SHPO Comments, 100% Draft
Reviewed by: Andrew Dial

30% Draft Comments are in blue
70% Draft Comments are in green
100% Draft Comments are in purple

The Preservation plan shall contain sections including but not limited to the following:

1. an introduction that explains the purpose of the plan and a brief history of City of Columbia, including an overview of the preservation efforts that have taken place in the city's history and the benefits of historic preservation in City of Columbia;
    a. General history of Columbia is present. No overview of preservation efforts or benefits.
    b. General history of Columbia is present and previous comments have been addressed. The overview of preservation efforts in Columbia will need to be more fully developed in the final draft as it is thin. Warrensburg and Moberly's preservation plans are good examples to follow. There is a short paragraph summarizing the 2012 study. Expanding this section with more data from the 2012 study would make the preservation plan more useful for communicating with city leaders.
    c. Unchanged from previous submission, see previous comment.
2. a review of existing historic preservation ordinances and recommendations for their future development;
    a. HPC powers and duties has been copied from the city's website. This is not the complete ordinance and does not constitute a review. No recommendations are provided.
    b. Copy of the HPC powers and duties is unchanged; an analysis section has been added. The full ordinance is Sec. 29-2.3(c)(1-15) where only (c)(2) is reproduced here. I recommend providing the full ordinance and moving it to an appendix. The analysis also appears to contain some inaccurate information regarding COAs. (see below). Recommendations for future ordinance development are not present and will need to be added for the final draft.
    c. Analysis is present but brief. These are not recommendations for future ordinance development.
3. a clear and concise articulation of the City of Columbia's long-range vision for historic preservation;
    a. Not present, I expect this will be one of the final pieces.
    b. Not present, I expect this to be in the final draft.
4. the goals, objectives, and implementation strategies for historic preservation;
    a. No goals or objectives listed. There are recommendations about plaques and coloring books.
    b. List of goals is included. I'm surprised to see them this early as the city is still conducting input sessions. I expect the final goals to change in order to accommodate feedback from the input sessions.
    c. No change from previous submission

5. a section that identifies areas that have already been surveyed and prioritizes areas for future research and survey;
    a. There is a list of past surveys and a map illustrating the areas surveyed but the map does not match the map of surveys from the SHPO website. It is not readable to the viewer as there is no legend. No prioritization of future surveys. Recommendations for nominations of African-American sites and the Miles Manor Subdivision.
    b. Maps have been added to this draft but they are still incomplete as they do not include the Benton-Stephens survey currently underway. Not sure why the Rocheport surveys are in here since that is a different city.
    c. Benton-Stephens survey map added and Rocheport surveys removed. Still not seeing a prioritization for future surveys.
6. a map showing the geographic area and contributing status of historic properties within the city limits including those that are National Register of Historic Places listed properties and any locally designated Landmarks and Historic Districts;
    a. Unclear whether the draft map shows the areas surveyed or listed.
    b. Not present. I expect to see this in the final draft.
    c. List of NR-designated places is present. No map is included
7. an appendix referencing relevant terms and definitions, ordinances or other legislation, policy, and survey information as appropriate.
    a. Not present
    b. Bibliography provided, otherwise not present.
    c. Present

Conclusion: the submitted preservation plan does not fully meet the milestones of the grant due to the issues described above.