

**Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative
Collaboration Workshops
Final Report**

**Prepared by Mr. Bill Thomas
Steering Committee Chair, Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative
11/20/15**

**Collaboration Workshops Final Report
Contents**

Background.....3
Results.....5
Next Steps.....10
Collaboration Workshops Findings.....11
Summary.....30
Addenda.....31

- Steering Committee Members
- Collaboration Workshops Raw Feedback
- Organizational Chart

Background

Two years ago on November 20, 2013, organizational leaders and representative stakeholders of Route 66 met at the Route 66: The Road Ahead Strategic Roundtable in Anaheim, California. Organized by the World Monuments Fund (WMF), the primary purpose of the Roundtable meeting was to discuss the results of a Route 66 Economic Impact Study (2012) conducted for the WMF by Rutgers University. One of the key recommendations from the Roundtable meeting called for the creation of a new national framework for collaboration amongst Route 66 stakeholders. Consensus was reached at the Roundtable, that the WMF and the National Park Service (NPS) would facilitate a process to bring stakeholders together to develop the proposed new framework for national collaboration.

To jump-start this process, WMF and NPS appointed an ad-hoc Steering Committee comprised of representatives from tourism, preservation, transportation, small business, economic development, education, and state and national Route 66 organizations. In November 2014, the Steering Committee met for two days in Albuquerque, New Mexico to finalize recommendations developed over a period of months. There, the Steering Committee reached consensus on a proposed new organization designed to facilitate national collaboration amongst Route 66 stakeholders. The structure of the proposed new organization included a board of directors and working groups/committees designed to promote tourism, preservation, Route 66 Associations (advocacy), economic development, and education/research. The ultimate goal was to fashion a fresh, inclusive approach for Route 66 that represented all stakeholders — everyone with dedication and passion for the Mother Road.

With this goal in mind, the Steering Committee assigned four of its members to travel the length of Route 66 and present the proposed ideas it had come up with via a series of meetings to which all interested parties would be invited. The 2.5-3 hour Collaboration Workshop meetings were lively affairs, with participants actively engaged in discussing the ideas proposed by the Steering Committee. Mr. Bill Thomas, Chairman of the Steering Committee, facilitated the workshops, which began with Mr. Aaron Mahr, Superintendent of the NPS National Trails Intermountain Region, and Ms. Kaisa Barthuli, Program Manager, NPS Route 66 Corridor Preservation Program, providing background information on the role of NPS in its partnership with the Steering Committee, as well as a brief overview of how and why the Steering Committee was established. Those in attendance were asked for direct input regarding the ideas proposed by the Steering Committee. Participants were asked to consider a mission statement, strategic outcomes, goals, and a structure for the proposed new organization that would facilitate national collaboration amongst Route 66 stakeholders. Specifically, the participants were asked to identify strengths/weaknesses for each idea, to list questions they had about each idea, and to offer any recommendations they might have for each idea. The participants discussed the proposed ideas in small groups, then each small group reported out on its work. At the conclusion of each Collaboration Workshop meeting, written comments were collected from each small group so a record of stakeholder input could be collected.

Over 300 people participated in the Collaboration Workshops, including members of Route 66 associations, tourism officials, economic development professionals, businesspersons, preservationists, educators, government officials, and others interested in reviving and renewing Historic Route 66.

Following the Collaboration Workshops, the feedback collected at these meetings was organized, reviewed, and analyzed to identify common themes, concerns, and recommendations. A Collaboration Workshop Preliminary Report was prepared and presented to the Steering Committee, with the goal of providing its members with answers to the question: “What were the reactions of the Collaboration Workshop participants to the ideas/plans that were proposed to them?”

Steering Committee members reviewed and discussed the findings presented in the Preliminary Report, then made decisions regarding edits and revisions to the ideas that had been presented to Route 66 stakeholders at the Collaboration Workshops. After finalized versions of a mission statement, strategic outcomes, goals, and organizational structure were agreed upon, the Steering Committee identified a series of next steps designed to begin implementing the task of creating a new national framework for collaboration amongst Route 66 stakeholders.

The following “Results” section of this report details Steering Committee decisions and next steps.

Results

Based upon its review and analysis of feedback received from the Collaboration Workshops, the Steering Committee approved the following foundational elements of a new national organization focused on promoting collaboration amongst Route 66 Stakeholders:

Mission

The mission of the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative is to revitalize and sustain Route 66 as a national icon, for the benefit of all Route 66 communities, travelers, and businesses/attractions, through collaborative partnerships focused on promotion, preservation, research/education, and economic development.

Strategic Outcomes

The outcomes the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative will work to accomplish include:

- Increased Collaboration: We want to improve communication and participation among and between sectors (tourism, preservation, associations, transportation, economic and community development) to leverage their work for the benefit of the entire road.
- Effective Promotion: We want to promote the road and increase the number of visitors, both domestic and international, coming to Route 66, with the specific aim of increasing their length of stay and the amount of money they spend along Route 66.
- Purposeful Preservation: We want to purposefully preserve the historic resources (buildings, structures, sites, districts, objects, and landscapes), traditions, and experiences that give Route 66 its idiosyncratic character.
- Increased Economic Vitality: We want to act as a catalyst for community and economic development by helping sustain and strengthen existing Route 66 businesses and attractions, and by helping new ones develop.
- Quality Research and Education: We want to ensure that the history and stories associated with Route 66 are both accurate and accessible to the public, to researchers, and to educational institutions in order to enhance and encourage greater connection to, and understanding of, the Mother Road.

Strategic Goals

Following are the goals The Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative will pursue in order to achieve its stated outcomes. Note: The means and metrics that will be used to measure achievement of these goals will be developed by the Working Groups responsible for them.

Increased Collaboration:

- Establish one professionally – led, representative body with a board initially appointed by the Route 66: The Road Ahead Steering Committee, to deliver on strategic outcomes/goals, convene meetings, act as a central resource, and represent the road as a whole.
- Leverage the resources of organizations such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), the World Monuments Fund (WMF), and the National Main Street Center to assist with the achievement of the organization’s strategic outcomes.
- Build a budget and 3 year financial plan that initially underwrites the new Route 66: The Road Ahead organization.

Effective Promotion:

- Establish a national Promotion Working Group to collaboratively market, both domestically and internationally, all of Route 66 and to obtain matching funds through such sources as Brand USA.
- Develop a comprehensive marketing and communications strategy to promote the road that leverages social media, and provides a cohesive website and a clearinghouse for information.
- Educate the public, tour operators, communities, entrepreneurs, governments, and the next generation about the history, cultural importance, economic value, attractions, and business opportunities along Route 66.

Purposeful Preservation:

- Establish a national Preservation Working Group to collaboratively share best practices and ideas between such groups as State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and Departments of Transportation, focused on the preservation of Route 66 related bridges, buildings, structures, districts, sites, objects, and landscapes.
- Pursue federal legislation for designation of Route 66 as a National Historic Trail.
- Share information with Route 66 stakeholders about the meaning and benefits of preservation and the tools, techniques, and incentives for appropriate preservation outcomes.

Increased Economic Vitality:

- Establish a national Economic Development Working Group to collaboratively share best practices and examples of successful community revitalization and to build effective strategies for leveraging tourism for economic development purposes.
- Identify and promote case studies that demonstrate the effectiveness of leveraging Route 66 tourism for economic development purposes, in order to draw in support and increase the involvement of Route 66 stakeholders.
- Develop and implement a comprehensive fundraising and sponsorship plan designed to initially underwrite the new Route 66: The Road Ahead 501(c)(3) organization.

Quality Research and Education:

- Establish a national Research/Education Working Group to collaboratively support professional and amateur educators and researchers in their efforts to inspire and renew public understanding of Route 66.
- Assist educational institutions at all levels in presenting Route 66 research to students, travelers, tourists, and the general public.
- Support the research and preparation of comprehensive and accurate Route 66 information and its distribution in multiple forms, including: netcasting, broadcasting, print, social media, and curriculum.

Organizational Structure

Following is a description of the organizational structure that will be used by the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative to help accomplish its Mission.

The new organization will include a Board of Directors, an Executive Committee, and a set of five Working Groups (one each for Promotion, Preservation, Economic Development, Research/Education, and State Associations Advocacy). The new organization will also include an Executive Director, along with two advisory groups: An International Advisory Group and American Indian Tribal Advisory Group. The Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative will be registered as a 501(c)(3) entity.

Following is a description of each element of the organizational structure of the Route 66 Road Ahead Initiative:

Board of Directors

The Board of Directors includes:

- 8 – State Route 66 Association representatives (one each from Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). Each State Route 66 Association will determine the individual it wishes to be seated as a Director on the Board. Each of these individuals will be voting members of the Board.

- 5 – Chairman of each of the Working Groups. Chairman of each of the Working Groups will initially be appointed by the members of the Route 66: The Road Ahead Steering Committee. Each Chair will be a voting member of the Board.
- 1 – Executive Director of the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative. The Executive Director will be hired by the organization and sit on the Board as a non-voting member.
- Ex. Officio members as determined by the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative. Ex. Officio individuals will be non-voting members.

The Route 66: The Road Ahead Steering Committee will initially appoint the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Secretary/Treasurer of the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors will then be responsible for formulating and adopting a set of by-laws that will govern its ongoing operations, including processes/procedures for filling Board of Directors positions.

The Board of Directors will be charged with focusing on governance and policy issues. It will meet, at most, quarterly.

Executive Committee

The Executive Committee includes six individuals:

- The Chairman of the Board of Directors
- The Chair of each of the Working Groups
- The Executive Director of the organization

The Executive Committee will be responsible for the on-going management and administration of the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative organization. The Executive Committee will meet frequently, as much as monthly.

Working Groups

The Working Groups established by the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative include:

- Promotion Working Group – the Chair of this group will be appointed by the Steering Committee, and be chosen based upon his/her professional experience in marketing and/or tourism. The Chair will be responsible for recruiting 10-12 members to comprise this Working Group.
- Preservation Working Group – the Chair of this group will be appointed by the Steering Committee, and be chosen based upon his/her professional experience in historic preservation. The Chair will be responsible for recruiting 10-12 members to comprise this Working Group.

- Economic Development Working Group – the Chair of this group will be appointed by the Steering Committee, and be chosen based upon his/her professional experience in economic development. The Chair will be responsible for recruiting 10-12 members to comprise this Working Group.
- Research/Education Working Group – the Chair of this group will be appointed by the Steering Committee, and be chosen based upon his/her professional experience in research & education. The Chair will be responsible for recruiting 10-12 members to comprise this Working Group.
- Route 66 State Associations Advocacy Working Group – the members of this Working Group will nominate a Chair for this group, who will then be approved by the Route 66: The Road Ahead Steering Committee. The Chair will be responsible for recruiting the members to comprise this Working Group.

Advisory Groups

Two Advisory Groups will be established by the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative.

They will include:

- An International Advisory Group – This group would be comprised of representatives from each of the several international Route 66 Association groups.
- An American Indian Tribal Advisory Group – This group would be comprised of representatives from the American Indian Alaska Native Travel Association and other tribal groups involved in leveraging Route 66 for cultural, historic, and economic development purposes.

The Executive Committee would be charged with formulating a plan for establishing these two Advisory Groups and presenting it to the Board of Directors for consideration and action.

The purpose of each Advisory Group will be to advise the Board of Directors on matters pertaining to how International Route 66 Associations, American Tribal organizations, and our Road Ahead Initiative can work together in the promotion, preservation, and economic development of Route 66, as well as on research and education related matters.

Next Steps

In addition to finalizing the foundational elements of the new organization it is creating, the Steering Committee identified four next steps it will immediately implement, including:

1. Secure 501(c)(3) status for the new organization – The Steering Committee will complete and file the paperwork necessary to establish the new organization it has created as a not-for-profit entity. 501(c) will be secured by or before July 30, 2016.
2. Appoint a nominal set of Board of Directors for the new organization – This group will be identified primarily for the purpose of completing and submitting 501(c)(3) documentation. As the process moves forward, the Steering Committee will finalize appointments to the Board of Directors, including Working Group chairman. It will also work the several state Route 66 associations to identify whom each will seat on the Board of Directors.
3. Establish a National Historic Trail Designation Task Force – This Task Force will work with the National Trust for Historic Preservation to take the steps needed to introduce legislation in Congress designating Route 66 as a National Historic Trail. Mr. John Conoboy will chair this task force.
4. Establish a Financial Sustainment Task Force – This Task Force will map out a three-year plan/budget for securing the funding needed to initially underwrite the new organization. Mr. Bill Kelly, Executive Director of the Illinois Route 66 Scenic Byway Program, will chair this task force.

The next section of this report presents the detailed findings from the feedback received from Route 66 stakeholders who attended and took part in the Collaboration Workshops.

Collaboration Workshop Findings

In this section of this Final Report, details regarding the Steering Committee's review and analysis of feedback from the Collaboration Workshops are presented. The information is categorized in terms of "High-Level Findings" and "Common Feedback Responses" based on an analysis of all feedback comments received regarding the four different Activities in which participants at the Collaboration Workshops took part. During these Activities workshop participants were asked to consider:

- A proposed Mission Statement for the new collaborative organization being created
- A set of proposed Strategic Outcomes & Goals designed to help achieve the stated mission
- A proposed organizational structure for the new organization
- The suggestion that National Historic Trail designation be pursued for Route 66

High-Level Findings

In its review and analysis of all the feedback comments gathered from the Collaboration Workshops, the Steering Committee noted the following high-level, initial findings:

- Workshop participants supported the overall goal of establishing a new organization designed to foster collaboration amongst all Route 66 stakeholders
- Workshop participants suggested a number of specific changes/edits to the substance of the ideas/plans proposed at the workshops, none of which would drastically alter the substance of those ideas/plans
- Workshop participants voiced many comments, questions, and recommendations regarding how to carry out the ideas/plans proposed at the workshop which should be maintained for possible use as the process of establishing a new organization proceeds

It is noteworthy to point out that in all of the verbal comments heard during the Collaboration Workshops - and in all the written feedback collected after the workshops - there were no comments that said, "Do not do what is being proposed."

Positive comments were balanced by the identification of perceived weaknesses in the ideas/plans that were proposed - and a large number of pragmatic questions and recommendations regarding the specifics of exactly how all of what was being proposed would actually get accomplished, were offered.

Workshop participants were asked to think about the ideas/plans proposed to them in terms of strengths, weaknesses, questions, and recommendations. Initial high-level findings per each of these categories include:

Comments regarding **Strengths** primarily focused on:

- Support for the idea of working to establish a single organization that focused on helping Route 66 stakeholders collaborate with each other for the overall revitalization and renewal of the road.

Comments regarding **Weaknesses** primarily focused on:

- The perceived challenge of overcoming the past – i.e. figuring out how to achieve actual collaboration and coordination amongst groups that have worked independently for so long.
- The need to identify sources of funding to support the proposed new organization

Questions asked primarily focused on:

- The significant challenge of creating a new organization that would function as a national framework for collaboration, including the “mechanics” of how members of the proposed Board would be selected or appointed.
- How goals and outcomes would/could actually be achieved.
- Requests for greater clarity/specifics regarding various aspects of the proposed ideas/plans.

Recommendations made primarily focused on:

- Calls for “equity” amongst states in the new organizational structure, i.e. equal representation of each of the states or state association organizations on the proposed board and in the proposed working groups.
- Efforts to ensure inclusiveness in the overall effort, including African-American, Millennials, and tribal organizations.

In addition to offering the above high-level findings, the Steering Committee’s review and analysis of all the feedback comments resulted in the identification of a set of common feedback responses detailed below.

Common Feedback Responses

As noted above participants took part in four different Activities during the Collaboration Workshops. In its review and analysis of the feedback collected from these Activities, the Steering Committee found the following to be the most common feedback responses made by the participants.

Note: In the course of thinking about all the feedback responses gathered from the Collaboration Workshops, the Steering Committee recognized that participant feedback comments fell into two basic “types”:

- “Substantive” Feedback Comments – i.e. Comments made by Collaboration Workshop participants that dealt with WHAT the ideas/plans they discussed actually stated or said.

- “Instrumental” Feedback Comments – i.e. Comments made by participants that focused on HOW the ideas/plans the participants discussed should or could be carried out or accomplished.

Separating the common feedback responses into these two categories was done in order to help Steering Committee members take a strategic approach to the task of using all this feedback to make decisions. A strategic approach focuses first on deciding WHAT to do/WHAT to achieve. Once that is determined, the focus can then be placed on the best way of doing whatever is to be accomplished.

With this in mind, the Steering Committee determined that the substantive common feedback responses were the ones it should pay primary attention to when deciding upon any changes to the wording or content of the mission statement, set of strategic outcomes and goals, proposed organizational structure, or the suggestion to seek National Historic Trail designation that were presented to Collaboration Workshop participants.

The Steering Committee noted that while the instrumental feedback was important, it dealt with the secondary issue of how to do something, not the primary issue of what to do in the first place.

With this in mind, the common feedback responses from the Collaboration Workshop participants shown below are labeled as either “WHAT” (i.e. substantive) comments or “HOW” (i.e. instrumental) comments. Responses for each of the four Activities are as follows.

Activity I – Consideration of the Proposed Mission & Strategic Outcomes

Workshop participants were given the following instructions for Activity I:

Please focus on the following in your group discussion during this Activity:

Strengths/Weaknesses: What do you think are the *strengths/weaknesses* of the proposed mission and strategic outcomes presented to you?

Questions: What *questions* do you have regarding the proposed mission and strategic outcomes presented to you?

Recommendations: What *recommendations* do you have regarding the proposed mission and strategic outcomes presented to you?

Proposed Mission Statement

“The mission of the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative is to revive and renew Route 66 as a symbol of freedom, adventure, and prosperity by engaging in cross-state collaboration, promotion, and preservation in order to foster economic development along the road.”

Common feedback responses regarding the proposed Mission Statement included:

Strengths

The following specific strengths were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the proposed Mission Statement:

1. **WHAT** - One organization is an excellent/good idea
2. **WHAT** - Emphasis on Cross-state collaboration
3. **WHAT** - Focus on Economic development

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Question

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants regarding the proposed Mission Statement.

- 1) **WHAT** - Make it more clear in the mission statement that this is a NATIONAL effort. Either:

“The mission of the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative is to revive and renew Route 66 as a NATIONAL symbol...” or,

“The mission of the Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative is to revive and renew NATIONAL Route 66 as...”

- 2) **WHAT** - Many don't like "revive and renew". Use "revitalize"? Or "sustain"? or "Inspire continued renewal?" - At the same time, there were several notes from participants who specifically commented that they liked the use of the "revive & renew" phrase.
- 3) **WHAT** - Symbol of freedom from who/what? "Freedom" is potentially polarizing term. Was it freedom, prosperity, adventure for everyone? E.g., African Americans.
- 4) **WHAT** - Include words: national, international, education/research, and heritage tourism in mission statement.
- 5) **WHAT** - Mission statement is too long and wordy. Need to get the point across in a simpler fashion to keep the reader interested while still connecting with the individual on an emotional/adventurous level. A weakness in the mission statement is that it is redundant to the stated outcomes. Instead emphasize the WHY of what the org is doing, the uniqueness of the route, and inclusivity (see #5 next bullet below). Recommend dropping "in order to foster"
- 6) **WHAT** - Should the mission statement make it clear that this is an organization/initiative, representative of all states/orgs/sites along the road?
- 7) **WHAT** - Economic development should not be the exclusive end-goal in the mission statement. Make equal to other goals of collaboration, preservation, promotion, etc. For example, wording could be adjusted to "cross state collaboration in order to preserve, promote, and foster economic development".
- 8) **WHAT** - Prosperity? What does this mean? Perhaps change this word to "opportunity". Does prosperity mean economic development?
- 9) **WHAT** - Consider including the words "authenticity" and "idiosyncratic" in the mission statement and/or as often as possible through goals and outcomes.
- 10) **WHAT** - Accurate Research and Education – All the other outcomes EXCEPT this one are included in the mission statement. Add it to the mission statement (education)
- 11) **WHAT** - Need to strengthen language on how the "little guy" will be involved and/or benefit – perhaps include this in the mission statement.
 - a. Whole thing needs more emphasis on people. For example, instead of just preservation, org should help people save places. Incorporate an element of fun, adventure, and multi-generational experience.
 - b. Need economic incentives to involve little guys, like cost-share grants. Should there be specific outcomes regarding funding help for property owners/businesses to help them see how this will benefit them?
- 12) **HOW** - Realistic? Maybe a bit too much w/o very specific structure, plan, funding sources.
- 13) **HOW** - Turf wars exist - how to coordinate efforts? How does cross-state collaboration happen? Who will head it up and who decides that?

Proposed Strategic Outcomes

Common feedback responses regarding the proposed Strategic Outcomes included:

1. Strong Cross-State Collaboration - Increase communication and participation among and between sectors (tourism, preservation, associations, transportation, economic & community development) to leverage their work for the benefit of the entire road.

Strengths

The following specific strengths were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the desired outcome of achieving Strong Cross-State Collaboration:

1. **WHAT** - Cross-state collaboration is a good idea in theory
2. **WHAT** - Having one organization is excellent
3. **WHAT** - Unification of goals
4. **WHAT** - Good goals. Succinct easy to understand and clear. Comprehensive.

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the desired outcome of achieving Strong Cross-State Collaboration:

- **WHAT** – Cross-state collaboration difficult to achieve
- **WHAT** - Measurable outcomes?
- **HOW** - In the goals or outcomes, need to make it clear how the existing state and national Route 66 org's will be represented or involved in the collaboration.
- **HOW** - Need to make it VERY clear how all 8 states will be fully represented. Show how equity will be achieved among the states.

2. Effective Promotion: Increase the number of visitors, both domestic and international, coming to Route 66, with the specific aim of increasing their length of stay and the amount of money they spend along the Route.

Strengths

The following specific strengths were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the desired outcome of achieving Effective Promotion:

1. **WHAT** - Effective promotion and increased prosperity are key to the success of the mission. More tourists and more tourist dollars are foundational to achieving everything else.

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards achieving the desired outcome of Effective Promotion:

- **WHAT** - Accurate Research and Education - Roll this into promotional part of program?
- **WHAT** - Measurable outcomes?
- **HOW** - Add/elaborate on effective promotion through events or great race.

3. Purposeful Preservation: Purposefully maintain and preserve as much of the authentic roadway design, original buildings, landscapes, traditions, and experiences that together make up the idiosyncratic experience that is the essence of Route 66.

Strengths

The following specific strengths were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the desired outcome of achieving Purposeful Preservation:

1. **WHAT** - The purposeful preservation outcome is the most exciting, and can be achieved through the collaboration with Departments of Transportation, tribes, and others.

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards achieving the desired outcome of Purposeful Preservation:

- **WHAT** - Rewrite Purposeful Preservation - “Purposefully DOCUMENT, maintain, and preserve...”
- **WHAT** - Measurable outcomes?
- **HOW** - Preservation – Need to emphasize preservation of the past and development for the future are not in conflict. Balance prosperity with authenticity, development with preservation.

4. Increased Prosperity: Act as a catalyst for community development, increasing the prosperity of the people who live along, and are connected to, Route 66 by helping sustain existing businesses and attractions, and by helping new ones develop.

Strengths

The following specific strengths were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the desired outcome of achieving Increased Prosperity:

1. **WHAT** - Effective promotion and increased prosperity are key to the success of the mission. More tourists and more tourist dollars are foundational to achieving everything else.

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards achieving the desired outcome of Increased Prosperity:

- **WHAT** - Rewrite Increased Prosperity: "Act as a catalyst for community and ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, BY HELPING TO sustain existing businesses and attractions, and by helping develop new ones.
- **WHAT** - Measurable outcomes?
- **HOW** - Need to involve more than just biz owners for low-income areas along road - workforce, local gov, social services, faith.

5. Accurate Research and Education: Ensure that the history and stories associated with Route 66 are both accurate and accessible to the public, to researchers, and to educational institutions in order to enhance and encourage greater understanding of the mother road.

Strengths

The following specific strengths were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the desired outcome of achieving Accurate Research and Education:

- **WHAT** – It's good to include education as one of the goals.

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Question

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards achieving the desired outcome of achieving Accurate Research and Education:

- **WHAT** - Accurate research and education – conflicting opinions on use of word "accurate". Some really like it, some say drop the adjective since lore and legend is as important as fact.
- **WHAT** - Rewrite Accurate Research/Education: "... encourage greater understanding and CONNECTION TO the mother road

- **WHAT** - Measurable outcomes?
- **WHAT** - All strategic outcomes are briefly mentioned in the proposed mission except Research and Education.
- **HOW** – Structure for accurate education and research is undefined – how can you encourage this?

Activity II- Consideration of Proposed Strategic Goals

Workshop participants were given the following instructions for Activity II:

Please focus on the following in your group discussion during this Activity:

Strengths/Weaknesses: What do you think are the *strengths/weaknesses* of the proposed goals presented to you?

Questions: What *questions* do you have regarding the proposed goals presented to you?

Recommendations: What *recommendations* do you have regarding the proposed goals presented to you?

NOTE: Many feedback comments/notes received from participants in Activity II actually dealt with the nature of the new organization and how it would be set up/structured. Accordingly, they are not reported here. Rather, they can be found in the Activity III section of this report.

Proposed Strategic Goals:

Goal 1.0 - Strong Cross-State Collaboration

Strengths

The following specific strengths were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the overall goal of achieving Strong Cross-State Collaboration:

WHAT - Cross-state collaboration a good idea in theory

WHAT - Having one organization is excellent

WHAT - Unification of goals

WHAT - Good goals. Succinct, easy to understand and clear. Comprehensive.

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the specific goals shown below that are associated with achieving the overall goal of Strong Cross-State Collaboration:

Goal 1.1 - Establish one professionally – led, representative body with an elected board, to deliver on strategic goals, convene meetings, act as a central resource and represent the road as a whole

WHAT - What does “professionally-led” mean? Will this alienate grass-roots/mom and pop? Perhaps remove that reference?

Goal 1.2 - Leverage the resources of National Trust (NTHP) or World Monuments Fund (WMF) as potential incubators

WHAT - Leverage resources SUCH AS NTHP and WMF..." or perhaps don't call out these two since there are many resources beyond these two groups.

Goal 1.3 - Build budget and 3 year plan with targets for financial sustainability, post incubation

WHAT - 3 years too short. Perhaps 5 years?

WHAT - WHOSE financial stability? Clarify.

Goal 2.0 - Effective Promotion:

Strengths

The following specific strengths were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the overall goal of achieving Effective Promotion:

WHAT - This will help provide a consistent message and plan for traveler as well as a resource.

WHAT - One promotional entity to sell entire road

WHAT - One central resource is a good idea

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the specific goals shown below that are associated with achieving the overall goal of Effective Promotion:

Goal 2.1 - Develop comprehensive marketing and communication strategy to promote the road, leverage social media and build a single cohesive website and clearing house for information

WHAT - Don't be specific with the "social" in social media... just say media.

WHAT - Promotion needs to include goal of branding and marketing.

Goal 2.2 - Establish collaborative Cross-State Tourism/Marketing Group to promote the whole road and obtain matching funds through Brand USA to market Route 66 overseas

WHAT - ... to market Route 66 DOMESTICALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY."

WHAT - More are only Brand USA and National Trust called out? Who is Brand USA? Perhaps not call out these two, or say "such as Brand USA..." There are many more potential investors.

Goal 2.3 - Educate public, tour operators, communities, entrepreneurs, government and the next generation about the history, cultural importance, economic value, attractions and business opportunities along Route 66

WHAT - Need more about cross-promotion between businesses (stop at a restaurant get directed to next stop)

HOW - Create Rt66 video game/app (one suggestion: a game/app much like Oregon Trail (1990) app with game traveling down the route highlighting great places to stop/historic locations.)

Goal 3.0 - Purposeful Preservation:

Strengths

The following specific strengths were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the overall goal of achieving Purposeful Preservation:

WHAT - Appreciate Purposeful Preservation - where do I sign up?

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the specific goals shown below that are associated with achieving the overall goal of Purposeful Preservation:

Goal 3.1 - Gain National Treasure status through National Trust (NTHP)

WHAT - What is National Treasure status and its value to the route?

Goal 3.2 - Pursue federal legislation to designate Route 66 as a National Historic Trail

WHAT - Combine #1 and 2 (National Treasure status with pursue NHT) and add another bullet "Educate and assist stakeholders to preserve authentic Route 66 resources and experiences."

Goal 3.3 - Establish Cross-State Preservation Group to share best practice and ideas especially between State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and Departments of Transportation (DOT) including common standards, bridges, buildings, storytelling and signage etc.

WHAT - Common Standards somewhat inconsistent with preserving idiosyncratic nature and alarming to many. Clarify.

WHAT - Leaves out a lot of helpful groups/agencies, mentioning just NTHP, SHPO, DOTs. Counties especially need to be included!

WHAT - Should cities and counties be included, not just states? Also include statewide nonprofits, MainStreets, Humanities and Arts Councils.

WHAT - Add as #4: Need to add preservation goal of providing sensitivity guidance on how to do new development along the route to balance preservation with development. How can we determine new

design, buildings, experiences, etc. that fit the spirit of the road? Style guide is needed for cohesive plan that is strategically balancing the character of the route.

Goal 4.0 - Increased Prosperity:

Strengths

The following specific strengths were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the overall goal of achieving Increased Prosperity:

WHAT - Good ideas in Increased Prosperity goals.

WHAT - Shared best practices in marketing, preservation, increased prosperity good.

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the specific goals shown below that are associated with achieving the overall goal of Prosperity:

Goal 4.1 - Promote economic development case for support, provide mentorship, training and resources

WHAT - Promote the case for economic development to provide mentorship training, and resources (for whom??)" Perhaps provide training ABOUT resources, funding, etc.

Goal 4.2 - Develop and implement a comprehensive corporate development (fundraising and sponsorship) plan

Goal 4.3 - Establish Cross-State Economic Development Group to share best practice and examples of successful community revitalization and build effective strategies to leverage tourism

Goal 5.0 - Accurate Research and Education:

Strengths

The following specific strengths were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the overall goal of achieving Accurate Research and Education:

WHAT - Including focus on education in the strategic outcomes is good

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the specific goals shown below that are associated with achieving the overall goal of Accurate Research and Education:

Goal 5.1 - Assist educational institutions at all levels in presenting research to students, travelers, tourists, and the general public.

WHAT - To assist educational institutions at all levels in EXPERIENCING research to students, travelers, tourists, and the general public.

Goal 5.2 - Support the preparation of comprehensive and accurate information and its distribution in multiple forms: netcasting, broadcasting, print, social media, and curriculum.

WHAT - To support the preparation of comprehensive information and its distribution in MULTIPLE FORMS OF MEDIA AND CURRICULA.

Goal 5.3 - Encourage collaboration among educators and researchers, professional and amateur, to inspire and renew public understanding of Route 66.

WHAT - Should "Research/Education committee" be related to or combined with the "Promotion Committee"?

WHAT - Don't forget to also focus on educating business owners.

WHAT – As regards the Title of this goal itself: Remove word "accurate" - part of history is love and fiction - it's not always accurate (accuracy can be biased too).

Activity III - Consideration of Proposed Organizational Structure

Workshop participants were given the following instructions for Activity III:

Please focus on the following in your group discussion during this Activity:

Strengths/Weaknesses: What do you think are the *strengths/weaknesses* of the proposed organizational presented to you?

Questions: What *questions* do you have regarding the proposed organizational structure presented to you?

Recommendations: What *recommendations* do you have regarding the proposed organizational structure presented to you?

Strengths

The following specific strengths were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the proposed Organizational Structure:

WHAT - 3 Year Terms - good

WHAT - Good to hire professional, paid management

WHAT - A strong framework for development

WHAT - A simple structure that allows for chairs of working groups to comprise board

WHAT - Committee chairs serve on board. Each state represented on each committee. Simple, effective structure. This can work!

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants regarding the proposed Organizational Structure.

WHAT - Many opinions expressed that board should be bigger. E.g., total of 13-15, each state represented, and specific expertise represented (committee chairs).

WHAT - Board needs uneven # for voting.

WHAT - Three year term limit is too short. Five years instead?

WHAT - Must stagger chair terms.

WHAT - What are qualifications of committee and board members?

WHAT - Who is paid? Who is volunteer?

WHAT - Is this a decision-making/executive board?

WHAT - Is this a deep pockets board or expertise board, or both?

WHAT - Are there other support staff? Each of the chairs is going to need more people to make this successful.

WHAT Show on chart where grass roots involvement is – where is the benefit to/involvement of the little guy.

WHAT - Why no tribal involvement? A huge portion of NM and AZ has 66 going through reservation land. We need their involvement.

WHAT - What role does each existing state organization play in this? Need to have a more clear definition of the "state" committee.

WHAT - Could or should preservation and research and Ed (Promotion) committees/objectives be combined?

HOW - Who will head this org and who decides that?

HOW - What is timeframe to make this happen?

HOW - How will board meetings happen? In person? Videoconference? Or?

HOW - We collaborate, yes - but what are the exact ways we link the committees? What is the medium or forum for information sharing and exchange?

HOW - How will all states be represented? Expand board to include all 8 states plus a few more at large members? Have a non-voting 8-state advisory board? Or are all states going to be represented on each committee?

HOW - Many differing opinions on whether board and committee members should be elected or appointed.

HOW - Can board members be re-elected (or re-appointed)?

HOW - Constant communication needed. Facebook, twitter, integral.

HOW - Where are 8-12 people coming from on the committees? Are they at large?

Activity IV – Consideration of Proposed Designation of Route 66 as a National Historic Trail

Workshop participants were given the following instructions for Activity IV:

Please focus on the following in your group discussion during this Activity:

Strengths/Weaknesses: What do you think are the *strengths/weaknesses* of the proposal to seek National Historic Trail designation for Route 66?

Questions: What *questions* do you have regarding the proposal to seek National Historic Trail designation for Route 66?

Recommendations: What *recommendations* do you have regarding the proposal to seek National Historic Trail designation for Route 66?

Strengths

The following specific strengths were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the proposed idea of designating Route 66 as a National Historic Trail.

WHAT - It's permanent - once designated, not renewal is needed with a Trail

WHAT - If managed by NPS, there would be an established management program and institutional knowledge to help establish and launch the Trail.

WHAT - More permanent than Corridor Preservation Program

WHAT - Feasibility study already completed

Weaknesses/Recommendations/Questions

The following specific weaknesses, recommendations, and questions were those most commonly noted in the written feedback received from Collaboration Workshop participants as regards the proposed idea of designating Route 66 as a National Historic Trail:

WHAT - What is end goal of NTHP National Treasure status? Make this clear.

WHAT - Anything restrictive for businesses? Potential impacts on businesses and infrastructure (utilities, cafes, hotels, etc.) need to be clearly stated as well as provisions/allowances to incorporate new development. Would NHT cause difficulty with development, new business/buildings, filming, uses, etc.? Would NPS have new usage rules and regulations? Would they impair usage, development, etc.? Will NHT place a burden on business owners?

WHAT - Are traditional trail reps going to push back (i.e., Lewis and Clark Trail vs. paved road)?

WHAT - What other options open to Route 66 aside from CPP or NHT?

WHAT - Most states have or are developing their own Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plans with their own goals, challenges, and opportunities. How will NHT impact this?

HOW - Would the NHT be managed by the nonprofit or Fed's? How would the national nonprofit and Fed's work together?

HOW - How are boundaries determined? From where to where? Who decides (there are disagreements on where road went within some communities/states)?

HOW - Are ALL alignments included, even abandoned ones?

HOW - What about alignments on private property? What is burden on these owners? Are there incentives for them?

HOW - Is unanimous approval required from all states?

HOW - What are the benefits of designation? Are there specific or known impacts on preservation and economic development?

HOW - Where does money for the NHT come from?

HOW - What precisely would the NPS funding be used for?

HOW - Will there be money for individual sites? Is there going to be anything under NHT for preservation comparable to CPP grants?

HOW - If there are to be no more grants, what are Cooperative Agreements and how do they work?

HOW - If we choose NHT, can Route 66 get funding from other sources?

HOW - What would the signs say/look like?

HOW - Rt66 is not generally seen as a "Trail", it ceased being a trail when it became a road in 1926.

HOW - Public education and marketing are needed to make broad definition of "trail" clear (i.e., "trail" can encompass more than just foot/wagon/horse trails.)

Route 66 being the first to commemorate the automobile age in the National Trail System is important.

HOW - Route 66 is constantly evolving – would NHT try to freeze time?

Relationships Between Existing Route 66 Organizations and the Proposed New Collaborative Route 66 Organization

In addition to the common feedback responses to the ideas/plans presented during the specific Activities included in the Collaboration Workshops, questions were asked by a number of workshop participants regarding what the relationship was between the National Historic Route 66 Federation, the Route 66 Alliance, the US 66 Highway Association, and the Route 66: The Road Ahead Alliance.

One of the responsibilities of the Route 66: The Road Ahead Steering Committee was to make a recommendation about whether the new national collaborative organization being discussed should be housed within an existing organization such as the National Historic Route 66 Federation or the Route 66 Alliance, or if a new organization should be created. The consensus among the steering committee members was that a new, fresh organization would be most effective. The main purpose of the new organization would be to create a collaborative forum to include and support all existing Route 66 nonprofits, including state associations, the Federation, the Alliance, the US Highway 66 Association, international Rt. 66 associations, and Native American tribal groups.

The new organization and the collaborative forum created by it will provide the opportunity for all existing organizations to come together, share information, develop resources, and leverage respective efforts, with each organization helping in those areas where it has the most expertise, experience, and resources. The Road Ahead Steering Committee, the Federation, the Alliance, and the US Highway 66 Association have developed this statement to clarify respective organizational goals and minimize confusion regarding the existence of multiple national organizations.

Accordingly, in answer to the question regarding the relationship between these several organizations: Under the umbrella of the original 1927 organization known as the U.S. 66 Highway Association formed by Cyrus Avery, the 501c(4) Route 66 Federation and the 501c(3) Route 66 Alliance will continue their previous work, while attempting to modify their roles respective to their non-profit statuses. The Alliance has shifted its focus to the development of (and fundraising for) the Route 66 Experience and interpretive center in Tulsa, Oklahoma. The Road Ahead Initiative will move forward with its efforts to establish a new organization designed to promote collaboration amongst all Route 66 Stakeholders. If and when goals and activities of any of these several organizations shift or change, there will be close dialogue between the Road Ahead, the Federation, the Alliance, and the US Highway 66 Association to make sure all respective efforts support each other.

Summary

In reading and reflecting upon this report, the Road Ahead Steering Committee invites you to envision a new national framework for collaboration along Route 66 that creates – for the first time ever – a single place where tourism officials, economic development professionals, members of state and national Route 66 associations, business persons, preservationists, educators, not-for-profits, and government officials work together to revitalize and renew Historic Route 66.

The process for achieving that vision is noted above, in the Mission Statement, Strategic Outcomes, Strategic Goals, and Organizational Structure approved and adopted by the Road Ahead Steering Committee, based on its review and analysis of feedback received from Route 66 stakeholders who participated in the Collaboration Workshops. With these foundational elements in place, several immediate next steps that need to be taken are also noted above.

The vision is clear: The creation of a new organization focused on promoting and facilitating collaboration amongst all Route 66 stakeholders. Everyone with an interest in and passion for Route 66 is invited to join this effort.

Addendum A

Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative Steering Committee Members

David Bricker, Deputy District Director, California Department of Transportation
John Conoboy, National Historic Trail Manager, National Park Service, retired
David Dunaway, University of New Mexico
Sharlene Fouser, Arizona Route 66 Association
Melvena Heisch, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office
Jim Hinckley, Owner/Author, Jim Hinckley's America
Cory Jobe, Deputy Director, Illinois Office of Tourism
Bill Kelly, Executive Director, Illinois Route 66 Scenic Byway Program
David Knudson, President, National Historic Route 66 Federation
Dan Lennon, Director, Missouri Division of Tourism
Kevin Mueller, Owner, Blue Swallow Motel
Tommy Pike, President, Route 66 Association of Missouri
Dan Rice, Executive Director, Route 66 Alliance
Bob Russell, Mayor, City of Pontiac, Illinois
Bill Thomas, Economic Development Director, Logan County, Illinois
Amy Webb, Field Director, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Rich Williams, Director, New Mexico Main Street Program
David Zimmerman, Historic Preservation Specialist, Arizona Department of Transportation

Kaisa Barthuli, Program Manager, NPS Route 66 Corridor Preservation Program, Ex. Officio Member
Aaron Mahr, Superintendent of the NPS National Trails Intermountain Region, Ex. Officio Member

Addendum B

Collaboration Workshops Raw Feedback

Hundreds of individual pieces of feedback were collected from the over 300+ Route 66 stakeholders who participated in the Collaboration Workshops.

Each individual piece of feedback can be viewed on the Route 66: The Road Ahead website. Access the following URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/66roadahead/>

Addendum C

Route 66: The Road Ahead Initiative Organizational Chart

