



COSTEP MA

Coordinated Statewide
Emergency Preparedness

YOUR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PARTNER FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES

**MITIGATION FOR MEMORY:
SAFEGUARDING MASSACHUSETTS' CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**FINAL REPORT
FEMA HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM PROJECT**

prepared by

Andrew Grilz
Project Coordinator
& COSTEP MA Board representative,
New England Museum Association, et al.
Submitted December 2014

Table of Contents

1) Project Overview	Page 3
2) Community Meetings and Tool Kit	Page 5
2.1) Community Meeting Tool Kit	Page 6
2.2) Towns and Meeting Sites	Page 7
2.3) Changes to the Initial Proposal	Page 8
2.4) Conclusions	Page 9
3) Training Sessions	Page 10
3.1) Changes to the Initial Proposal	Page 11
3.2) Conclusions	Page 11
4) Regional Planning Agencies (RPA) Meetings	Page 14
4.1) Changes to the Initial Proposal	Page 15
4.2) Conclusions	Page 16
5) The <i>Mitigation for Memory</i> Framework	Page 17
5.1) Changes to the Initial Proposal	Page 17
5.2) Conclusions	Page 17
6) Statistics and Metrics	Page 19
7) Financials	Page 21
8) Conclusions	Page 23
9) Index to Supporting Documents	Page 24

1) Project Overview

The Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC) was awarded a federal Institute of Museum and Library Services grant in 2007 to develop a framework for creating a statewide emergency preparedness program for cultural organizations. Within the time frame of that grant (and continuing after the grant term expired), the operational structure of COSTEP was determined, a model for engaging communities in emergency preparedness for cultural resources was developed, and pilot outreach activities were undertaken in the communities of Lexington, Lancaster, and Salem, Massachusetts.

COSTEP MA (Coordinated Statewide Emergency Preparedness in Massachusetts), as the pilot project, was created to build and foster a statewide emergency planning process that serves the cultural and emergency management communities and addresses disaster prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation. The goal of COSTEP MA is to ensure that Massachusetts cultural resource organizations – such as museums, libraries, archives, historical societies, and municipal records offices – are prepared for and able to respond to any emergency or disaster. Cultural stewards at these organizations will work with each other and their local emergency managers to ensure the preservation of, and access to, their collections, thereby strengthening the resilience of their municipalities. In 2011, COSTEP MA was awarded funding through the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program for a project named “Mitigation for Memory: Safeguarding Massachusetts’ Cultural Heritage.”

The primary goals of the project were to:

- 1) Complete at least 14 community meetings, hosting no less than three meetings in each of the four MEMA regions across Massachusetts.
- 2) Complete at least 6 meetings with various regional planning agencies in Massachusetts, with at least one meeting in each of the four MEMA regions.
- 3) Host a series of four mitigation training sessions, one in each MEMA region.
- 4) Develop a meeting “tool kit” for the community meetings, comprising publications, promotional materials, and an informational video.
- 5) Develop a framework that provides other interested parties with the basic tools used and strategies learned in conducting the COSTEP MA *Mitigation for Memory* project across Massachusetts.

Begun in 2008, COSTEP MA is a collaboration of more than 43 organizations, including the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC), the New England Museum Association (NEMA), the Massachusetts Archives, the Massachusetts Historical Society, the National Park Service, the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (MEMA), the Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC), and many others. (A complete list of participants can be found on the COSTEP MA website, <http://www.mass.gov/mblc/costepma/about-costep-ma/costep-ma-partners.html>).

With the receipt of HMGP funding, a more aggressive outreach program was enacted than was previously possible, which now included hosting training sessions and expanding the outreach meetings to regional planning agency offices, as well as hosting an additional 14 more community meetings, distributed across the Commonwealth. New tools were developed, including an introductory video, information brochures, and an emergency response wallet card. This card lists the basic steps any

institution should undertake in the face of a disaster and contact information for emergency managers and disaster recovery specialists if the incident exceeds the capacity of the institution or community to handle it on their own.

Response to this program has been overwhelmingly positive, with many cultural stewards remarking on the need for such assistance and emergency managers commenting on the lack of prior knowledge about the needs and priorities of the cultural community. With the development of these tools and an aggressive outreach program of organizational and informational meetings and mitigation training sessions, COSTEP MA has firmly established itself within both the emergency management and cultural communities in Massachusetts and is well positioned not just to sustain but to expand its reach to communities and towns not yet approached.

The HMGP grant also provided funding to develop a universal framework for this innovative approach to mitigation training, which can be translated into any regional, organizational, or community structure. The network of communication and collaboration established by the community meetings and the Regional Planning Agency (RPA) meetings has found traction, and representatives across the Commonwealth have stepped forward to sustain the COSTEP MA process and help it develop in new municipalities. First-contact meetings are planned for several more towns, and follow-up meetings are already planned for 2015 to establish the program firmly in other towns.

This report will detail the specifics of how each of the goals set forth was achieved, what modifications were made to the project over time, and summarize the evaluations and conclusions reached in the implementation of the program.

2) Community Meetings and Tool Kit

The backbone of this project's outreach efforts has been the community meeting. Piloted in Lexington, Lancaster, and Salem before the HMGP grant was awarded, the model to be followed was already established. In each town or city approached, a list of key players to be invited to the initial meeting was drawn up. Some of these participants were considered critical to the success of the introductory meeting and were contacted by phone, email, and through intermediaries who could exert influence and verify the credentials of COSTEP MA. (These key individuals are marked with an asterisk below.) While the community meetings can and have been successful without the presence of these individuals, active participation and the continuation of the COSTEP MA program in the town is much more likely when these offices are engaged from the outset.

The principal contact list for any town typically included:

- Emergency Management Director (EMD)*

- Library Director*

- Curator or Director of the local historical society

- Town Clerk's office*

- Town Parks and Recreation office

- Town Cemetery office

- Town Chamber of Commerce

- Town Historical Commission

- Local fire and police (if not already represented by the EMD office)

- Representatives from any other museums or historic properties in the town

- Representatives from any college or private library

- Representatives from any college or private archives

- Representatives from the local churches, synagogues, or houses of worship

(Note: While the effort to be inclusive was paramount, the objective of this contact with houses of worship was to make sure historic records, such as those for births, baptisms, weddings, death, or other rites of passage, were protected and preserved. As such, houses of worship that were simply "prayer halls" and did not conduct such services for their congregation nor maintain records of such were welcome to attend but not specifically pursued for inclusion.)

Other institutions suggested by pre-meeting contacts included community theaters, medical archives, fraternal organizations, and other outliers who would benefit from participation in the community meeting.

Invitee information was acquired through personal connections and extensive Internet searching. Several towns were approached specifically because of strong connections within the COSTEP MA organizational structure, providing likely receptive contacts. The MEMA website provided a list of EMDs and their contact information (although this information was occasionally out of date), while the town website would commonly provide contact information for all the municipal offices that were to be contacted. When the MEMA list proved unreliable, the local EMD would often be found in the same manner, and sometimes vice versa. When searching out the private nonprofit cultural institutions in the community, identification of these organizations was much more challenging. Occasionally, a town

would list local sites of interest to visitors on the town website. This would be an ideal method to identify local museums and historic sites. Wikipedia often provided a list of local places of interest on the page dedicated to the town. The local chamber of commerce or tourist board (if the town was large enough to have one) also provided information.

Houses of worship were the most difficult group to contact. While many houses of worship do have well-thought-out websites with obvious contact information, many more have little to no Internet presence and/or have a business office that is open for only a few hours a week, often managed by volunteers. Google searches of houses of worship do provide some information and can be used to generate a list, though often incomplete, of the institutions that should be approached. Some groups, such as the Quakers, while having a presence in almost every major town in Massachusetts, have no centralized authority and as such are incredibly difficult to reach without knowing a member of the congregation. An interfaith council often served as an exceptional means of reaching the entire community.

2.1) Community Meeting Tool Kit

The HMGP grant provided the resources to develop and print a variety of documents and other collateral materials that helped provide basic information about the program and helped promote the process before, during, and after the community meetings.

The most prominent of these tools was a 7½ minute video created to detail the efforts and intentions of COSTEP MA. This video documents both a large-scale incident and a small institutional-level incident where COSTEP MA or its precepts were appropriately involved: specifically, the 2011 tornado that devastated Monson, MA, and a fire in a single historical property in Salem, MA, owned by the Peabody Essex Museum. COSTEP MA did serve as a point of contact, support, and response following the Monson tornado. The video serves as a simple yet powerful summary of what COSTEP MA can accomplish, how it fits into the existing emergency management structure, and how and why a community can become participants in the project. The video is available on the Internet through YouTube (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0R5p_yT801I&feature=youtu.be), through a link on the COSTEP MA homepage (<http://www.mass.gov/mblc/costepma/>), and is shown at the beginning of every community and RPA meeting.

In addition to the video, informational brochures were created and printed for distribution at both meetings and any other appropriate venue, such as conferences or other gatherings. The brochure provides the information that demonstrates to both cultural stewards and emergency managers the need for a program such as COSTEP MA and explains how to begin the process for those interested in bringing the program to their town. An emergency response wallet card was also produced. This accordion-fold document is essentially “COSTEP MA in your pocket,” with a list of action steps to follow in the event of an incident within an individual institution or within a community. The card also includes contact information for COSTEP MA representatives, emergency management personnel, and vendors to contact for assistance responding to an incident. The HMGP funding also permitted the creation of both a stand-alone table-top and a floor banner with the brochure image and key points about COSTEP MA. These banners were on display at all the community meetings and at other venues.

These documents were provided in folders to all community meeting attendees as well as to all participants in the Regional Planning Committee meetings. These folders also included a handout on how to continue the conversation begun by the introductory meeting, a copy of the command and

control flowchart demonstrating how COSTEP MA fits into the existing emergency management structure, and another handout from NEDCC highlighting its 24-hour help line, which now serves as the 24-hour contact point for COSTEP MA as well.

In addition to wallet cards and brochures, Cultural Resources Inventory Forms were also made available at the community meetings. (These documents are also available on the COSTEP MA website at <http://www.mass.gov/mblc/costepma/forms-and-documents.html>). Two versions of this document exist – one for municipal offices, one for private nonprofit institutions. The purpose of these documents is to provide emergency managers with a description of a cultural institution, its highest-priority objects in a crisis, and what resources it has in-house to respond to a crisis and to offer to the community in the event of a large disaster. (These forms appear in the Supporting Documents section of this report.)

2.2) Towns and Meeting Sites

The following list, in alphabetical order, includes those who were contacted to arrange the meetings.

- 1) Amherst (MEMA Region 4)
Date: October 29, 2014 (held concurrently with South Hadley)
Site: Eric Carle Museum
- 2) Arlington (MEMA Region 1)
Date: October 28, 2014
Site: First Parish Universalist Unitarian Church
- 3) Blackstone (MEMA Region 3)
Date: October 22, 2014
Site: Blackstone Town Selectmen meeting room
- 4) Bourne (MEMA Region 2)
Date: October 7, 2014 (held concurrently with Sandwich)
Site: Sandwich Emergency Management Office
- 5) Charlton, (MEMA Region 4)
Date: December 16, 2014
Site: Charlton Public Library
- 6) Fitchburg (MEMA Region 4)
Date: November 18, 2014
Site: Fitchburg Library
- 7) Framingham (MEMA Region 1)
Date: February 5, 2014
Site: Framingham Public Library
- 8) Harwich (MEMA Region 2)
Date: January 30, 2014
Site: Harwich Library

- 9) Haverhill (MEMA Region 1)
Date: June 20, 2013
Site: Haverhill Library
- 10) Natick (MEMA Region 1)
Date: Feb 12 & May 5, 2014
Site: Natick Public Library, Natick Police Emergency Management Command Center
- 11) New Bedford (MEMA Region 2)
Date: November 5, 2014
Site: New Bedford Whaling Museum
- 12) Northampton (MEMA Regions 3)
Date: March 7, 2014
Site: Northampton Public Library
- 13) Sandwich (MEMA Region 2)
Date: October 7, 2014 (held concurrently with Bourne)
Site: Sandwich Emergency Management Office
- 14) South Hadley (MEMA Region 3)
Date: October 29, 2014 (held concurrently with Amherst)
Site: South Hadley Public Library

(The complete invitation lists for all 14 meetings can be found in the Supporting Documents section of this report.)

2.3) Changes to the Initial Proposal

Several amendments were made to the community meeting model as the project developed. Most of these were recognized early in the process, and consequently the majority of the meetings benefited from these changes. The most time-consuming aspect of these revisions was the inclusion of houses of worship to the invitations. Not undertaken in the pilot towns, this increased the number of contacts in each town; often doubling the number it would have been otherwise. As mentioned previously, adding houses of worship was also complicated by the absence of an Internet presence for many congregations.

As the project progressed, the need for regularly scheduled follow-up meetings also became evident. Most meetings would successfully gather about 1 in 4 invitees at best. There was sometimes an advantage to COSTEP MA returning more than once, if only to make the inaugural presentation twice to two different audiences. (This happened in Haverhill, where almost no one from the first meeting attended the second meeting. We reached about two-thirds of our invite list with the two meetings.) Follow-up meetings helped establish the Cultural Triage Officer (CTO) more firmly in the local EMD's command and control structure. They also served to reinforce COSTEP MA's efforts and agenda and further helped to secure buy-in from the range of participants.

While the idea of a Cultural Triage Officer was envisioned prior to the receipt of the HMGP grant, the one established CTO (Julie Arrison of Historic New England, serves as the CTO for Salem) can be regarded as more of a pilot program as well. As the project developed, the advantage of having a person

from within the local community acting as the “ambassador” for COSTEP MA became evident. Ms. Arrison has helped establish the expectations and responsibilities of a CTO for all who have come after her. Following the pattern proposed and set forth by Ms. Arrison, a CTO typically hosts two gatherings a year within their community. One will feature a guest speaker who can present content relevant to disaster preparedness or hazard mitigation. The second meeting will involve some sort of activity or tabletop exercise to improve preparedness or response skills among the staff of the local cultural institutions. Of the eighteen towns approached before or during this grant period, there are currently seven active CTOs encompassing nine towns; three more prospective CTOs (in four towns) will be added to the roster in the coming year. While other towns have followed this model and hosted meetings of their own, Salem is thus far the only COSTEP MA community that has established its own Internet presence via Facebook.

2.4) Conclusions

While the community meetings are the most labor-intensive method employed to reach the target audience for COSTEP MA, the value of a “from-the-bottom-up” approach cannot be overemphasized. It does require knowledge of the day-to-day needs, resources, and inherent risks involved in the care and curation of critical documents, artifacts, and other touchstone items by cultural stewards. It is also critical to gain the recognition and cooperation of the emergency managers within a community to accomplish the essential line of communication. All too often, the introduction of COSTEP MA was greeted with less than enthusiasm, sometimes even with suspicion. The offer of a free program meant to improve the resiliency and lessen the hazards within a community was not always believed, and many times initial contacts were misconstrued as sales calls. Often a lack of understanding regarding the goals of the project hampered initial contacts; more than once, COSTEP MA was mistakenly considered an initiative to help digitize permanent records. As time progressed and word spread of the program, these misidentifications became less common.

Once the presentation had been made and the audience introduced to the advantages of participating in COSTEP MA, a core of support was found in every town. Cultural Triage Officers have been established in seven of the eighteen towns approached by COSTEP MA prior to and during the term of the grant, with three volunteers self-identifying for four other towns in recent weeks. Persuading individuals to attend the organizational meetings in the first place, however, has been and will continue to be the biggest hurdle to establishing COSTEP MA communities. As the project continues to grow and add adherents, the reticence to participate can be expected to diminish.

3) Training Sessions

Training sessions, unlike the community meetings or the RPA meetings, were open to all, not just by invitation. This required a different modality to reach the audience desired. While the intended audience was the same as the community meetings, the sessions were limited to only four dates, one session held in each of the four MEMA regions. This meant a much broader reach with a much smaller intended population and a need to publicize in a way that had not been done before.

Promotion of the training sessions largely depended upon the established peer and professional connections of the COSTEP MA executive and steering committee. Both the MBLC and NEMA made an extensive list of members available. MEMA's list of emergency managers and responders was also included in the notifications for the meetings. Announcements were sent out through the various distribution emails available through all these groups, in addition to posting notices on the NEMA website, the COSTEP MA website, and the COSTEP MA and COSTEP Salem Facebook page.

While the attendance was open ended, there was a need to limit the size of the audience so as not to overwhelm the instructor. At his request, attendance was limited to 40 people per session. To secure this, registration was required for the first time for a COSTEP MA activity. The free online registration service Eventbrite was employed to capture and monitor registration. (Eventbrite also served as another form of social media through which to advertise the training sessions.) The four sessions were all advertised at the same time, beginning in March, approximately a month before the first session. Registration for all sessions was split between emergency management personnel and cultural resource representatives, with the ratio being about 1 emergency management staff to on average 8 cultural resources representatives (with the exception of Northampton, where the ration was closer to 1 to 5).

The four sites selected for the training sessions were:

- The House of Seven Gables, Salem (April 15)
- The Harwich Community Center, Harwich (May 5)
- The Northampton Historical Society (June 12)
- Worcester Polytechnic Institute Library & Archives (June 25)

The variety of sites was deliberate and was a strong representation of the type of institutions COSTEP MA seeks to serve. The only missing institution type was churches, and it is hoped that churches will be addressed in a future round of training. The selected sites also fulfilled the requirement that one training session be held in each of the four regions into which MEMA divides Massachusetts for administrative purposes.

Each session involved a critical evaluation of the host institution (or in the case of Harwich, a historic property owned by the host). In several instances, the scrutiny became an issue of anxiety for some members of the host institution's staff, as failings and faults were being actively searched for. It became necessary to calm and placate them that they were not being criticized for their diligence, or perceived lack thereof. In fact, the exact opposite was closer to the truth. The most reassuring comment made was that only institutions that could withstand such close examination would be considered for this level of scrutiny.

Each session generated engaging and lively conversations on various subjects. Salem, for instance, focused heavily on the issue of access for emergency personnel. The issue of “acceptable risk” regarding a historic tree in the garden that potentially threatened one of the historic buildings on the campus was a catalyst for vigorous debate, while the training in Northampton gravitated more toward issues of security for both visitors and collections.

(It should also be noted that these sessions, probably the most successful activities conducted by COSTEP MA to date, were the only ones where a free lunch was included. The value of morning coffee and a deli platter cannot be underestimated.)

3.1) Changes to the Initial Proposal

Of all the aspects of the proposal as originally submitted, the training session changed the least from its conception, perhaps largely due to the fact that there was no precedent in the COSTEP MA model for these trainings beyond similar activities conducted by COSTEP MA partners.

The training sessions were the only aspect of the program that involved surveying of the attendees, and the responses were almost universally positive, with the only criticism being a desire for more information or more material that could be taken away after the session. Others suggested that future sessions offer either a more remedial or conversely, a more advanced, program than the session they attended. These comments will be taken into consideration as the next set of training sessions are developed and will be incorporated to the best ability COSTEP MA can achieve given the resources at hand.

3.2) Conclusions

Many participants expressed a sudden awareness of potential threats that they had never considered before and were grateful for the disaster resources available of which they were previously unaware.

A follow-up survey was sent to 100 participants 8–16 weeks after the training sessions (allowing for time to evaluate and review the lessons learned at the sessions, then implement changes to policy accordingly). Response was relevant and consistent, albeit small statistically. Of the 17 respondents, there were two principal responses – they either fully embraced the training and were proceeding with the new knowledge to conduct self-evaluations (some participants went as far as to contact the trainer to conduct site evaluations), while others had been waylaid by lack of funding or reticence to engage on the part of upper management.

The following is a sampling of comments from both surveys:

From on site, end-of-training-session surveys:

“We had identified the need to take on emergency planning but did not have the tools to begin. This provided tremendous resources and context for the process.”

“Very helpful to have additional viewpoints and to meet with other cultural institutions to discuss regional response capacity.”

“Content was excellent.”

“[The training session] moves us to look at risks, assessments, mitigation and disaster planning from various points of view.”

“The stories of different disasters and how they were dealt with was insightful.”

“The real examples are always the most instructive. [Trainer]Arthur has several which really enhanced the content.”

“All institutions need to make this a priority. The speaker clearly indicated what has to be done. We should all do it and work with each other to share best practices.”

*“I think this should program should be required for **all** institutions.”*

“I would like to attend a more advanced workshop, as I/we are already using 95% of the suggested policies/practices.”

“[The training was] highly valuable!”

From follow-up online surveys:

1) What have you enacted based upon the training?

“Our organization embraced what we learned and offered training to a local facility that met this need. This organization is usually slow to respond but we will continue to badger.”

“We will have practice sessions with the local police and fire departments. Our current plan was reviewed by and approved by Mr. Dutil.”

“We have improved our EOP.”

“Yes, we hope to get a disaster plan and training modules started with the organization this fall.”

3) What was the most valuable information provided?

“Contact information.”

“All of the information was helpful, giving me an understanding of what cultural institutions have to consider when planning for the protection of their institutions.”

“Awareness of staying consistent and up on all necessary changes and challenges.”

“Learned many new potential disasters that I hadn't even thought about it. More planning to do!”

8) What was the most important thing learned in the training?

“There are many hazards out there just waiting to happen!!”

“Buy-in of upper level admins = key”

“Working with your local Emergency Management Agency.”

“It’s easy to push emergency preparedness to the bottom of the To-Do List, but the COSTEP [MA] session reminded me that it’s important to tackle at least a little bit at a time.”

“Just the reminder of how much could go wrong was a frightening eye-opener, but the session and the other material at least offered some specific advice to help counter some of the effects of the disasters.”

(Note: Questions 2 and 4 through 7 were either statistical gathering questions or simple yes/no inquiries that did not provide opinions and are, therefore, not included here.)

4) Regional Planning Agencies Meetings

The format of the meetings with the RPAs (Regional Planning Agencies or sometimes RPCs, Regional Planning Committees) is the objective that has changed the most since the inception of the project. Developed in cooperation with MEMA, the meetings with the RPAs were originally conceived to be full-day workshops, with participants from across each of the four MEMA regions. However, this model proved unworkable. The typical RPA meeting model was something much more akin to a town meeting, with the various town representatives gathered for at best an hour or two to discuss a wide range of subjects relevant to the region, be it economic, political, education, flood plain revision, or even medical issues (such as, in one memorable meeting, Ebola containment protocols for first responders). Consequently, COSTEP MA could be and often was added to a docket of other speakers and given a very short amount of time to present its case. This required a revision of strategies.

The RPA meetings were retooled to resemble the community meeting model more closely. As with the community meetings, the terms of the FEMA grant required one meeting in each of the four MEMA regions. The community meeting format was adapted to the presentation – the video would serve as the opening event, followed by a PowerPoint presentation laying out the merits and advantages of participation in the COSTEP MA program. The PowerPoint presentation was modified from the one shown at the community meetings to more strongly emphasize the financial advantage of a well-prepared and resilient community in the face of potential disaster. The idea was emphasized that cultural resources are critical to the longevity of a community and represent the collective memories and shared experiences of a community – two critical yet non-material resources that are often affected by disaster. Loss of cultural resources makes it that much more difficult for a community to recover emotionally from an incident and much more likely that a town will never truly recover if these needs are not quickly and correctly addressed.

RPAs targeted for attention were chosen to reflect the greatest possible geographic distribution possible. (It should be noted that the Northwestern quadrant of Massachusetts requires more direct contact.)

Meetings were held with the following groups:

Merrimack Valley Regional Planning Authority, March 2013. (Arranged and attended by Lori Foley) The 30-minute PowerPoint presentation dealt specifically with the economic value of cultural resources in the Merrimack Valley and the impact the loss of these resources can have on the region. Also emphasized was the need to address the lack of formal disaster plans by cultural institutions within the community. (A copy of this presentation, the template for all the following RPA meetings, can be found in the Supporting Documents to this report.)

The Metro West Regional Collaborative (Sub-regional division of the Metropolitan Area Planning Authority), June 2013. We initially approached Martin Pillsbury at the MAPC for assistance in developing relationships with the sub-regions outside Boston. Mr. Pillsbury suggested which sub-regions to approach – the MWRC was considered a receptive crowd and also a very independent-minded committee (“gone rogue” was the exact phrase used but with humor). Unfortunately, the committee was undergoing a leadership change at the time, and scheduling became a bit muddled. We did eventually present to the committee, which invited several local leaders from the various cultural

commissions and other similar committees within their jurisdiction to attend. The other speaker for the meeting covered the subject of the expansion of the flood plain map in Massachusetts – we could not have asked for a better segue. From this meeting, we were asked to approach the towns of Natick and Framingham for further discussion to establish the COSTEP MA model in these communities.

The Central Regional Mass Planning Authority, May 2014. The staff of the CRMP constituted the only participants in this meeting, but they were an active and interested group. They in turn sent a representative to the training held at WPI a few weeks later. The CRMP is very interesting in participating and suggested we “piggyback” our community meeting schedule onto their towns and cities that are about to begin a review of their emergency response plans. The meeting planned for Fitchburg conveniently coincided with their review. CRMP has also offered meeting space and assistance with trainings or other events should we require it.

The Cape Cod Commission, June 2014. This meeting was held specifically to hear about COSTEP MA and how it intersects with the already well organized emergency response network on the Cape. Participants were largely Cape Cod Commission staff, the Barnstable County REPC, and some representatives from the Cape Libraries Automated Materials Sharing (CLAMS). We have had great success and been well received by several towns and EMDs across the Cape. Sandwich, Harwich, and Bourne are all well aware of the COSTEP MA model, and we have active CTOs to cover Harwich and Sandwich (and probably Bourne). Not much new ground was covered in this meeting, but the reception was welcome and made it evident that COSTEP MA is being taken seriously across the area.

The Pioneer Valley Regional Planning Authority, October 2014. While COSTEP MA was wedged into a very full agenda for a very well-attended meeting, the message was well received and several representatives of both institutions and towns were interested in follow-up conversations about bringing the COSTEP MA model to their community. The length of the meeting and the contents of the conversations that followed the COSTEP MA presentation may have taken the spotlight off COSTEP MA, but it was a successful meeting, and we would be welcomed back anytime.

Southern Berkshire Regional Emergency Planning Commission (Subcommittee of the Berkshire RPA), October 2014. Unfortunately, COSTEP MA was very much upstaged in this meeting. We were the first presentation, which was held at 7:30 in the morning. The Subcommittee met at the local hospital in Greater Barrington, and as such, the meeting was largely attended by medical personnel and EMS staff. The conversation very much favored the medical community. Following the COSTEP MA presentation, there was a discussion about how emergency responders would handle any reports of Ebola in an emergency call, how to deal with decontamination of ambulance and hospital staff in the event of a suspected case, public relations, etc. We were very much overshadowed by the much more topical and relevant issue.

4.1) Changes to the Initial Proposal

The initial proposal envisioned the RPA meetings as full day events. It became clear after initial contact with the RPAs themselves that this was not a workable model. The RPA groups follow diverse and discreet organizational models that vary from region to region, making a uniform approach impossible. Instead, each group was approached following their own organizational and meeting model, which typically translated into a presentation to a board or committee, sometimes as one presentation among many. In most instances, this worked to our favor: the presentations to the MWRPA and Pioneer Valley RPA elicited requests to repeat the presentation for either a specific community within the RPAs

jurisdiction, or for a group in the region. Other presentations, such as for the Cape Cod Commission or the CRM RPA were smaller meetings where COSTEP MA was the only topic for discussion. In both of these instances, continuing support for the program was secured from the RPA, and vital contact information and endorsement was secured from the groups as well. Ultimately, the opportunity to present the value of the program and gain support from the RPA is more valuable and will serve to advance the program further than any sort of all-day activity might have accomplished.

4.2) Conclusions

The biggest difference between the community meetings and the RPA meetings is that the RPAs, while covering a larger area and constituency, serve better as partners to reach into the communities they represent and provide COSTEP MA with both informational and practical support as the program continues its outreach efforts. For example, the CRM RPA has not only volunteered space to conduct meetings and trainings in the future but has also suggested partnerships with COSTEP MA for future training opportunities. In addition, they have provided us information as to which towns within their constituency are in the process of revising the emergency management plans, and would consequently be most receptive to the inclusion of a new initiative such as COSTEP MA.

5) The Mitigation for Memory Framework

The *Mitigation for Memory* Framework, written by preservation consultant Beth Patkus, is the culmination of the knowledge gained through the active engagement perpetuated in the community meetings, the RPA meetings, and the training sessions. It is intended to serve as a template for other communities across the United States that wish to emulate the COSTEP MA model for their own cultural resources. The Framework serves as a guide with open parameters to accomplish the same goals; it was determined early on in its development that several aspects of the COSTEP MA model enacted in Massachusetts are endemic to the political and even geographical specifics of the Commonwealth. For instance, given the immediate proximity to other towns, cities, and even other states that most communities in Massachusetts enjoy, the collaborative effort endorsed by the program may in fact encompass more than one town at a time, as we experienced in Sandwich and Bourne, as well as South Hadley and Amherst. The town-centric structure of local government in Massachusetts may not be found widely in other parts of the country, where a stronger county government may be the more appropriate place from which a COSTEP MA initiative should begin. To accommodate this, the language and direction of the Framework has been specifically edited to avoid making it regionally exclusive.

The Framework is the one aspect of the project that has not had, and could not have, a field test. However, the model it promotes has already been adopted and adapted by several New England states as the template for their own COSTEP network. During the development and execution of the project and the goals set under the HMGP grant, several documents, practices, and policies have been duplicated and modified to suit the needs of the other states, with our encouragement. This reinterpretation of our practices and procedures allowed us to better refine our own project. It also demonstrated that for the program to be universally acceptable, it would have to be made highly adaptable to different situational requirements.

Beyond making certain the Framework is configured to make it universally adaptable, it also emphasizes the need to incorporate the COSTEP MA model beyond the persons who undertake the introduction of the program and encourages incorporation and adaptation of the program through the auspices of an office or a position within an organization or department. If the roles and responsibilities of perpetuating COSTEP MA can be made to carry on beyond the individual and remain part of a job position, it can be sustained much more effectively.

A copy of the Framework appears in the Supporting Documents section of this report.

5.1) Changes to the Initial Proposal

As the Framework is largely the culmination of the knowledge acquired through the execution of the other aspects of the project, there have been no significant changes to this aspect of the project.

5.2) Conclusions

The COSTEP MA and Alliance for Response models have already been adapted and enacted by multiple entities, with analogous organizations now in existence in Utah, Colorado, and every New England state.

Many of these initiatives took root long before the development of this HMGP-funded project. The Framework, specifically written to be adaptable to any other state's or region's situational needs should serve to carry the program even further. Note that the Alliance for Response, a program sponsored and supported by Heritage Preservation, emphasizes bringing the cultural community and emergency managers together to open communication avenues to work together in a disaster. While COSTEP MA emphasizes a statewide effort, Alliance for Response most often involves local communities, although some regional and statewide entities do exist.

6) Statistics and Metrics

Community meetings:

The 14 towns approached through the community meetings were a diverse and eclectic group of communities representing the diversity of culture and a wide range of levels of preparedness for a disaster of any scale. The following is meant to quantify the population represented by the people who attended the community meetings. However, events like conferences provided a potentially much larger, unquantifiable population that was reached. In fact, through the natural osmosis of information sharing through both the cultural community and the emergency management community, the reach of the program is almost certainly larger than can be quantified here.

Population reached through community meetings:

Town	MEMA Region	First meeting held on:	Town population*
Amherst	3	October 29, 2014	37,819
Arlington	1	October 28, 2014	42,844
Blackstone	4	October 22, 2014	9,026
Bourne	2	October 7, 2014	19,754
Charlton	4	December 16, 2014	12,981
Fitchburg	4	November 18, 2014	40,318
Framingham	1	February 5, 2014	68,318
Harwich	2	January 20, 2014	12,243
Haverhill	1	June 20, 2013	60,879
Natick	1	February 12, 2014	33,006
New Bedford	2	November 5, 2014	95,072
Northampton	3	March 7, 2014	28,592
Sandwich	2	October 7, 2014	20,675
South Hadley	3	October 29, 2014	17,514
		Total population	998,082

*2010 Census figures

Including the population represented by the Salem COSTEP subgroup, which was active prior to the receipt of the grant, COSTEP MA has contacted and made a contribution to the preparation for and mitigation of disasters and other potential hazards affecting the cultural resources held in trust by over a million people in Massachusetts.

Training sessions:

As the training session participants were not representative of any specific community, and several organizations sent multiple representatives, impact cannot be measured in the same fashion as the community meetings. Demand for the content offered can be evaluated by the attendance levels of each session.

Training site	Date	Number of attendees	Percentage of capacity
Salem	April 14, 2014	43/40	109%
Harwich	May 5, 2014	32/40	90%
Northampton	June 12, 2014	19/40	48%
Worcester	June 24, 2014	30/40	75%

This works out to an average of over 80% capacity per session. Two of the sessions, Salem and Worcester, exceeded the anticipated attendance, and Salem even exceeded intended capacity. It also should be noted that the site in Northampton was filled to capacity with the 20 people who participated – if the session had filled to the projected capacity, it would have been impossible to conduct it in space provided.

7) Financials

The HMGP grant award was for \$165,290 with a match of \$59,730. The in-kind match was met through matching salaries and participants' time. The in-kind matching rate for the participants was \$30/hour. In Massachusetts, based on Independent Sector's 2013 valuation of a volunteer hour (https://www.independentsector.org/volunteer_time), the rate for volunteer time is \$27/hour, and this was the base rate that was initially used. However, since nearly everyone involved in the grant project makes significantly more than that rate, it was decided to use a compromise rate of \$30/hour. All people who were involved in the grant and qualified for cost share submitted their time-tracking forms to the Project Coordinator, who tabulated them and submitted the total number of hours and associated costs as part of the quarterly reports. In addition to the specific cost share figures listed above (\$59,730), 1,913 hours of partners' time were submitted at \$30/ hour for an additional total of \$57,390. Our match was more than met.

The initial budget proposal divided the expenditures into six categories: Salaries, Consultants, Travel & Incidental Expenses, Supplies & Materials, Services, and Other. It turned out that it was far more efficient and applicable to group the expenditures into Consultant & Related Expenses and Office & Administrative Expenses. While this necessitated transferring funds from one original category to another because the activities designated in that category had been accomplished without expending all the funds, in the end it was more efficient dealing with the funds in these two categories. Part of the reason for this was also that, as noted earlier, the community meetings required significantly more time in planning and follow-up, necessitating much more of the project coordinator's time than originally budgeted. Moreover, the categories on the reporting form necessitated consolidating some of these categories to match the quarterly report form.

Consultant & Related Expenses (Salaries, Consultants, and Travel & Incidental Expenses):

This category comprised all components of the community meetings, the RPA meetings, the production of the *Protecting Our Cultural Heritage* video, the training sessions, and the consultant fee for the author of the *Mitigation for Memory* Framework. This category included the fees paid to the consultants, the project coordinator's salary, travel, and meeting refreshments when appropriate. The workshop instructor was paid \$8,000 for the preparation and delivery of the four *Risk Assessment and Mitigation Planning* workshops. The consultant who wrote the *Mitigation for Memory* Framework, and who parenthetically also wrote the initial COSTEP Framework, was paid \$12,000. The Framework author conducted a significant amount of research and worked closely with the project director, the project coordinator, and the workshop instructor to ensure that all essential components of the project were addressed appropriately. Discussions of successive Framework drafts resulted in a final product that approaches mitigation training both from the bottom up (at the community level) and from the top down (at the state or regional level). Both approaches are valid, and outlining two different methodologies provides more options for potential Framework users.

Office & Administrative Expenses (Supplies & Materials, Services, and Other):

This category was originally budgeted at \$22,390. As it turned out, some of these expenses came in lower than expected, were determined unneeded for the project (e.g., conference calls and postage), or

were actually grouped under Consultant & Related Expenses (e.g., the video) because they involved working with a consultant (e.g., a videographer). Among the items included in this category were the design and publication of the COSTEP MA brochure and emergency response wallet card, both a table-top and a free-standing COSTEP MA banner, business cards for key COSTEP MA personnel, general office supplies such as folders and other materials distributed at the meetings, and rental of the Harwich Community Center for one of the workshops. As a consequence, this category totaled \$7,601.20. Even though the original budget was prepared with due diligence, budget realignment was necessary to reflect modifications in the proposed work plan. In future proposals, budgeting for this category should be rethought. Most of these items were distributed to participants at the workshops and at the community and RPA meetings. COSTEP MA had an exhibition booth at the New England Museum Association annual meeting in Cambridge, MA, on November 19–21, 2014. The banner was displayed at the booth and the other materials were made available to all attendees. It was a great opportunity to disseminate information about the project. The collateral materials were also distributed at other venues that included: a presentation at the one-year anniversary of Hurricane Sandy at the Archives Round Table of Metropolitan New York City (October 7, 2013), a session at the Preservation Massachusetts conference in Lexington, MA (October 18, 2013), a presentation to the New England Cemetery Association (December 3, 2014), and a presentation to the CERT leaders in MEMA Region 2 (December 11, 2014).

8) Conclusions

The need for a program like COSTEP MA is evident. A persistent theme in the conversations held across the Commonwealth during the community meetings and the trainings was the realization by the emergency management community that there had been, until that point, a knowledge gap regarding the significant cultural resources within their respective communities held in trust by the caretakers of these resources. At the same time, those caretakers were frequently unaware of the assets available to them in the event of a crisis and were largely unprepared and untrained as to how to mitigate hazards and how to build resilience into their organizations to better weather whatever incident might occur. While the utilization of the resources provided under the auspices of the HMGP grant acted as a catalyst for the goals of COSTEP MA, this project has shown that *Mitigation for Memory* has a life of its own and will continue to progress beyond the time frame of this grant. In almost every instance, volunteers have stepped forward to sustain, perpetuate, and advance the premise of COSTEP MA and continue to build upon a strong foundation. Additional community meetings are in development for 2015, several towns contacted during the grant period have follow-up meetings pending to firmly establish the COSTEP MA meeting agenda in their towns, and training opportunities continue to be developed. As COSTEP MA reaches more and more likely participants, it continues to gain momentum and evolve into a more effective organization committed to serving the cultural and emergency management communities in Massachusetts.

9) Index to Supporting Documents

A) Digital Documents

- 1) [Invitation lists for community meetings](#) (14 meetings held, 2 completed lists for meetings that were not held)
- 2) [Attendance lists for training sessions](#)
- 3) Documents contained in the community meeting information packet
 - a. [The “Next Steps” handout](#)
 - b. [The COSTEP MA Command and Control flowchart](#) explaining how COSTEP MA fits into the established emergency management structure
- 4) [A sample invitation letter to a community meeting](#)
- 5) [The invitation to the training sessions](#)
- 6) [The survey distributed at the training sessions](#)
- 7) [PowerPoint presentation used in the RPA meetings](#)
- 8) Cultural Resource Inventory Forms
 - a. [Introductory Letter](#)
 - b. [Inventory form for Municipal Offices](#)
 - c. [Inventory form for Cultural Institutions](#)

B) Physical Documents

- 1) The COSTEP MA introductory video on CD
- 2) Sample folder of documents distributed at community and RPA meetings
- 3) The *Mitigation for Memory* Framework