

**1. Introduction**

**1.1 - State Party**

United States of America

**1.2 - Date of ratification of the World Heritage Convention**

07/12/1973

**1.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of Section I of the Periodic Reporting**

Governmental institutions responsible for cultural and natural heritage
---

**1.4 - Primary government authorities responsible for the implementation of the Convention**

- Stephen Morris  
Department of the Interior, US National Park Service  
Chief, Office of International Affairs  
US National Park Service
- Jonathan Putnam  
US National Park Service Office of International Affairs  
World Heritage Program Officer

**Comment**

Add as the Key Official: Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks U.S. Department of the Interior 1849 C Street, NW Washington, DC 20240

**1.5 - Other key institutions responsible**

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Domain: natural and some cultural
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
Domain: natural and some cultural
- Smithsonian Institution  
Domain: cultural and natural
- Advisory Council for Historic Preservation  
Domain: cultural
- US Forest Service  
Domain: natural

**1.6 - Comments**

There are literally hundreds of governmental and non-governmental organizations in the United States which play some role in the management, protection and presentation of cultural and natural heritage - far too many to list. Each of the 50 states has their own agencies responsible for natural and cultural heritage, as do most local governments. In addition, there are many NGOs, some at the national level, and many more at the local level, which also focus on heritage protection.

**2. Inventories / lists / registers for cultural and natural heritage**

**2.1 - Cultural Heritage (Level and Status)**

National	Process completed or continually updated
----------	--

Regional / provincial / state	Process completed or continually updated
Local	Process completed or continually updated
Other (please provide details in 2.7)	

**2.2 - Natural Heritage (Level and Status)**

National	Process completed or continually updated
Regional / provincial / state	Process completed or continually updated
Local	Process completed or continually updated
Other (please provide details in 2.7)	

**2.3 - Are inventories/lists/registers adequate to capture the diversity of cultural and natural heritage in the State Party?**

Inventories / lists / registers capture the full diversity of cultural and natural heritage.

**2.4 - Are inventories / lists / registers used to protect the identified cultural heritage?**

Inventories / lists / registers are frequently used for the protection of cultural heritage.

**2.5 - Are inventories / lists / registers used to protect the identified natural heritage?**

Inventories / lists / registers are frequently used for the protection of natural heritage.

**2.6 - Are inventories / lists / registers used for the identification of properties for the Tentative List?**

Inventories / lists / registers are frequently used for the identification of potential World Heritage Properties.

**2.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to inventories / lists / registers of cultural and natural heritage (questions 2.1 to 2.6)**

**3. Tentative List**

**3.1 - Potential future nominations (Property name / anticipated year of nomination)**

San Antonio Missions / 2014 /
-------------------------------

**3.2 - Tools used for a preliminary assessment of the potential Outstanding Universal Value**

ICOMOS thematic studies
IUCN thematic studies
Filling the gaps – an action plan for the future by ICOMOS, Gaps analysis by IUCN
UNESCO's Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List
Other global comparative analysis

**3.3 - Level of involvement in the preparation of the Tentative List**

National government institution(s)	Good
Regional / provincial / state / government(s)	Fair
Local government(s)	Fair
Other government departments	Good
UNESCO National Commission	Good
Local authorities within or adjacent to the property	Fair
Local communities / residents	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Good
Landowners	Good
Local industries	Not applicable
Non Governmental Organization(s)	Good
Consultants / experts	Good
Site manager / coordinator(s)	Good

**3.4 - Was the authority(ies) listed in question 1.4 responsible for the approval and submission of the Tentative List?**

Yes

**3.5 - If not, what authority(ies) is responsible for the approval and submission of the Tentative List?**

**3.6 - Do you intend to update your Tentative List within the next six years?**

Yes

**3.7 - Comments**

**4. Nominations**

**4.1 - Property**

Name	Date of submission	Status
Mesa Verde National Park	1978-06-05	inscribed
Yellowstone National Park	1978-06-05	inscribed
Grand Canyon National Park	1979-03-02	inscribed
Everglades National Park	1979-03-02	inscribed
Edison National Site	1979-03-02	not inscribed
Independence Hall	1979-03-02	inscribed
Redwood National and State Parks	1979-12-31	inscribed
Mammoth Cave National Park	1980-12-09	inscribed
Olympic National Park	1980-12-09	inscribed
Wright Brothers National Memorial	1980-12-09	withdrawn
Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site	1981-12-31	inscribed
Great Smoky Mountains National Park	1982-12-23	inscribed
La Fortaleza and San Juan National Historic Site in Puerto Rico	1982-12-23	inscribed
Statue of Liberty	1983-12-28	inscribed
Yosemite National Park	1983-12-28	inscribed
Chaco Culture National Historical Park	1984-12-31	deferred
Chaco Culture	1987-04-16	inscribed
Hawaii Volcanoes National Park	1986-12-03	inscribed
Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville	1986-12-29	inscribed
Pu'uhonua Honaunau National Park, Hawaii	1986-12-29	deferred
Pueblo de Taos	1987-12-30	deferred
Taos Pueblo	1991-09-27	inscribed
Taliesin and Taliesin West	1990-09-28	deferred

Name	Date of submission	Status
Carlsbad Caverns National Park	1994-10-04	inscribed
Savannah City Plan	1994-09-27	referred
Papahānaumokuākea	2009-01-21	inscribed
Mount Vernon	2009-01-21	withdrawn
Glacier National Park	1984-12-31	deferred
Waterton Glacier International Peace Park	1993-09-29	inscribed
Kluane/Wrangell-St Elias/Glacier Bay/Tatshenshini-Alsek	1979-02-26	inscribed
Kluane/Wrangell-St Elias/Glacier Bay/Tatshenshini-Alsek	1991-09-30	inscribed
Kluane / Wrangell-St Elias / Glacier Bay / Tatshenshini-Alsek	1993-10-01	inscribed

**4.2 - Involvement in recent nominations**

National government institution(s)	Good
Regional / provincial / state government(s)	Good
Local government(s)	Good
Other government departments	Good
UNESCO National Commission	Fair
Local authorities within or adjacent to the property	Good
Local communities / residents	Good
Indigenous peoples	Good
Landowners	Good
Local industries	Not applicable
Non Governmental Organization(s)	Good
Consultants / experts	Good
Site manager / coordinator	Good






**4.3 - Perceived benefits of inscribing properties on the World Heritage List**












Strengthened protection of sites (legislative, regulatory, institutional and / or traditional)	Limited benefit
Enhanced conservation practices	Low benefit
Catalyst for wider community appreciation of heritage	Low benefit
Improved presentation of sites	Low benefit
Enhanced honour / prestige	Some benefit
Increased funding	Low benefit
Additional tool for lobbying / political influence	Low benefit
Stimulus for enhanced partnerships	Low benefit
Increased recognition for tourism and public use	Limited benefit
Stimulus for economic development in surrounding communities	Low benefit
Others (please provide details in 4.4)	

**4.4 - Comments**

**5. General Policy Development**

**5.1 - Legislation**

Title	Year	Link to source
Public Law 97-446 (12.01.1983)	1983	
American Antiquities Act of 1906 as amended (16 USC 431-433)	1906	
Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 as amended (16 USC 469-469-2)	1974	
Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as amended (16 USC 470aa-mm)	1979	
Executive Order 12555	1986	

Title	Year	Link to source
Native American Graves protection and Repatriation Act of 1990	1990	
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: Final Rule	1995	
The Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 USC 431- sets up the criteria for National historic Landmarks)	1935	
Implementation of the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (19 USC 2601)	1972	
Regulation of Importation of Pre-Columbian Monumental or Architectural Sculpture or Murals, Public Law 92-587, 19 USCA sections 2091ff	1972	
National Historic Preservation Act (1966)	1966	
The National Trails System Act of 1968 (16 USC 1241-1251) as amended through P.L. 111-11, March 30, 2009	1968	
National Stolen Property Act- Sections 2314 and 2315 of US Code, title 18-Crimes and Criminal Procedure (1983 as amended in 1987)	1983	
Protection of Archaeological Resources (43 CFR 7)	1997	
Abandoned Shipwreck Property Act (43 USC 2101-2106)	1987	
Abandoned Shipwreck Guidelines		

**Comment**

Add the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916, Wilderness Act of 1964, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act of 1972, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Clean Water Act of 1972, the Clean Air Act of 1970, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. The 2004 Periodic Report lists many more important pieces of legislation: <http://www.nps.gov/oia/topics/SectionIRpt.pdf>

**5.2 - Legislation not listed in 5.1**

**5.3 - Comment**

Please see the 2004 Periodic Report <http://www.nps.gov/oia/topics/SectionIRpt.pdf>

**5.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulations) adequate for the identification, conservation and protection of the State Party's cultural and natural heritage?**

The legal framework is adequate for the identification, conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage.

**5.5 - Can the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulations) for the identification, conservation and protection of the State Party's cultural and natural heritage be enforced?**

There is excellent capacity/resources to enforce the legal framework .

**5.6 - Other International Conventions adhered**

**Comment**

· Conservation of Arctic Flora & Fauna · Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna · Convention on Wetlands of International Importance · Convention to Combat Desertification · Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter Conv. on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere · Conv. on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Cult Property

**5.7 - Implementation of International Conventions into national policies**

There is adequate coordination and integration.

**5.8 - States Party's policies to give heritage a function in the life of communities**

There are policies that are effectively implemented.

**5.9 - Integration of heritage into comprehensive / larger scale planning programmes**

There are policies that are effectively implemented.

**5.10 - Comments**

**6. Status of Services for Protection, Conservation and Presentation**

**6.1 - To what degree do the principal agencies / institutions responsible for cultural and natural heritage cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of this heritage?**

There is some cooperation between the principal agencies / institutions for the conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage but improvements are possible.

**6.2 - To what degree do other government agencies cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of natural and cultural heritage?**

In general, cooperation exists between other government agencies and the principal agencies / institutions for the conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage but there are still deficiencies.

**6.3 - To what degree do different levels of government cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of cultural and natural heritage?**

In general, cooperation exists between different levels of government for the conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage but there are still deficiencies.

**6.4 - Are the services provided by the agencies / institutions adequate for the conservation, protection and presentation of World Heritage properties in your country?**

There is excellent capacity to conserve, protect and present World Heritage properties.

**6.5 - Comments**

**7. Scientific and Technical Studies and Research**

**7.1 - Is there a research programme or project specifically for the benefit of World Heritage properties?**

There is no research programme specifically addressing World Heritage.

**7.2 - Research projects**

- UNDERSTANDING THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF A WORLD HERITAGE SITE DESIGNATION / On-going U.S. and global  
Both  
N/A

This study will aggregate the total direct, indirect, and induced benefits that result from the designation of a world heritage site. It will harness existing data regarding the number of visitors to a heritage site, the total length of stay and mode of their accommodations, and their purchasing behavior. It will also look for information about regional employment and other external economic trends. When necessary, it will create new data-sets or develop new indicators and multipliers that fill gaps in our knowledge of heritage economies.

**7.3 - Comments**

US WH sites benefit from ongoing and extensive scientific & technical research at the national level, although little of the research is directed specifically at or derives directly from the WH designation of the properties, per se. Many of the direct benefits come from NPS programs, and through studies from other governmental agencies & academic institutions. See <https://irma.nps.gov/rprs/Home>

**8. Financial Status and Human Resources**

**8.1 - Sources of funding**

National government funds	Major source of sustained funding
Other levels of government (provincial, state, local)	Major source of sustained funding
International assistance from the World Heritage Fund	Not applicable
International multilateral funding (e.g. World Bank, IDB, European Union)	Not applicable
International bilateral funding (e.g. AFD, GTZ, DGCS, GEF, etc.)	Not applicable
NGOs (international and / or national)	Major source of sustained funding
Private sector funds	Major source of sustained funding
Other (Please specify in 8.6)	

**8.2 - Involvement of State Party in the establishment of foundations or associations for raising funds and donation for the protection of World Heritage**

No

**8.3 - National policies for the allocation of site revenues for conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage**

Yes

**8.4 - Is the current budget sufficient to conserve, protect and present cultural and natural heritage effectively at the national level?**

The available budget is sufficient but further funding would enable more effective conservation, protection and presentation to meet international best practice standards.

**8.5 - Are available human resources adequate to conserve, protect and present cultural and natural heritage effectively at the national level?**

Human resources are adequate but additional staffing would enable more effective conservation, protection and presentation to meet international best practice standards.

**8.6 - Comments**

8.2 While there are many private sources of funds for the protection of cultural and natural heritage, which WH sites in the U.S. benefit from, this is not focused specifically on World Heritage per se.

**9. Training**

**9.1 - Formal training / educational institutions / programs**

- National Park Service / National / both  
Focused on National Park Service needs
- US Fish and Wildlife Service / national / Primarily natural
- National Center for Preservation Technology and Training / national / cultural

**9.2 - Training needs**

Conservation	High priority
Education	High priority
Promotion	Medium priority
Interpretation	High priority
Administration	High priority
Visitor management	High priority
Community outreach	High priority
Risk preparedness	High priority
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High priority
Other	Not applicable

**9.3 - Does the State Party have a national training/ educational strategy to strengthen capacity development in the field of heritage conservation, protection and presentation?**

There is no national strategy for capacity development in the field of heritage conservation, protection and presentation but nonetheless this is being done on an ad hoc basis.

**9.4 - Comments**

There are hundreds of different training programs around the U.S. which provide training relative to World Heritage, including universities, governmental organizations, and NGOs - far too many to list in total.

**10. International Cooperation**

**10.1 - Cooperation with other States Parties**

Participation in other UN programmes
Bi-lateral and multi-lateral agreements
Financial support
Contributions to private organisations for the preservation of cultural and natural heritage
Participation in foundations for international cooperation
Sharing expertise for capacity building
Hosting and / or attending international training courses/seminars
Distribution of material / information

**10.2 - Twinned World Heritage properties with others**

Yes

**10.3 - Comments**

Among international cooperation initiatives, the U.S. hosts World Heritage site managers from developing countries at our World Heritage sites, where they receive training in a variety of heritage management topics. For more information, see [http://www.nps.gov/oia/new/New\\_Page/WH\\_Fellowship.htm](http://www.nps.gov/oia/new/New_Page/WH_Fellowship.htm)

**11. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

**11.1. Media used for World Heritage sites promotion**

**11.1.1 - Publications**

Information
Awareness Raising
Education
International
National
Regional
Local

**11.1.2 - Films / TV**

Information
Awareness Raising
Education
International
National
Regional
Local

**11.1.3 - Media campaigns**

Information
Awareness Raising
Education
International
National
Regional
Local

**11.1.4 - Internet**

Information
Awareness Raising
Education
International
National
Regional
Local

**11.1.5 - Postage stamps, medals**

Awareness Raising
International
National

**11.1.6 - World Heritage Day**

Not applicable
----------------

**11.1.7 - Translation and diffusion of publications made available by the World Heritage Centre**

Not applicable
----------------

**11.1.8 - Other (please specify in 11.1.8)**

Not applicable
----------------

**11.1.9 - Comments**

**11.2. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

**11.2.1 - Strategy to raise awareness among different stakeholders**

There are no strategies to raise awareness about conservation, protection and presentation of World Heritage but nonetheless this is being done on an ad hoc basis.

**11.2.2 - Level of general awareness**

Private Sector	Poor
Youth	Poor
Communities living in/around heritage sites	Poor
Tourism industry	Poor
Decision makers and public officials	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Poor
General public	No awareness

**11.2.3 - Does the State Party participate in UNESCO's World Heritage in Young Hands programme?**

The State Party does not participate in UNESCO's *World Heritage in Young Hands programme*.

**11.2.4 - Level of frequency of activities**

Courses for teachers for the use of the <i>World Heritage in Young Hands Kit</i>	Never
Courses/activities for students within the school programmes	Occasionally
Youth Forums	Never
Skills-training courses for students	Never
Organized school visits to World Heritage properties/cultural and natural sites	Occasionally
Activities linked to heritage within the framework of UNESCO Clubs/Associations	Never
Other (comment below)	

**11.2.5 - Comments**

**12. Conclusions and Recommended Actions**

**12.1. State Party's implementation of the World Heritage Convention**

**12.1.1 - Identification of heritage**

<b>Identification of heritage</b>
Inventories / lists / registers capture the full diversity of cultural and natural heritage.
Inventories / lists / registers are frequently used for the identification of potential World Heritage Properties.

**12.1.2 - National Inventories**

<b>National Inventories</b>
National : Process completed or continually updated
Regional / provincial / state : Process completed or continually updated
National : Process completed or continually updated
Regional / provincial / state : Process completed or continually updated

**12.1.3 - Tentative List**

<b>Tentative List</b>
Yes

**12.1.4 - Legal framework**

<b>Legal framework</b>
There is excellent capacity/resources to enforce the legal framework .

**12.1.5 - Implementation of international conventions within national policies**

<b>Implementation of international conventions within national policies</b>
---

**12.1.6 - Communities**

<b>Communities</b>
Local communities / residents: Fair
Level of involvement / consultation of local landowners: Good
Level of involvement / consultation of local industries: Good
Local communities / residents: Good
Indigenous peoples: Good
Landowners: Good

**12.1.7 - Larger-scale planning**

<b>Larger-scale planning</b>
There are policies that are effectively implemented.

**12.1.8 - Status of Services for Protection, Conservation and Presentation**

<b>Status of Services for Protection, Conservation and Presentation</b>
In general, cooperation exists between different levels of government for the conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage but there are still deficiencies.

**12.1.9 - Scientific and Technical Studies and Research**

<b>Scientific and Technical Studies and Research</b>
There is no research programme specifically addressing World Heritage.

**12.1.10 - Financial status**

<b>Financial status</b>
The available budget is sufficient but further funding would enable more effective conservation, protection and presentation to meet international best practice standards.

**12.1.11 - Human resources**

<b>Human resources</b>
Human resources are adequate but additional staffing would enable more effective conservation, protection and presentation to meet international best practice standards.

**12.1.12 - Training**

<b>Training</b>
-----------------

<b>Training</b>
Ad hoc basis for national strategy for capacity development in the field of heritage conservation.

**12.1.13 - International cooperation**

<b>International cooperation</b>
Participation in other UN programmes
Bi-lateral and multi-lateral agreements
Financial support
Contributions to private organisations for the preservation of cultural and natural heritage
Participation in foundations for international cooperation
Sharing expertise for capacity building
Hosting and / or attending international training courses/seminars
Distribution of material / information

**12.1.14 - Education, Information and awareness building**

<b>Education, Information and awareness building</b>
Private Sector : Poor
Youth : Poor
Communities living in/around heritage sites : Poor

**12.2. Actions for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* (identified from table 12.1).**

**12.2.1 - Please select the top issues (up to six)**  
Please refer to question 5.2

### 12.3. Priority Actions Assessment

#### 12.3.2 - Priority actions assessment

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

**12.3.3 - Additional actions for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention**

**13. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise**

**13.1 - Was the questionnaire easy to use and clear to understand?**

Yes

**13.2 - Please provide suggestions for improvement:**

In general, the questionnaire format was somewhat limiting and did not provide an engaging experience for the sites. We also felt that the overall tone of the questionnaire was too negative and should provide more opportunities to highlight positive aspects. We suggest consideration of a more limited questionnaire supplemented by a narrative.

**13.3 - Please rate the level of support from the following entities for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire**

World Heritage Centre	Good
UNESCO (other sectors)	Not applicable
UNESCO National Commission	Not applicable
ICOMOS International	Not applicable
IUCN International	Not applicable
ICCROM	Not applicable
ICOMOS national / regional	Not applicable
IUCN national / regional	Not applicable

**13.4 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?**

Most required information was accessible

**13.5 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from the previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities**

UNESCO	Poor
Advisory Bodies	Poor
State Party	Fair
Site Managers	Fair

**13.6 - Comments**