landscaped yard and outbuildings.
textile mills, grist and saw mills, warehouses, cotton gins, ice and power plants, loft-type manufacturing buildings, and warehouses. In many smaller Georgia cities, a distinctive form of self-contained community, the mill village, is found around some industrial buildings, usually late 19th- and early 20th-century textile mills. Rural gristmills with their dams and millponds often are located in isolated areas near sources of waterpower.

Community landmark buildings are a small but diverse group of important historic buildings that housed community institutions such as local governments, religious groups, civic organizations, and schools or served important community functions such as railroad transportation. Common examples include courthouses, city halls, post offices, churches and other places of worship, lodges, clubhouses, theaters, auditoriums, gymnasiums, libraries, jails, hospitals, fire stations, depots, and community centers. Although they account for only 5 percent of all historic buildings, community landmark buildings are prominent due to their large size, architectural treatments, strategic locations, community functions, and historical associations. They are often focal points in their communities.

Agricultural buildings are found in most areas of the state, usually grouped with other buildings, structures, and landscape features on farms or plantations. They typically include farmhouses, tenant farmhouses, barns and sheds, storage and processing buildings, detached kitchens, smokehouses, blacksmith shops, and offices. Historically, agriculture dominated land use in the state, and agricultural buildings were numerous across the entire state. Today

The Fulton Bag & Cotton Mill building in Atlanta, Fulton County, is an excellent example of a large industrial building successfully rehabilitated using the historic preservation tax credits.
they are relatively rare and in more urbanized areas of the state have virtually disappeared.

**Structures**

Structures are defined by the National Register of Historic Places as “functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating shelter.” Common kinds of historic structures in Georgia include water towers, wells, and windmills, agricultural “outbuildings” such as corncribs or silos, and fortifications, bridges, icehouses, power plants, railroads, and roads. Other familiar structures include lighthouses, tunnels, dams, and bandstands. Less numerous historic “structures” include railroad locomotives and other rolling stock as well as ships, boats, and other watercraft.

Another kind of historic structure, less commonly recognized, is the structured environment: the large-scale, two-dimensional plans or patterns that underlie historic development. Historic structured environments include city plans, courthouse squares, agricultural field patterns, land-lot lines, suburban subdivisions, and the layout of parks, gardens, cemeteries, and yards.

**Objects**

Objects are similar to but smaller than structures. For historic preservation purposes, the term “object” applies to works that are primarily artistic or utilitarian in nature and are relatively small and simply constructed. Although it may be by nature or design movable, an object is usually associated with a specific setting or a type of environment. Outdoor sculpture, monuments, boundary markers, statuary, and fountains are examples of historic objects.

City of Rome Streetscape, Floyd County. Photo courtesy of the Georgia Department of Community Affairs.
Sites

A site is defined as “the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archaeological value....” There are several different types of sites in Georgia.

Archaeological sites, both historic and prehistoric, are the most numerous if not the most familiar type of historic property in Georgia.

A wide variety of archaeological sites exist in Georgia. Some are complex “stratified” sites, with various layers representing different periods of occupation and use. Other complex sites are the “multi-component” locations of prehistoric villages and towns with distinct civic, religious, residential, and even industrial areas. Less complex sites may represent a single activity or use, such as hunting or fishing, manufacturing or quarrying, agriculture, or camping. Major river valleys, ridgelines, and the Fall Line have yielded the greatest numbers of archaeological sites. Less-well-known sites are being found underwater, on river bottoms, in coastal marshes, and off the coast on the continental shelf.

Prehistoric archaeological sites in Georgia include monumental earthen mounds and platforms separated by broad open plazas, low shell middens in the form of piles and rings, rock quarries, fishing weirs, rock piles, scattered stone chips and concentrations of broken pottery, house sites, and entire village sites. Historic archaeological sites include Revolutionary and Civil War earthworks, industrial sites, refuse dumps, “dead” towns, Spanish mission sites along the coast, agricultural sites including antebellum plantations and Depression-era tenant farms, and the subsurface evidence of former buildings, structures, and landscape features. Underwater archaeological sites include prehistoric fish weirs, American Indian dugout canoes, colonial wharf complexes along major rivers, ferry landings, and shipwrecks. Cemeteries and individual graves also can be considered as archaeological sites, although state and federal laws protecting burial sites severely restrict their archaeological investigation.

Historic sites are places where an event or activity took place but where there were no buildings or structures associated with the event or activity or where the associated buildings or structures no longer exist. Historic sites are important primarily for the events or activities that took place there, although significant archaeological resources also may be present. Historic sites may have distinctive natural features, such as a mountain or cave or tree, or they may simply be the place where something important happened, such as an open field where a military engagement took place. The
most commonly recognized type of historic site in Georgia is the battlefield.

*Traditional cultural properties* are sites that have pronounced historic value to a specific racial, ethnic, or cultural group and that continue to play a vital role in contemporary cultural life. Such sites may be distinctive natural places (such as a mountain top) or historic environments (such as an ethnic neighborhood), or they may be simply a revered spatial location, a special place. Their value is evidenced through tradition, oral history, continuing traditional uses or practices, or common cultural knowledge. An important difference between traditional cultural properties and other types of historic properties is that the traditional cultural property derives its primary significance not from its physical, structural or archaeological features but rather from its direct and continuing associations with important historic cultural beliefs, customs, or practices of a living community. Relatively few traditional cultural properties have been documented in Georgia—they include the Ocmulgee Old Fields in Macon and New Echota in Calhoun County—although it is likely that many exist.

**Landscapes**

Georgia’s historic landscapes range from small formal gardens to vast expanses of agricultural countryside. Examples include courthouse squares (often the largest public landscape space in a community), city parks, streetscapes in neighborhoods with their street trees and sidewalks, cemeteries (ranging from the formal and park-like to the vernacular), landscaping at institutions like college campuses and vacation resorts, and state parks. A well-documented type of historic landscape is the yard; fifteen major forms of historic “domestic” landscapes dating from the 18th century to the mid-20th-century have been identified through the “Georgia’s Living Places” project. Farmsteads with their field systems, woodlands, orchards and groves, hedgerows, fences, field terraces, and dirt roadways are another important form of historic landscaping in Georgia. Many of the largest historic landscapes in the state are found in state parks and public and private conservation areas that were developed to reclaim worn-out agricultural and timberlands while providing opportunities for outdoor recreation.

**Historic Districts**

Historic districts are combinations of buildings, structures, sites, objects, landscapes, and structured environments where the overall grouping, the ensemble, takes on an identity and significance apart from its individual components.
The most common type of historic district in Georgia is the residential neighborhood. Another common type is the downtown central business district. The Waynesboro Historic District in Burke County—Georgia’s 2,000th listing in the National Register of Historic Places—comprises an entire historic community. Other equally important but less numerous types of historic districts include industrial and warehousing areas, school campuses, military installations, parks, and waterfronts. Farms with their houses, outbuildings, and field systems also comprise historic districts. Georgia has several vast archaeological districts, such as the Etowah Valley, and several large rural historic districts containing multiple farms, rural communities, and historic rural landscapes, such as the Sautee-Nacoochee Valleys in White County and the Johnstonville-Goggins historic district in Lamar and Monroe Counties. The largest historic district in Georgia in terms of acreage is McLemore Cove in Walker County (50,141 acres); the largest historic districts in terms of numbers of contributing historic resources are Kirkwood (1,788) in DeKalb County and Collier Heights (1,757 contributing resources) in Fulton County. The smallest historic district in Georgia is a row of three shotgun houses along a street, all that remains of a once-extensive historic African American neighborhood.

**African American Historic Properties**

Historic properties associated with African Americans form an important subset of the state’s historic properties. A large population of African Americans has lived in Georgia, making important contributions to the state’s history and culture.

Overall, the pattern of historic properties associated with African Americans in Georgia is similar to the statewide profile in terms of types of buildings and periods of development. However, significant differences distinguish African American historic properties in at least five ways:

First and foremost, there are proportionally far fewer extant historic properties associated with African Americans. African Americans historically made up approximately one-third of the state’s population. However, less than 10 percent of the state’s historic properties are known to be directly associated with African Americans. Part of this disproportion is due to the fact that many historic properties associated with African American history have been lost through demolition, neglect, or replacement. Another reason is that until recently African American associations with extant historic properties have not been well documented; with continuing advances in historical research, more historic properties associated with Georgia’s African American population are being documented.
Second, there are differences in the relative numbers of the different types of extant historic buildings associated with African Americans. Houses constitute a smaller percentage, while community landmark buildings make up a much larger percentage. Two-thirds of African American community landmark buildings are churches, compared with one-half statewide. Another large percentage are schools. Very few historic African American owned-and-operated farms have been documented, although a number are represented in National Register listings and Centennial Farm designations; conversely, many farms and plantations in the Piedmont, Coastal Plain, and Coastal regions were worked and even managed by enslaved African Americans prior to the Civil War and by African American tenant farmers during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, but relatively few associated buildings and structures remain.

Third, the environmental setting of Georgia’s African American historic properties differs from the statewide profile. Greater percentages are in urban areas including smaller cities and towns. Correspondingly smaller percentages are located in rural areas. Far fewer are in suburban areas; the city of Atlanta is an exception, with its extraordinary collection of 20th-century African American suburbs stretching westward from the Atlanta University Center to Collier Heights. Another difference in the environmental setting is due to racially segregated settlement patterns. In many communities, all African American historic properties are situated in the same relatively small area. As a result, large and small houses, community landmarks and places of work, industries and recreational facilities, all are juxtaposed in a distinctive community amalgam that is different from white-occupied historic areas where “zoning,” whether by ordinance or practice, tended to separate disparate land uses and building types. In rural areas, many African American houses are clustered in distinctive hamlets, sometimes with a small country store and occasionally a church and school.

Fourth, there are significant differences in the architectural characteristics of houses associated with African Americans. The percentage of vernacular (or “no academic style”) houses is much higher, and there is a greater prevalence of smaller house types and forms such as shotguns, hall-parlor houses, double pens, and saddlebag-type houses.

Finally, with regard to historic landscapes, African American associations are not well documented in existing surveys. Distinctive landscape traditions dating from the ante-bellum period through the mid-20th century, characterized by strong cultural associations and symbolic meanings rather than visual aesthetics, have been recognized in the past few years. In other cases, documented

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

I have a great passion for American farms and rural communities. As sprawl increases, our rural heritage may be lost forever.
African American landscapes such as the swept yard have virtually disappeared.

HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN GEORGIA

How Many Historic Properties Are There in Georgia?
HPD estimates that there are about 250,000 historic buildings in Georgia. This includes buildings 50 years old or older that are architecturally or historically significant and have retained their historic integrity. More than 94,000 historic buildings have been recorded through computerized field surveys; another 50,000 or so are recorded in older paper-based surveys. Previously unsurveyed buildings are being added to the inventory at the rate of about 3,000 per year.

No one knows exactly how many archaeological sites exist in Georgia. Because they are mostly underground, or under water, they are difficult to locate without expert field investigation. At the present time, more than 53,000 archaeological sites have been identified and recorded in the University of Georgia’s Archaeological Sites File. Only a very small percentage of the state’s land area has been systematically surveyed for archaeological sites. Newly discovered archaeological sites are being reported at the rate of nearly 2,000 per year.

Why Do the Numbers of Historic Properties Keep Changing?
The numbers of known and predicted historic properties in Georgia change from time to time, with good reason. On the one hand, known historic properties are lost every year. A historic building may burn to the ground, or an archaeological site may be bulldozed. Each year nearly 1,000 historic buildings are lost statewide. On the other hand, with the passage of time, properties that formerly were not old enough to be considered historic come of age, so to speak, and the expanding scope of history and archaeology encompass properties not previously recognized as historic. In addition, ongoing field surveys identify more historic properties every year and provide a better basis for counting and estimating the total number of historic properties in the state.

Why Are More Historic Properties Being Identified?
The process of identifying and evaluating historic properties lies at the very heart of historic preservation. By its very nature, it is a continuing process. Just as time marches on, so does history, and historic preservation with it.
The study of history and the practice of archaeology that underlie historic preservation are dynamic. Both are constantly expanding. For example, historians are now studying what is called the “recent past”—the period from World War II through the 1960s—while archaeologists are pushing back the dates of human occupation in Georgia to 12,000 years and more. Architectural historians are analyzing the distinctive characteristics of mid-20th-century Ranch Houses and Split Levels, now recognized as the hallmark houses of their period, as well as Modern or International-style buildings—the state’s newest community landmark buildings. Historians continue to expand on the achievements of Georgia’s women and African Americans, while archaeologists and ethnologists are documenting traditional cultural properties associated with Native Americans overlooked in previous surveys.

An expanding historic preservation constituency is bringing with it a broader view of historic properties. For example, increased participation by African Americans has encouraged the broader recognition of African American historic properties from the earliest days of exploration and settlement to the mid-20th-century civil rights movement. Heightened interest by Native Americans has led to increased sensitivity to many types of prehistoric sites, particularly burials. The role played by women in Georgia’s history has continued to be an important factor in preserving associated historic properties. Support for the state’s Centennial Farm program has re-kindled interest in the history of Georgia’s farms. Sites associated with the Civil War will be of heightened interest during and after the upcoming sesquicentennial of that event.

How Many Historic Properties Have Been Lost?
No one knows how many archaeological sites have been destroyed over the years. But every time ground-disturbing activity takes place, there is the potential for additional loss. Artifacts are destroyed, physical relationships among archaeological features are lost, and therefore the potential of the site to yield useful information about our past. It is likely that more archaeological sites are destroyed each year than the approximately 2,000 newly identified sites that are added to the statewide inventory.

Based on studies by HPD, it is clear that the vast majority of all the historic buildings that once existed in Georgia already have been lost. In just the last half-century, nearly 90 percent of the 810,000 buildings that existed in the state prior to World War II have been lost through outright destruction or drastic remodeling. And in some counties, in just the past 40 years, more than a third of the buildings that were included in the state’s first historic resources surveys in the mid-1970s have been lost. Losses

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?
Our patterns of development are linked to our history. If we lose the historic character of our communities, we will lose what makes them unique and special.

Ranch houses are a group of properties that in recent years are being recognized for their historic and architectural importance. Many of these are being demolished to make way for larger houses or new developments. This 1950’s ranch house in Wildwood Drive, Atlanta, Fulton County, was recently demolished to make way for a much larger residence.
include vernacular buildings of all kinds, modest houses all across the state, farmhouses including large plantation houses and smaller tenant farmhouses, entire lower- or working-class neighborhoods, many utilitarian agricultural and industrial buildings and structures, commercial buildings on the outskirts of traditional downtowns and in small rural communities, and many homes associated with African Americans.

Rural areas have been especially hard-hit, resulting in an oddly skewed impression today of Georgia’s historic environment. Historically, Georgia was a predominantly rural state; as late as 1940, nearly two-thirds of the state’s buildings and structures were classified as rural. But today, nearly two-thirds of the properties identified in historic resources field surveys are located in towns and cities.

A recent trend in the loss of historic buildings involves houses in neighborhoods dating from the 1910s through the 1960s in urban and suburban areas which are being rebuilt to accommodate contemporary lifestyles or demolished and replaced with new, larger houses. In one Georgia suburban county alone, the number of mid-20th-century houses being lost each year is equivalent to an entire medium-sized neighborhood subdivision. Another recent trend involves the replacement or remodeling in a faux-historic style of mid-20th-century “modern”-style commercial and community landmark buildings in communities of all sizes.

What’s on the Horizon in Terms of “New” Historic Properties?
During the next few years, buildings and structures dating from the post-World War II “Sun Belt” building boom will continue to command attention. Chief among them will be houses and subdivisions,
community landmark buildings including schools, churches, and banks, International-style commercial buildings and storefronts, neighborhood and regional shopping centers, engineered industrial buildings, and Modern-style college campus buildings. Most numerous will be houses as mid-century Split Levels, Split Foyers, and Two-Story Houses join the ranks of the now-well-documented Ranch House as “historic.” Most of these houses will be found in the suburbs around larger cities and in suburban-type subdivisions in smaller cities.

Buildings designed in the non-traditional mid-20th-century Modern or International style of architecture will continue to draw attention as more and more of them become 50 years old. First appearing in Georgia in the early 1930s, modern architecture took hold in the 1940s and became pronounced across the state in the 1950s. It is most evident in community landmark buildings such as post offices, libraries, public health facilities, city halls, and courthouses. Public schools are the most familiar “modern” community landmark buildings; newcomers to this realm, now being actively researched at HPD, are the Modern mid-century “equalization” schools, built by the hundreds across the state in a desperate attempt to avoid desegregating the state’s public school system by providing “equal” schools for African American children. Other common examples of mid-century Modern-style buildings are commercial buildings, particularly banks. A unique architectural phenomenon is represented by the mid-century updating of many older commercial buildings in traditional central business districts with new, modern facades. In a similar mode, Modern-style mid-century additions to older factories as well as a few new highly engineered industrial buildings reflect the last major era of the textile industry in Georgia.

During the shelf life of this plan, the number of potentially historic properties may increase as never before (the closest analogy would be the way that early 20th-century Bungalows dramatically swelled the numbers of “new” historic buildings in the 1980s). The decades of the 1950s and 60s have the potential to double the number of historic buildings and structures that historic preservation must address. Innovative ways of dealing with these must be developed—along with plain old hard work—if historic preservation is to successfully accommodate this wave of “modern” historic buildings.

From a broader geographical point of view, two new kinds of large-scale historic landscapes will demand our attention: suburban landscapes and pine-tree plantations. The emerging “historic” suburban landscape will consist largely of contiguous residential subdivisions with their mid-century landscaping and street layouts.

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

Once a historic/cultural building, landscape, site or structure is lost there is no rebuilding it or re-creating it. Losing such places diminishes our sense of community and our local community.

This modern style commercial building in Summerville, Chattooga County, is an example of the mid-20th-century updating of older buildings with new, modern facades.
that comprise the suburbs around most larger Georgia communities. Within that residential landscape will also be shopping centers, office parks, industrial parks, and recreational parks. While some of these smaller components of the suburban landscape already are being studied, the larger suburban environment of which they are a part will itself become a focus for research, evaluation, and planning. In rural areas, attention will be directed toward a better understanding of the historical significance of silviculture—in particular, pine-tree plantations, which in many parts of the state have replaced traditional agriculture as a primary land use. While trees have been grown commercially for many years, it has been only since the 1930s that scientific and commercial forestry has been practiced on a large scale, and only recently have these managed forested lands been looked at from a historical perspective. Fundamental questions such as the historical significance of silviculture—the significance of establishing and maintaining pine-tree plantations on land that was formerly farmed in more traditional ways—will have to be addressed.

By 2015, another 10,000 archaeological sites will have been documented. New kinds of archaeological sites will be investigated, and these as well as previously identified sites will be examined using new techniques and in light of new information. Archaeologists will expand current efforts to document underwater archaeological sites in an organized way. Rivers, tidal streams, and the seacoast can be expected to yield new information about historic maritime and riverine activities. Heightened awareness of traditional cultural knowledge will be brought to bear in cooperative ventures involving archaeological sites associated with Native Americans and African Americans. The modern archaeological record may be critically examined in several respects: World War II-era sites may expand upon current historical documentation and first-person accounts of wartime preparedness, and landfills may provide critical physical evidence of 20th-century material culture and associated lifestyles. On a broader scale, archaeological information derived from pollen, soils, animal bones, and other sources will inform environmental scientists on the scope and kinds of changes to the natural and human environments that occurred hundreds and thousands of years ago and that may affect us in the future.

**WHAT MAKES A PROPERTY “HISTORIC?”**

To be considered “historic,” a property must have three essential attributes: sufficient age, a relatively high degree of physical integrity, and historical significance.
Age: A property must be “old enough” to be considered historic. Generally speaking, this means that a property must be at least 50 years old, although this is just a general rule of thumb. Another way of looking at it is that a property must be old enough to have been studied by historians, architectural historians, or archaeologists so that its place in history is clear. This latter perspective allows some types of properties that are less than 50 years old to be considered “historic.”

Integrity: In addition to having sufficient age, a property must retain its historic physical integrity. For a building, structure, landscape feature, historic site, or historic district, this means that the property must be relatively unchanged. Its essential character-defining features relative to its significance must still be present. For an archaeological site, integrity means that the site must be relatively undisturbed, with its patterns and layers of artifacts and other archaeological evidence relatively intact. For a traditional cultural property, integrity means that the site must be recognizable to today’s affiliated cultural group, evidenced through tradition, and still used or revered in some way.

Significance: Finally, and most importantly, a property must be significant to be considered historic. Significance is defined in three ways: (1) through direct association with individuals, events, activities, or developments that shaped our history or that reflect important aspects of our history; (2) by embodying the distinctive physical and spatial characteristics of an architectural style or type of building, structure, landscape, or planned environment, or a method of construction, or by embodying high artistic values or fine craftsmanship; or (3) by having the potential to yield information important to our understanding of the past through archaeological, architectural, or other physical investigation and analysis.

How Do We Decide What’s Historic?
Each of us may have our own personal opinions about what is historic and what is not. Similarly, different social and cultural groups may have different definitions of “historic.” Other interest groups in our society may look at historic properties in entirely different ways or may not value them at all. An important part of historic preservation is establishing public processes to determine what is historic and what is not. Once these determinations have been made, they become public preservation policy. There are several established ways in Georgia of publicly determining whether properties are historic and worthy of being preserved.

National Register of Historic Places: One of the most important ways in which we determine which properties are historic and which are not is through the National Register of Historic Places.
Since its creation by an act of Congress in 1966, the National Register has been one of the foundations of historic preservation across the country and in Georgia. It provides uniform standards, a public process, and a national perspective for determining the significance and preservation worthiness of properties. Although the criteria for determining National Register eligibility are essentially unchanged since 1966, their interpretation and application to properties are continuously clarified and updated through published guidance, bulletins, and precedent-setting National Register listings. Listing in the National Register or determining National Register eligibility are among the clearest statements of public policy about what is historic and worthy of being preserved.

At the present time there are more than 2,000 Georgia listings in the National Register of Historic Places encompassing more than 75,000 historic properties in the state. Historic properties in Georgia are being added to the National Register at the rate of approximately 25 listings representing nearly 2,000 historic properties per year. Traditionally, Georgia has ranked in the top 10 states in the nation in the number of National Register-listed properties.

Georgia Register of Historic Places: Established in 1989, the Georgia Register of Historic Places is our state’s companion to the National Register of Historic Places. Modeled closely after the National Register, the Georgia Register is Georgia’s official statewide list of historic properties worthy of being preserved. Properties listed in the National Register are automatically listed in the Georgia Register.

Local Designations: Another important way of determining the significance and preservation worthiness of properties in Georgia is through local landmark or historic district designation. Under the provisions of the Georgia Historic Preservation Act of 1980, local governments can pass ordinances that specify standards and procedures for designating historic properties in their jurisdictions. Criteria and designations may vary from community to community, reflecting local conditions, needs, goals, and prerogatives. At the present time, more than 130 local governments in Georgia have established local historic preservation commissions or have designated local historic landmarks or districts.

Section 106 Environmental Reviews: Federal government agencies are required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to take into account the effects of their undertakings on properties that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. A national review process established by the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation prescribes the method by which these agencies carry out this legal responsibility. Federal agencies must consult with the state historic
preservation office in determining if properties in their project areas are listed in the National Register or might qualify for listing; interested parties and the general public are also invited to comment. This public process identifies hundreds of historic properties each year in Georgia.

Planning: Another way that local communities can define their historic properties is through local comprehensive development plans. As required by the 1989 Georgia Planning Act, local plans must include consideration of historic properties. These plans provide an opportunity for communities to make a public statement about what is locally considered historic and worthy of being preserved. Other local land-use tools, including zoning, sign, and tree ordinances, can be used to delineate or designate historic properties.

Historical Markers: The state historical marker program uses unique criteria and procedures to identify properties of statewide significance. The oldest of the many ways in which historic properties are identified in Georgia, the marker program dates back to the early 1950s. Originally managed by the Georgia Historical Commission, the program currently is administered by the Georgia Historical Society with assistance from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Through the marker program, former as well as extant historic properties are officially recognized. Currently there are approximately 2,000 state historical markers in Georgia. They are accompanied by uncounted numbers of local and regional historical markers.

How Are Properties Determined to Be Historic?
Although there are several different ways of determining whether properties are historic, all of these processes share three fundamental steps:

The first step consists of gathering information about a specific property—the facts, so to speak—including a physical description and historical documentation. Maps, plans, and photographs supplement this information.

The second step involves putting the individual property in its place in history: seeing how it “fits” into the larger scheme of things, documenting what role it played in our history, ascertaining what it might tell us about the past, or determining if it is a good or exceptional example of an architectural style or building type. Useful ways of doing this include comparing and contrasting it to similar properties, to historically related properties, or to other properties in the same vicinity. Another useful way is to determine how the property relates to the distinctive aspects of Georgia’s history. Yet another way is to measure how well it retains the char-
acter-defining features of its building type or architectural style. Formal studies called “historic contexts” prepared according to National Park Service standards present contextual information by which to determine whether or not a property is historic in especially useful ways.

The third step consists of applying criteria for evaluation to the property and what is known about it—a yardstick for measuring its significance, so to speak. The National Register of Historic Places “Criteria for Evaluation” or the designation standards found in a local historic preservation ordinance are commonly used to measure the significance of a historic property.

Each step of the process involves public input and participation along with appropriate professional involvement. Taken together, these three steps constitute the basic methodology for determining the significance of properties.
Georgia has a rich human history that began at least 12,000 years ago. Written records have existed since European contact but approximately 96 percent of Georgia’s past is unrecorded. Archaeological research provides one means of uncovering this unwritten history. Archaeology is the study of humans and their closest ancestors through the material remains they have left behind. Contrary to common belief, archaeologists do not study dinosaurs; in fact the earliest humans and last dinosaurs are separated by at least 64 million years!

Archaeologists’ primary means of accessing the past is through excavation or “digging” a site. Depending on the site and the conditions, archaeologists choose from many different tools ranging from tiny dental picks and paint brushes to backhoes or other heavy equipment. What does not change between excavations is the note taking and recording that takes place. Excavation is an inherently destructive process that destroys the archaeological record as the data are collected. Therefore it is important that archaeologists record as much as possible for future researchers; including taking careful notes about each artifacts location or provenience. Provenience is the term archaeologists use to describe the artifacts exact location and its relationship to other artifacts. To an archaeologist, most individual artifacts are not that informative on their own. What allows archaeologists to reconstruct the stories of past people are the complicated relationships of one artifact to another. If these artifacts are removed from the ground without careful excavation and note taking, this rare information is lost forever.

The real work in archaeology starts after the excavation is over. Laboratory work, including cleaning, analyzing, stabilizing, cataloguing, and storing the artifacts takes usually three to four times as long as the time spent digging and in special cases can take much longer. Once the artifacts are safely cleaned and stored, the archaeologists have an obligation to report on the excavations to make the information available to other archaeologists and the public.

Through careful excavation, analysis, and reporting archaeologists have been able to build a story of Georgia’s past. Archaeologists frequently organize people by their time periods, creating a series of categories containing cultures with similar traits. Though
not perfect, these periods provide a starting point to discuss the
commonalities and differences both within and between differ-
et time periods. A brief summary of Georgia history is presented
below through the Early Twentieth Century. Most of this informa-
tion is drawn from The New Georgia Encyclopedia and Historical
Archaeology in Georgia. Readers are encouraged to consult these
resources for more detailed information.

The Paleoindian Period
The first unequivocal evidence of humans in the southeastern
United States dates to around the end of the last ice age about
13,000 years before the present (BP) during the Paleoindian Period.
This period is associated with a distinctive type of projectile point
known as the Clovis point, named after the town in New Mexico
where it was first identified. Compared to later time periods, little
is known about the Paleoindians. They were hunter-gatherers who
lived most of the year in relatively small groups of perhaps 25 to
50 individuals. Some evidence suggests large animals like mast-
odons and mammoths were an important food resource though a
wide array of plants and smaller game like deer, rabbits, and squir-
rels were probably also important. No large intact Paleoindian
sites have been located in Georgia though Clovis Period projec-

Excavations at Cane Patch, a coastal Late Archaic site on Ossabaw Island.
tile points have been recovered from across the state. The presence of these points indicates Paleoindian people were present in Georgia around 13,000 BP but the total population may have been small. Evidence of Georgia’s early inhabitants increases after the Paleoindian Period during the Archaic Period.

**The Archaic Period**

By around 10,000 BP, mega fauna such as bison, horses, mastodons, mammoths, and camels had disappeared from the region and the early inhabitants of Georgia continued to refine their lifeways to fit the changing environmental and social conditions. Archaeologists view these changes as the beginning of the Archaic Period which lasted from approximately 10,000 to 3,000 BP. These seven thousand years are typically sub-divided into three sub-periods: the Early, Middle, and Late Archaic.

Life during the Early Archaic (10,000 to 8,000 BP) was probably much the same as it had been during the Paleoindian Period. People still lived in small groups and remained quite mobile, periodically moving across the landscape to find food and to meet and trade with other groups. Archaeologists identify Early Archaic sites by the presence of diagnostic (i.e. distinctively shaped) stone tools including spear points and scrapers that may have been used to prepare hides. People still ate large game like white-tailed deer, black bear, turkey, as well as turtles, fish, shellfish, birds, and smaller mammals. They also enjoyed nuts, roots, fruits, seeds, and berries. Like the Paleoindian Period Early Archaic sites are rare in Georgia.

The Middle Archaic Period lasted from about 8,000 to 5,000 BP. The beginning of the Middle Archaic Period is marked by environmental change as the climate became drier and warmer in some areas of the southeastern United States. Archaeologists often identify Middle Archaic sites by the presence of distinctive spear points. Based on the local stone Middle Archaic people were using to make their tools, they traveled less or had smaller trade networks. As their movement and/or trade were reduced more regionalized cultures may have developed. During this Period, people continued to make use of a broad spectrum of food resources, probably still moving through their territory on a seasonal basis to make better use of the available resources. No large Middle Archaic habitation sites have been found in Georgia but small sites are common in upland settings throughout the Piedmont.

The Late Archaic Period lasted from about 5,000 to 3,000 BP. During this time, trends that began in the Early and Middle Archaic grew and matured. During the Late Archaic population size probably increased as territories continued to shrink and people con-
constructed more permanent settlements. Archaeologists often identify Late Archaic sites based on the presence of large stemmed projectile points, cooking slabs made of soapstone, atlatl weights, grooved stone axes, and metates (grinding stones).

Another important marker of the Late Archaic Period is fiber-temper pottery. The earliest pottery in the New World was invented on the South Carolina and Georgia coast during this Period. This pottery often had Spanish moss or palmetto fiber added to the clay to strengthen it; once the vessels are fired the fiber burns away leaving distinctive marks in the pottery.

Late Archaic people made extensive use of aquatic resources and their sites are often marked by large piles of shell. Their use of freshwater shellfish is evident at the Stallings Island site located on an island in the Savannah River north of Augusta. The Stallings Island site consists of a two-acre accumulation of freshwater shellfish shells, sometimes over 10 feet deep, with other food remains, pit features, pottery and artifacts. The Sapelo Island shell ring is an example of a coastal shell construction. The Sapelo Island shell ring is actually the largest of three rings located on the island. While archaeologists do not know why or how these ring shaped structures form, the food remains recovered suggest Late Archaic people used them year round. They may be the result of ring shaped villages or communal feasting events, either way the rings likely reflect a higher level of social organization than in the earlier Periods.

The Woodland Period
During the Woodland Period (3,000 to 1,100 BP) people continued to refine developments that began during the preceding Late Archaic Period. The pottery became lighter and stronger, people continued to become more settled and lead less mobile lives, and their societies continued to increase in complexity. The Woodland Period is also sub-divided into three parts: Early, Middle, and Late.

The Early Woodland Period lasted from about 3,000 to 2,300 BP. During this time, people lived in villages of around 50 people. The villages had more permanent structures though the inhabitants probably still moved on a seasonal basis returning to the site year after year. Archaeologists recognize sites from this Period by the pottery which is often decorated with impressions from wooden paddles that were carved or wrapped with fabric.

Though direct evidence from Georgia is lacking, cultivation increased in other parts of the southeast. Early Woodland people practiced small scale horticulture growing starchy seed plants like goosefoot, maygrass, knotweed, and sunflower. These resources formed a small but important portion of their diet.
The Middle Woodland Period dates from 2,300 to 1,400 years ago and marks a time of profound political change. Villages continued to grow larger and more permanent. The villages were often circular and built around a central plaza. Trade appears to have been on the increase as loosely knit but far ranging trade networks moved exotic goods like galena and copper from the Midwest to the South and seashells from the Gulf Coast to the Midwest. During this Period, ceramics became more refined and decoration techniques and designs became more complex. These designs were impressed into the exterior of the pottery with elaborately carved wooden paddles. These complex decorations replaced the simple patterns of the Early Woodland.

Horticulture continued to increase in importance and maize was introduced throughout the southeast. Maize cultivation appears to have been less important in Georgia during this period and did not constitute a significant portion of the diet. There is also evidence people began to clear Georgia’s forests to make way for crops during this Period.

Rock and earthen mounds first began to appear in Georgia during the Middle Woodland Period. These mounds were usually cone shaped mounds used to house the dead but some were flat topped mounds that may have functioned as stages for ceremony. The Kolomoki site in southwest Georgia is the largest Middle Woodland settlement discovered in Georgia. The site included at least eight flat topped mounds, seven of which are preserved. Kolomoki is the oldest example of this type of mounds in the southeast and foreshadows the size and complexity of sites during the later Mississippian Period.

Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?

We have lost so much in terms of cultural and natural resources due to neglect, sprawl and general wastefulness. Historic preservation provides a way to connect the dots between sense of place and sustainable development.
During the Late Woodland Period (1,400 to 1,100 BP) many trends of the preceding periods may have reversed. Mound building decreased, as did long distance trade. Maize cultivation appears to have increased with maize becoming increasingly important in North Georgia during this Period. The bow and arrow were introduced during this Period and the smaller distinctive projectile points (i.e. arrowheads) are often used to identify sites from this Period. Warfare may have increased as a result of the bow and arrow as shown by the construction of fortified villages. People lived in small settlements of about 20 houses with the exception of larger fortified sites.

The Mississippian Period

The Mississippian Period in Georgia dates from about 1,200 to 400 BP and was a time of tremendous population growth. During the Mississippian Period people lived in small villages and hamlets spread along rivers. These societies were parts of chiefdoms with a clear distinction between commoners and elites. The people were farmers and there were seldom more than 100 people in a village. However, these people also constructed large ceremonial centers with large flat topped earthen mounds where hundreds of people would gather and sometimes live. Research has shown these mounds were strongly linked to chiefs who lived on them, performed rituals and buried their dead. Smaller Mississippian sites are easily recognizable by their small triangular projectile points and their distinctive pottery styles which include stamping, incising and pinched rims.

Like the preceding Archaic and Woodland Periods, the Mississippian is sub-divided into three periods: Early, Middle and Late. During the Early Mississippian (1,200 to 900 BP) the first chiefdoms developed in the state. Ocmulgee National Monument is an excellent example of an Early Mississippian mound center. Pottery recovered from the site shows that emigrants from what is now Tennessee or farther west occupied the site just outside of modern day Macon, Georgia. They built mounds, council chambers, and defensive works during their 300 year occupation of the area. The site has been designated a National Monument and visitors can view the remains of a council house floor that was excavated by archaeologists and enclosed for viewing.

By the Middle Mississippian (900 to 650 BP), powerful chiefs ruled much of Georgia from large centers with mounds and palisades. One of the largest and most impressive examples of a chiefdom capital was the Etowah site, located in northwestern Georgia near Cartersville. The site contains six earthen mounds, the highest of which rises 60 feet above the surrounding floodplain. A large
town surrounded the mounds at the center of the site. The village was protected by a large moat and palisade with regular spaced towers along its length. The site is owned by the state of Georgia and managed by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources which also maintains a museum on the site.

During the Late Mississippian Period (650 to 400 BP) the large chiefdoms had lost much of their power and splintered into small chiefdoms more evenly distributed along Georgia’s waterways. These chiefdoms were in turn ruled by a few powerful paramount chiefdoms that controlled hundreds of linear miles of river ways, perhaps encompassing up to seven smaller chiefdoms. During this Period, the Native people of Georgia first came in contact with Europeans as Hernando de Soto and his army of Spaniards traveled through the Southeast.

The subsequent influx of Europeans brought the Mississippian Period to an end. Native peoples were devastated by European diseases against which they had no defense. Additionally, the desire for new European goods and their participation in the deer skin trade caused entire populations to relocate to be near European settlements. The disease and population movements destabilized the remaining chiefdoms and hastened their dissolution, bringing an end to the Mississippian Period.

**Early European Colonization**

After de Soto’s exploration between 1539 and 1542, the Spanish began to take a greater interest in Georgia. The Spanish built a mission on St. Catherine’s Island in 1566, which was part of the Guale Mission Province along the South Atlantic Coast, to convert Native peoples to Catholicism. The mission, Santa Catalina de Guale, included a friary, church and kitchen which were surrounded by a defensive palisade. The mission was burned in 1597 and rebuilt before it was abandoned again. The site was the subject of a large scale archaeological excavation during the 1980s, which produced a wealth of information about the effects of the Mission system on Native Americans.

The British were the first to establish European settlements within what would become Georgia. In 1733 General James Oglethorpe and a group of colonists traveled south from Charleston and settled the city that would become Savannah after negotiating a treaty with the Yamacraw Native Americans who occupied the area. The British settled the coastal region to act as a buffer between Spanish Florida and British settlements in South Carolina by establishing a series of fortifications south of Savannah. Among these were Fort George and Fort Frederica. Currently, both these sites are publicly interpreted.

---

**Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?**

*It provides a window into the past and the ability to actually feel historic places, not just read about them.*
The American Revolution and the Growth of Agriculture
After the colony was settled, it continued to grow and prosper. In 1777 Georgia joined with the rest of the Colonies and sent representatives to the Continental Congress. In 1778, the British tried to retake Georgia and succeeded in retaking Savannah. After the war, the economy began to recover and plantations began to resume their business. After the invention of the cotton gin in 1793, cotton began to replace rice as Georgia’s most important crop. After Sea Island cotton was introduced 1786, cotton plantations were built on the coast. One example was Cannon’s Point on St. Catherine’s Island. Cannon’s Point was a large plantation and has been the subject of a great deal of archeological inquiry providing some of the first archaeological data about enslaved peoples in a plantation setting.

The Civil War
Cotton and the plantation system continued to be an important part of the Georgia economy until the Civil War. Fort Pulaski, Georgia came under attack in 1862, but Georgia saw relatively little action until the Battle of Chickamauga in 1863. As Sherman assumed command of the Union forces and began his advance on Atlanta and eventually the sea beyond, the Confederacy fought a series of delaying battles including the Battle of Kennesaw Mountain, the Battle at Resaca, and the Battle at Pickett’s Mill. Many of the sites of large battles are now federally owned (Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park) or state historic sites (Resaca and Pickett’s
Important archaeological investigations have occurred at these sites, providing further information to support firsthand accounts from the battles.

In addition to battlefields, Georgia also had prisoner of war camps like Andersonville and Camp Lawton. Andersonville, now a National Historic Site, was a Confederate prisoner of war camp built in 1864 in southwest Georgia. The camp was designed to house 10,000 Union prisoners but was soon filled with over 30,000 men. As the population increased, a shortage of supplies and the unsanitary conditions within the prison lead to the deaths of over 13,000 men. In 1998, a POW museum was constructed on the site which commemorates all American POWs.

Camp Lawton was another Confederate prisoner of war camp that was constructed to help relieve some of the burden at Andersonville. The prison was only in use for approximately six weeks after it was finished prior to its evacuation in advance of Sherman’s March to the Sea Campaign. After the camp fell into disuse its exact location was lost until recent archaeological investigations relocated the site in Magnolia Springs State Park and the Bo Ginn National Fish Hatchery. These ongoing investigations have revealed a wealth of information about the lives of the prisoners and the guards who were stationed there. As the excavations proceed, more information about the lives of the prisoners and their story will be forthcoming.

Reconstruction and the Early Twentieth Century
The Civil War devastated Georgia’s social and economic structures. Slave emancipation changed the face of agriculture as first wage labor, and then sharecropping and share-renting became the dominant forms of agricultural labor organization. Railroads were rebuilt, but slowly, and the depression of 1873-1878 further slowed economic redevelopment. In the 1890s cotton mills and their attendant mill villages began to assume the dominant role in Georgia’s industrial development, a position they would continue to hold until 1940. Urban centers also rebuilt. Savannah became known for naval stores, sugar, and paper, Columbus for its clay works and textile mills, and Atlanta for financial services and an increasingly-diversified economic base. Data-recovery excavations have taken place at a wide variety of Reconstruction-era sites, including both operator and cropper/renter houses, rural mills, and urban centers such as Augusta and Columbus.

Movement of rural families to the urban centers was a defining feature of the early twentieth century in Georgia, particularly after the boll weevil decimated cotton fields beginning in 1915. Georgia became a major supplier of war supplies with the advent of World War I.
of World War I, leading to significant industrial growth, particularly in cities like Atlanta, Augusta, and Savannah. The war also led to the establishment of Georgia’s many military installations, such as Fort Benning and Camp Gordon, outside Atlanta. World War II further suppressed cotton farming, as exports nearly ceased and field labor became harder to get. The New Deal programs of the 1930s and early ’40s led to increased food crop production as well as the implementation of land use practices such as contouring. Early twentieth century site types that have been investigated in Georgia include rural domestic sites, military posts, and industrial sites in the larger cities.
SECTION III:
THE PLANNING PROCESS
An effective historic preservation plan must do many things. It must represent views of those who will implement it and those who will be affected by its implementation. It must consolidate the myriad of issues confronting preservation and anticipate how those issues will evolve in the future. The plan should focus on the highest priorities, effectively addressing threats to historic resources, yet it must also be practical and present visions and goals that reach beyond the present practices and ways of thinking.

Creation of a preservation plan is just one part of a larger, ongoing planning process. The teamwork of the Historic Preservation Division (HPD) staff, with the assistance and input of other Georgia preservationists, is the foundation of the process as well as the strength and force behind the continuing evolution of Georgia’s preservation goals and activities. The implementation and success of a statewide plan is impossible unless those in the state’s preservation community share these common goals and objectives.

This plan was developed as the successor to Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Plan, 2007-2011: Building a Preservation Ethic, published in 2007. The preparation and implementation of a statewide comprehensive plan for historic preservation provides HPD, the preservation community, and other stakeholders in Georgia with the opportunity to consider a wide range of strategies to identify, evaluate and protect Georgia’s irreplaceable historic properties. It is also required by the National Park Service (NPS) for the participation of a state historic preservation office (SHPO) in the national historic preservation program. In Georgia, HPD, a division of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GDNR), administers the SHPO programs.
Initiation
The planning process began in 2010 when HPD management staff met to discuss strategies for effective staff and public input for an updated preservation plan. The importance of gathering public input and incorporating this input into the development of the plan update was emphasized. The public participation strategy included a series of public meetings held across the state, and an on-line survey posted on our website and publicized through our electronic newsletter database, our Facebook page, and at our public meetings. In addition, HPD’s staff planning retreats addressed broad preservation goals and the continued need for a more efficient delivery of preservation services and concerted effort to identify innovative funding sources and partnerships to enhance the preservation cause.

Public Input Meetings
Between October of 2010 and February of 2011, HPD coordinated with the historic preservation planners of Georgia’s regional commissions to host eleven public meetings across the state. The meetings were advertised through HPD’s electronic newsletter, HPD’s website, HPD’s Facebook page, press releases to the print media, and through the regional commissions and certified local governments listserv. The meetings were held in Eastman (Heart of Georgia-Altamaha region); Albany (Southwest Georgia region); Franklin (Three Rivers region); Athens (Northeast Georgia region); Calhoun (Northwest Georgia region); Macon (Middle Georgia region); Thomson (Central Savannah River Area region); Columbus (River Valley region); Douglas (Southern Georgia region); Gainesville (Georgia Mountains region); and Atlanta (Metro Atlanta region). Attendance varied from region to region, from a few individuals to twenty to thirty individuals per meeting. The meetings were structured to include a short presentation on the main preservation programs administered by HPD, the current preservation plan’s goals and priorities and a discussion of the statewide historic preservation planning process, followed by an open forum for participants to express their views. Participants included preservation non-profits; state, regional and local officials; historic preservation commission members; historic preservation advisory committee members; consultants; code enforcers; preservation planners and other preservation professionals; historic home owners; educators; and the interested public.

Participants provided valuable suggestions on what they considered to be the most important preservation issues facing the
state and what preservationists’ priorities should be. The main concerns voiced at these meetings centered on the following:

1. education and outreach strategies to assist property owners and local governments in preserving historic properties;
2. preservation training for public and elected officials;
3. sustainability and historic preservation;
4. historic preservation education for youth and the general public;
5. funding for preservation projects.

Other issues brought up at these meetings included:

1. promoting preservation and heritage tourism;
2. diversifying preservation products and constituents (i.e. reaching out to non-traditional partners);
3. education in preservation-related building trades and historic preservation education for professionals in planning, architecture, and other fields;
4. developing better tools to help rural regions of the state;
5. state stewardship of historic properties;
6. preservation of historic records;
7. enhanced training for local historic preservation commissions;
8. better historic preservation advocacy;
9. promoting and educating the public about the preservation tax credits;
10. need to focus on the preservation of historic neighborhoods;
11. importance of modern (“recent past”) resources; and
12. importance of historic resource surveys, including the development of a database on Civil War sites.

Survey Questionnaire Results

In a further effort to seek the input of as many people as possible, HPD prepared a ten question survey and posted it on its website for an eight month period, from July 2010 to February 2011. Participants in the public meetings were also encouraged to complete the survey and the regional preservation planners also publicized it. HPD also publicized the survey through direct electronic mailing, and through its weekly electronic newsletter. Over 400 surveys were completed. A summary of the survey results is discussed below.

As was the case in the public meetings, Georgians who completed the survey reflect a variety of roles and interests in historic preservation, ranging from local government officials; non-profit organizations; historic preservation commission members; pres-
ervation professionals and consultants in the fields of history, architecture, and archaeology; state government employees; as well as preservation students, educators, and owners of historic properties.

All regions in Georgia were represented in the survey. However, the majority of respondents were from Metro Atlanta (40.4 percent) and North Georgia (24.1 percent). Percentages of responses dropped considerably for the rest of the regions. Although this may reflect the fact that half of Georgia’s population lives in the Atlanta Metro Area, it may also indicate the need to develop more effective methods of communicating the preservation message to the rest of the state.

Which preservation activities should the Historic Preservation Division give priority to during the next five years to protect historic and archaeological resources?

The question listed 22 preservation activities that could be rated as not important, somewhat important, important, or extremely important. The three preservation activities that received the highest average ratings were:

1. federal and state tax incentives for historic preservation projects;
2. funding programs (heritage grants and CLG grants); and
3. partnering with local organizations to preserve and enhance historic downtowns and rural communities.

Downtown Waycross, Ware County.
Other activities that received a high average rating included:
1. promoting preservation legislation;
2. heritage tourism;
3. survey to identify historic buildings and structures;
4. coordinating efforts with state, regional and planning agencies;
5. review of state and federal projects for impact on historic and archaeological resources;
6. historic preservation training and workshops and other preservation education activities;
7. strengthening Georgia’s preservation network and developing new preservation partners; and
8. assisting local historic preservation commissions.

The question also allowed for respondents to include additional activities. Other responses included state stewardship of historic properties, developing school curriculum focusing on local historic resources, energy conservation and historic properties, and preservation of neighborhoods. An interesting point is that these additional activities were also brought up during the public meetings.

**Which historic resources in your area do you consider the most important to preserve?**

The question listed 17 historic resource types that could be rated as not important, somewhat important, important or extremely important. The resource type with the highest average rating was Main Street/Downtowns, followed by: public buildings, houses, historic landscapes, civic/public spaces, cemeteries, residential neighborhoods, and African American resources. The question also allowed for respondents to include additional resources. Other responses included Native American sites, other minority resources, theaters, gas stations, military aviation sites, and state-owned historic sites. An interesting point is that state-owned historic sites were also brought up during the public meetings.

**Which programs of the Historic Preservation Division are you most interested in?**

The question listed 17 programs in which individuals could rate or rank their level of interest as either not interested, somewhat interested, interested or extremely interested. The three programs that received the highest average rating were:
1. historic preservation planning;
2. grants for rehabilitation of historic buildings; and
3. tax incentives.

*The City of Cedartown, Polk County, received a Georgia Heritage grant to produce a preservation plan for its historic and still-functioning 1892 waterworks building.*
Other programs that received a high average rating included:

1. protecting historic and archaeological properties with state and federal environmental review laws;
2. technical assistance for local and community preservation planning;
3. architectural technical assistance in rehabilitating historic buildings; and
4. the Georgia and National Register of Historic Places.

Respondents also added other programs, such as: training in repair of historic buildings, sustainability initiatives, local regional planners, focus on other ethnic groups such as Native Americans and other minorities, preservation easements, and more intensive historic preservation training. The issues of training in repair of historic buildings and sustainability initiatives also were brought up at the public meetings.

**What do you consider to be the most effective methods that the Historic Preservation Division can use for providing historic preservation information to the public?**

The question listed 15 methods that could be rated as not effective, somewhat effective, effective, or extremely effective. The methods that received the highest average ratings were:

1. website;
2. ready access to HPD staff by telephone or email;
3. on-site staff assistance; and
4. training workshops

It is interesting to note that social media ranked 13th in average ratings, indicating that as a relatively new form of communication, it is not yet perceived as an effective method. However, this may change during the life of this plan, and other yet to be discovered ways of communicating will in all probability emerge.

**How did you learn about this survey?**

This question was quite revealing. Seventy-three percent of respondents learned about the survey through HPD's e-mail newsletter. Only 11.2 percent learned about the survey through our website, 8.9 percent through a public meeting, and 6.2 percent through Facebook. This shows the need to find new mechanisms to publicize preservation initiatives and get the word out.

**Why is the preservation of Georgia's heritage important to you?**

The survey also included three open-ended questions intended to elicit a more personal response. It was very revealing that almost all of the surveys included detailed answers to these questions. An analysis points to some important themes. The first open-ended
question asked “Why is the preservation of Georgia’s heritage important to you?” Among the main themes expressed were:

1. sense of place, continuity with the past;
2. uniqueness, community value;
3. for future generations;
4. pride in Georgia’s history;
5. sustainability;
6. non-renewable resources that will be lost forever if not preserved;
7. education, tangible links to history and place; and
8. economic benefits

The responses overwhelmingly address an emotional connection. Although the economic benefits of preservation were certainly brought up, intangible reasons such as sense of place, identity, pride, and quality of life predominated in the responses to this question.

What do you consider to be the most important preservation issues facing Georgia now and in the next five years?

This was the second open-ended question in the survey. Not surprisingly in this period of economic downturn, one of the main issues expressed was the need for funding for all types of preservation projects and the need to identify new funding sources. Many also mentioned specifically funding for HPD, state historic sites, and the regional preservation planners. Respondents also emphasized education about preservation, the need to focus on the younger generations to get them involved in preservation, finding better ways to balance development and preservation, demolition by neglect, training for local historic preservation commissions and local officials, preservation and sustainability, and the opportunity in the next four years to focus on the Civil War Sesquicentennial.

Respondents also mentioned the preservation of specific resource types as significant issues; many mentioned the preservation of mid-20th-century resources, preservation of rural landscapes and communities, and vernacular architecture. Other types of resources specifically mentioned were: Native American sites, archaeological sites, battlefields, historic landscapes, cemeteries and historic urban neighborhoods, specifically mill villages and African American neighborhoods.

What can you do to advance historic preservation in Georgia?

This was the third open-ended question in the survey. Most respondents emphasized continuing the work they are already doing to promote and carry out preservation projects, as historic preservation commission members, Main Street or Better Hometown...
directors, owners of historic properties, state or federal employees, educators, students and consultants. The main themes expressed included: lobbying for preservation, raising funds for preservation, advocating, educating, participating, volunteering, and staying involved within the preservation community. Answers to this question indicate that there is a motivated constituency for preservation in Georgia that is already working towards preservation goals and is willing to do more.

Public comments on draft plan
The draft *Georgia State Historic Preservation Plan 2012-2016* was prepared by HPD and posted prominently on our website (www.georgiashpo.org) for a one-month public comment period. Requests for public comments were publicized through HPD’s weekly on-line newsletter, through HPD’s Facebook page, and through direct emails. It was also announced at a variety of public meetings attended by HPD staff. The few comments received were very positive, acknowledging needs addressed in the plan’s goals and objectives regarding accessibility of National Register and historic survey information, the need to better educate public and elected officials about the benefits of historic preservation, and the importance of supporting and training Georgia’s historic preservation commissions.

CONCLUSION

The public input process has provided valuable ideas that have been incorporated into the goals, objectives and strategies of the current state plan. This involved a careful consideration of the main issues and results of both the public meetings and the public survey. It is evident that we need to find more effective ways to communicate the value of preservation and to provide preservation training to a wide base of constituents, including public and elected officials, professionals and students. It is also clear that our preservation stakeholders understand how preservation is relevant to the larger issues of quality of life, economic development and sustainability and that they want HPD’s core preservation programs to reflect this wider context.

Georgians have a strong sense and feel for why preservation is important to them and have definite opinions on what needs to be done to protect the state’s heritage. Citizens believe that preservation is important and it is up to all of us to be better stewards of the state’s resources and for federal, state and local officials to be more accountable to constituents. It is evident that the foundations of a
strong preservation ethic continue to be present in Georgia and that working together to realize the goals and objectives outlined in this Plan will bring us closer to realizing our vision of making Georgia a better place to live, work, learn and play.

What can you do to advance historic preservation in Georgia?

- Advocate and volunteer!
- Speak out about the importance and vulnerability of archaeological resources.
- Support local preservation organizations.
- Volunteer at historic sites in my area.
- Be a conscientious historic preservation commission member.
- Educate younger generations.
- Give presentations and publish on research.
- Apply my technical knowledge to achieve historic preservation goals. Support HPD programs and efforts.
- Serve on boards and participate in organizations that advance preservation; take good care of our historic home; advocate for historic preservation whenever opportunity arises.
- Inform and urge others to attend sites and to make donations.
- Serve on a commission.
- Be involved in local level in promoting historic preservation especially with city and county governments.
- Connect sustainable economic development and job creation to historic preservation.
- Promote, promote, promote.
- Stay involved.
- Advocate for rural preservation. I am also documenting all historic cemeteries in my community.
- Let people know that preservation is the ultimate recycling.
- Teach the public why historic preservation is important and give them opportunities to have hands-on experiences to create lifetime learners and supporters.
- Support state and local legislation related to preservation.
- Educate/advocate as part of my profession.
- Hosting a workshop on tax credits for owners of properties in our National Register district.
- Educate people in my community. Quiz public officials (and our local legislators) up for election on their views on preservation.
- I would like to better integrate historic preservation in the community planning projects that I perform in my job.
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