



New Summary Report - 09 December 2015

1. How often do you interact with the King County Historic Preservation Program?




Value	Percent	Count	Statistics	
Less than once a year	6.4%	5	Total Responses	78
Once or twice a year	25.6%	20	Sum	81.0
3 - 10 times per year	34.6%	27	Average	3.0
about monthly	18.0%	14	Max	3.0
more than once a month	15.4%	12		
Total		78		

2. Overall, what is your level of satisfaction with the King County Historic Preservation program?




Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
Very Dissatisfied	3.9%	3	Total Responses 78
Dissatisfied	1.3%	1	
Neutral	12.8%	10	
Satisfied	25.6%	20	
Very Satisfied	56.4%	44	
Not applicable	0.0%	0	
Total		78	

3. Which of the following Preservation Program services have you used or engaged with Preservation Program staff about? (check all that apply):



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
Landmark protection services (designation, design review and/or incentives)	55.1%	43	Total Responses 78
Public information and technical assistance (unrelated to landmark designation)	41.0%	32	
Environmental review and compliance	47.4%	37	
Total		78	

4. Which landmark protection services have you used or engaged with staff about?



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
Landmark nomination and designation	79.1%	34	Total Responses 43
Design review	69.8%	30	
Incentives	34.9%	15	
Other - Write In	11.6%	5	
Total		43	

Responses "Other - Write In"	Count
Left Blank	73
Assistance with restoration	1
COA	1
Care of landmark	1
Coordination on permitting	1
new roof on landmark	1


5. Please rank in importance the following landmark protection services: (where 1 is most important and 3 is least important)

	Score*	Overall Rank
Expertise of Preservation Program staff	93	1
Landmark designation and design review process	69	2
Availability, responsiveness and timeliness of Preservation Program assistance	67	3

Total Respondents 43

*Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.

6. Please rate your satisfaction with the Preservation Program's landmark protection services:



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
Very Dissatisfied	2.3%	1	Total Responses 43
Dissatisfied	2.3%	1	
Neutral	14.0%	6	
Satisfied	48.8%	21	
Very Satisfied	32.6%	14	
Total		43	


7. Additional comments on landmark protection services:

Count	Response
1	#5 question didn't function correctly, I could only rate 1 issue.
1	Collaboration among agencies is important. Common messaging and transparency also important.
1	I have found the Land Mark Preservation staff very nice and fun to work with.
1	Protection of landmarks could be more proactive.
1	Todd Scott has been very helpful in answering questions.
1	Todd Scott is a great resource! Always willing to help and very knowledgeable.
1	it would be great if they had an additional staff person to work specifically with cities
1	We need help in being able to keep our property viable in this economy. The main street initiative on Vashon island produced a number of new ideas for our property-and we have tried to incorporate some of those ideas in our plan for the future-we need help with the King County Zoning and Building Depts.
1	Need more notice to apply for funding opportunities. Windows do not seem to be open long enough especially when contractor bids are required.

Count Response

1	Lead staff have often been unavailable. Other than working with COAs, I am not sure what the measurable outcome of the office is.
1	Landmark Protection services, as provided by Todd Scott, are excellent but the reach of the County's program needs to be expanded.
1	Preserving and protecting all of our King County landmarks is of utmost importance to me. Too many historic places and items have already been destroyed.

8. Which public information services or technical assistance have you used?



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
web pages (other than publications available for download)	51.6%	16	Total Responses 31
publications (technical papers, reports, other written materials)	58.1%	18	
training and/or workshops - cemetery preservation, archaeology artifact id, etc.	22.6%	7	
Other	22.6%	7	
Total		31	

Responses "Other"	Count
Left Blank	72
Archaeology expertise	1
Grant application	1
Specific project assistance for identified but not protected structures.	1
consultation with staff	1
staff technical consultation	1

Responses "Other"

Count

Received help regarding administrative procedures and understanding the historic properties inventory	1
---	---


9. Please rank the importance of these public information or technical assistance services: (where 1 is most important and 3 is least important)

	Score*	Overall Rank
Expertise of Preservation Program staff in this area	76	1
Responsiveness and timeliness of Preservation Program assistance	54	2
Web site, publications, training/workshops and technical assistance	49	3

Total Respondents 32

*Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.

10. Please rate your overall satisfaction with public information or technical assistance services:



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
Very Dissatisfied	0.0%	0	Total Responses 32
Dissatisfied	3.1%	1	
Neutral	12.5%	4	
Satisfied	46.9%	15	
Very Satisfied	37.5%	12	
Total		32	


11. Additional comments on the Preservation Program's public information and technical assistance services:

Count	Response
1	Again...Todd Scott does a great job of helping with City questions.

Count Response

1	FYI - I really have not been using these programs very much in the past few years.
1	None
1	The staff is great, but the website needs to be updated.
1	it would be helpful to have more documentation available on line - context statements, survey reports, etc.

12. Which environmental review and compliance services have you used or engaged with Preservation Program staff about?



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
Review and comments under the County's Executive Procedures for Treatment of Cultural Resources (KC agency projects)	57.1%	20	Total Responses 35
Information for State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), non-County permitting or other cultural resource assistance	77.1%	27	
Review of permits for private projects (Department of Permitting and Environmental Review only)	17.1%	6	
Assistance with Section 106 and/or Executive Order 05-05 review of your projects	65.7%	23	
Consultation with the Preservation Program in Section 106 review conducted by non-County agencies	51.4%	18	
Other - Write In	5.7%	2	
Total		35	

Responses "Other - Write In"	Count
Left Blank	76
Historical Land Use	1

Responses "Other - Write In"

Count

coordinating different programs relative to a subdivide

1


13. How important are the following environmental review and compliance services to you? (where 1 is most important and 3 is least important)

	Score*	Overall Rank
Expertise of Preservation Program staff in environmental review and compliance	74	1
Availability, responsiveness and timeliness of Preservation Program assistance	54	2
Preservation Program review and comments	52	3

Total Respondents 36

*Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.

14. Please rate your overall satisfaction with environmental review and compliance services:



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
Very Dissatisfied	2.9%	1	Total Responses 35
Dissatisfied	2.9%	1	
Neutral	8.6%	3	
Satisfied	48.6%	17	
Very Satisfied	37.1%	13	
Total			35


15. Additional comments or suggestions regarding environmental review and compliance services:

Count	Response
1	Planning staff is difficult to work with.

Count Response


1	The archaeological review process could be streamlined. You need a full time archaeologist.
1	You have a great team for Section 106 review.
1	I have always found the staff to be quick and responsive in my interactions with them, and they are always very professional.
1	The County Archaeologists are very important to the Historic Preservation community and they are very busy and work very hard. Efforts should be made to fund the King County Archaeologists so they can continue to review development project plans and weigh in on cultural resources compliance.
1	I appreciate the pragmatism of the HPP reviews, but would also like to encourage further efforts in that direction.
1	King County staff are always knowledgeable and provide excellent technical skills - they are pressed for time and resources though, it would be great if the program could support additional staff or staff hours.
1	Would like to rate responsiveness also as 1 due to the timeliness of response periods. Though expertise is very important in order to provide accurate responses and comments.
1	The technical assistance that HPP provides to WTD is critical to the success of WTD projects. Phil LeTourneau is well respected by agencies and tribes, and his relationships are a real benefit to WTD when working to ensure cultural resources regulatory compliance.

16. How often would you use enhanced online King County-specific Preservation Program data and documents?



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
not needed/would not use	5.1%	4	Total Responses 78
once or twice a year	24.4%	19	
three to 10 times per year	26.9%	21	
about monthly	21.8%	17	
more than once a month	21.8%	17	
Total		78	

17. What would you use this information for? (check all that apply):



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
General interest and research	48.0%	35	Total Responses 73
Community history research	48.0%	35	
Investigation of specific historic properties	69.9%	51	
Environmental review and compliance tasks	53.4%	39	
Other - Write In	5.5%	4	
Total		73	

Responses "Other - Write In"	Count
Left Blank	74
Advocacy	1
Archaeology preservation	1
Referrals	1
Research on behalf of clients	1

[OLD VERSION] Potential program priorities - Several of you participated in updating the Preservation Program's Strategic Plan in 2014. The plan identifies numerous priority actions to be completed by the Preservation Program. Given continuing growth and development pressure in the region over the next decade, prioritize actions that would assist you in achieving your preservation goals:

	Score*	Overall Rank
Offer regular trainings on environmental review for county agency and contract city staff	0	1
Strengthen incentives for preservation	0	2

Total Respondents 0

	Score	Overall Rank
Offer regular trainings and/or workshops on landmarking and incentives for contract city staff, landmark commissioners, and property owners	0	3
Collaborate more closely with county agency and contract city staff on environmental reviews	0	4
Undertake survey and inventory projects to complete the county's historic resources inventory	0	5
Develop an on-line database for cultural resources in King County that is accessible to the public	0	6
Digitize paper reports and data and make them available on our website	0	7
		Total Respondents 0

*Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.

18. Potential program priorities - Several of you participated in updating the Preservation Program's Strategic Plan in 2014. The plan identifies numerous priority actions to be completed by the Preservation Program. Given continuing growth and development pressure in the region over the next decade, prioritize the top 3 actions that would assist you in achieving your preservation goals: (where 1 is most important and 3 is least important)

	Score*	Overall Rank
Strengthen incentives for preservation	94	1
Undertake survey and inventory projects to complete the county's historic resources inventory	80	2
Develop an on-line database for cultural resources in King County that is accessible to the public	76	3
Digitize paper reports and data and make them available on our website	48	4
Collaborate more closely with county agency and contract city staff on environmental reviews	46	5
Offer regular trainings and/or workshops on landmarking and incentives for contract city staff, landmark commissioners, and property owners	44	6
Offer regular trainings on environmental review for county agency and contract city staff	26	7
		Total Respondents 74

*Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.


19. What additional priorities should we consider?

Count	Response
1	Agency access to KC's sensitivity model and associated training
1	Connecting Kids with Collections
1	Expand grant opportunities for historic resources (bricks and mortar)
1	Expediting County project reviews
1	Helping with grants!!!!!!!
1	Historic District planning/training
1	Increasing staff to reduce review time

Count Response

1	Increasing your grant opportunities
1	Predictive models and context statements for archaeological resources
1	Preserve Masonic Halls
1	Reach out to the public
1	Training County employees on cultural resource protection protocols
1	promptness of service
1	review all County projects for cultural resouces potential; currently not being done or done poorly
1	City of Seattle oversight concerning archaeological properties and some additional review/commentary; especially about historical arcaheology
1	RAther than developing your own database, why don't you put a layer of KC properties on the WISAARD? Otherwise, it would see you would be reinventing a lot of programming, and its expensive. Also, finishing the predictive model(s) and getting them online would be nice.

20. How would you describe yourself? (mark boxes that best apply):



Value	Percent	Count	Statistics
Resident/general public	11.7%	9	Total Responses 77
Preservation professional (historian, preservation specialist, etc.)	28.6%	22	
Archaeologist	18.2%	14	
Architect, building contractor	9.1%	7	
County agency staff	15.6%	12	
Interlocal City or agency staff	7.8%	6	
Total		77	

Value	Percent	Count
State, federal or other agency staff	20.8%	16
Student, teacher	1.3%	1
Heritage organization member	10.4%	8
Other - Write In	6.5%	5
Landmark owner or steward	19.5%	15
Landmark commission member	10.4%	8
Total		77

Responses "Other - Write In"	Count
Left Blank	73
Developer of Historic Properties	1
Tribal	1
agitator	1
concerned citizen	1
IMember oof Kent Historical Society	1

URL Variable: action

Count	Response
-------	----------

URL Variable: controller

Count	Response
-------	----------

URL Variable: id

Count	Response
-------	----------

URL Variable: link_id

Count	Response
-------	----------

URL Variable: module

Count	Response
-------	----------