Baucum, Madonna <madonna_baucum@nps.gov>

Re: OMB review of NR form

Diebold, Paul <PDiebold@dnr.in.gov> Wed, Jul 1, 2015 at 3:20 PM
To: "Madonna_Baucum@nps.gov" <Madonna_Baucum@nps.gov>

Lisa Deline forwarded your contact information. Here are Indiana's responses to the questions:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;

Collection of the data on the National Register of Historic Places form is essential information toward the SHPOs, FPOs, Tribal officers, and NPS meeting their mandated efforts under the National Historic Preservation Act. Without the background data from listed resources, it would be impossible to quantify property types or use locational data to do future planning. Researchers frequently contact us to retrieve data from NR forms for historical and architectural research projects. The National Register form is a bedrock of the Federal preservation program.

- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;

The estimates made by Indiana are as accurate as possible. There is a fairly wide variation in the amount of time it would take a person who has never prepared a nomination from that of a paid professional.

- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;

It would be good to have an NR form that is formatted so that it takes up fewer pages and has fewer design quirks (blanks that don't always properly fill, etc.). A form with uniform drop-down menus would insure that the same terminology is being used by all.

- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents

Unless NPS provides additional funds for SHPOs to have more NR staff, it's difficult to see how the burden could be reduced very much.

Ms. Baucum,

Could you tell me who provided the numbers for Indiana's response to the questions about form? Here is what I had sent to Lisa:

1.	Individual nominations by consultants –	26
2.	How many by same consultant -	9
3.	Av. Time/nomination-	80 hrs
4.	Districts by consultants-	18
5.	How many by same consultant -	6
6.	Av. Time/nomination-	160 hrs
7.	New MPS by consultants-	2
8.	How many by same consultant-	0
9.	Av. Time/MPS-	160 hrs
10.	Individual nom. under new MPS-	3
11.	Number under existing MPS-	5
12.	Individual nominations by non-consultant	5
13.	How many by same-	0
14.	Av. Time/nomination-	100 hrs
15.	Districts by non-consultants-	0
16.	How many by same-	0
17.	Av. Time/nomination-	moot
18.	New MPS by non-consultant-	0
19.	How many by same -	0
20.	Av. Time/nomination-	moot
21.	New MPS by non-consultant-	0
22.	Nominations by non-cons., existing MPS-	1

PAUL C. DIEBOLD

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PRESERVATION SERVICES | **INDIANA DNR - DIVISION OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY** | 402 W. WASHINGTON ST. RM W274, INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204 | P: 317.232.3493 | F: 317.232.0693 | *www.in.gov/dnr/historic* | FIND US ON FACEBOOK | *Discover the real Indianapolis! www.nps.gov/history/nr/travel/indianapolis*