Michigan State Historic Preservation Office
Certified Local Government Program
CLG 4-Year Evaluation Report

DATE OF CLG VISIT	
DATE OF HDC MEETING	
DATE EVALUATION PREPARED	

CLG BACKGROUND INFORMATION

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT	DATE CERTIFIED BY NPS
NAME OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION	DATE OF LAST EVALUATION
CLG CONTACT PERSON	TITLE
MAILING ADDRESS	
EMAIL	TELEPHONE

REQUIREMENT 1. HISTORIC DISTRICT ORDINANCE				MEETS MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS YES ☐ NO ☐
Y	N	N/A	REVIEW CRITERIA	COMMENTS
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG maintain and enforce its local historic district ordinance for the entire period?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG provide copies of new and/or revised ordinances, regulations, design guidelines, and other such documents to SHPO for review and comment before they were implemented?	
☐	☐	☐	Are all ordinances, regulations, guidelines, and other such standards used by the CLG consistent with the requirements of PA 169 and the federal CLG program?	
☐	☐	☐	Were all local historic districts established, modified, or eliminated during the period done so in accordance with the ordinance and PA 169?	

SUMMARY

REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS

REQUIREMENT 2. HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION				MEETS MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS YES ☐ NO ☐
Y	N	N/A	REVIEW CRITERIA	COMMENTS
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG provide consistent staff support for the HDC?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG maintain a fully appointed HDC?	
☐	☐	☐	Were HDC vacancies filled within 60 days?	
☐	☐	☐	Were resumes for newly appointed members forwarded to SHPO with the CLG's annual reports?	
☐	☐	☐	Are 36 CFR 61 qualified professionals represented on the HDC or did the CLG make a good faith effort to recruit such members?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the HDC obtain outside expertise when necessary if professionals were not represented in the membership?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the HDC consistently meet at regular intervals, at least four (4) times annually?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the HDC operate in accordance with its bylaws/rules of procedure and are such documents on file with SHPO?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG provide new HDC members with a copy of PA 169, the CLG's local ordinance, the Standards, and other applicable materials?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the HDC consistently make appropriate design decisions based on the Standards?	
☐	☐	☐	Did at least one (1) HDC member or the staff liaison attend at least (1) training event each year?	

SUMMARY

REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS

REQUIREMENT 3. SURVEY AND INVENTORY				MEETS MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS YES ☐ NO ☐
Y	N	N/A	REVIEW CRITERIA	COMMENTS
☐	☐	☐	Has the CLG continued its efforts to identify important historic resources in the community?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG proactively coordinate architectural surveys, if undertaken, with SHPO?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG proactively coordinate archaeological investigations, if undertaken, with SHPO?	
☐	☐	☐	Did surveys, if undertaken, follow SHPO requirements or an approved alternative?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG maintain its inventory of locally designated and National Register properties in a publicly accessible location?	
☐	☐	☐	Were copies of new survey reports, Study Committee reports, and survey data sent to SHPO upon their completion or with the CLG's annual reports?	

SUMMARY

REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS

REQUIREMENT 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION				MEETS MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS YES ☐ NO ☐
Y	N	N/A	REVIEW CRITERIA	COMMENTS
☐	☐	☐	Were all HDC meetings properly noticed and compliant with the Open Meetings Act?	
☐	☐	☐	Were all HDC meeting agendas and minutes made available for access by the public?	
☐	☐	☐	Were related documents (e.g., local district maps, design guidelines, COA forms/instructions) made available for access by the public?	
☐	☐	☐	Were HDC decisions appropriately documented in minutes with the criteria and reasons for issuing a COA, NTP, or Denial?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG comment on National Register nominations within the timeline required by SHPO?	
☐	☐	☐	Did the CLG provide reasonable opportunity for public comment on National Register nominations at a publicly advertised HDC meeting?	

SUMMARY

REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS

REQUIREMENT 5. SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE				MEETS MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS YES ☐ NO ☐
Y	N	N/A	REVIEW CRITERIA	COMMENTS
☐	☐	☐	Has the CLG made meaningful progress toward its preservation goals over time?	
☐	☐	☐	Has the CLG continued to establish ongoing, achievable goals for its program?	
☐	☐	☐	Has the CLG submitted complete annual reports in a timely manner?	
☐	☐	☐	Has the CLG administered CLG subgrants in accordance with established procedures?	

SUMMARY

REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS

BEYOND MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS				
Y	N	N/A		COMMENTS
☐	☐	☐	Does the CLG have a formal survey plan?	
☐	☐	☐	Does the CLG have a community-wide preservation plan or is there a substantial preservation element included in the community's master plan?	
☐	☐	☐	Does the CLG have a formal communication channel/system with the building department (or other department, as appropriate) to notify the HDC of a permit request in a local historic district?	
☐	☐	☐	Does the HDC have an application for COA reviews?	
☐	☐	☐	Has the HDC authorized staff to provide administrative approval for minor projects?	
☐	☐	☐	Does the CLG/HDC regularly engage in community outreach and education?	
☐	☐	☐	Does the CLG/HDC regularly partner with other community organizations (DDA, Main Street, etc.)?	

EVALUATION SUMMARY