

Master Plan Committee (MPC)

January 25, 2021, Virtual on Microsoft Teams

Participants: Dave Bradford, Fred, Haberecht, Shelly Carroll, Tracey Abel, Tim Kemp, Jennifer Wright, Mari Strombom, Mike Rush, Mary Pedersen, David Hansen, Steve Cottingham, Tom Satterly, Nick Christiansen, Jessica Kramer, Jan Nerger, Leslie Taylor, Tom Biedscheid, Kristi Buffington

Introduction for New Members - Primary Purpose of MPC

1. Facilities Management facilitates two university committees that relate to each other, dealing with campus development – Master Plan Committee and Physical Development Committee (PDC).
2. MPC is primarily strategic in its charge, focusing on the highest best use of campus facilities from a development perspective and from the perspective of the university's mission. It is focused on the future and is long-range in its planning.
3. PDC is tactical in nature, dealing primarily in the campus experience through the perspective of the day to day campus experiences. It is forward looking to the extent of how the campus experience plays out, and considers items such as:
 - a. Signage and wayfinding as they affect the campus experience
 - b. Naming of buildings
 - c. Transit system from the perspective of how it serves campus on a day-to-day basis
4. Both committees are making an effort to take an inclusive decision-making perspective, by considering the following guidance from the Office of the Vice President for Diversity (<https://diversity.colostate.edu/notes-from-the-vpd-qa-how-leaders-can-take-action-to-advance-equity/>), and consistently asking questions, such as:
 - a. "When we are doing things, who benefits from how we do this?"
 - b. "Who is not being served by how we do this?"
 - c. "Who have we not considered in our process of putting this together?"
 - d. "What do we need to do to create an inclusive culture?"
 - e. "What barriers exist for others that we can remove?"
 - i. For the MPC, let's consider: is anyone being left out of the decision-making process that we should include? Is it the highest best use for whom? Are all voices being heard? Is this an inclusive environment that we are creating?

Historical Monuments & Historic Building Review Board

1. Introduction
 - a. Historic review relates to the highest best use of sites. It is a value judgement to decide what is highest best use of a building site that is designated as historic.
 - b. In the next era of CSU campus development there will be far more redevelopment, which will have impact on historic buildings.
 - i. Specifically, bldgs. over 50 years old, which are considered historic.
 - ii. At CSU, largely 35% of our bldg. stock is midcentury modern.
 - c. The current historic review is governed by an MOU between the state historical society and CSU.
2. Historic Building Review Board MOU and Additional Items for Historic Review

- a. CSU has 13 bldgs. on the national or state historic registers, along with the Ramsey Koenig Ranch at the Mountain campus
 - i. Former Fort Collins High School (now the University Center for the Arts) is a local landmark without the official designations of the registers (it is a City of Fort Collins Historic Landmark).
 - ii. In the 90s the state established a state historic register in statute. There was a lot of activity on campus to get buildings on the registers. Projects affecting buildings on the register were supposed to be reviewed by the Colorado Historical Society.
- b. Approval requested – To update MOU.
 - i. MOU between Colorado Historical Society and CSU in 1995, and has not been updated. The current structure outlined in the MOU is inefficient and narrow in focus in that it only addresses designated buildings. It is not a good tool to assist in the stewardship of CSU’s historic bldgs. and has not formally been activated in almost a decade.
- c. Approval requested – To change the membership of the Historic Building Review Board (HBRB) to the Design Review Committee (DRC) with several additional members. Receive MPC feedback on if this sounds like the right set of people. Are there other depts to reach out to?
 - i. Current MOU lists membership of Historic Building Review Board that includes many outside entities, including Fort Collins Landmark Preservation, the Board of Governors, student representation, in addition to Facilities.
 - ii. In the absence of the Historic Building Review Board, the Design Review Committee (DRC) has functioned by default to review several projects in bldgs. that are officially registered.
 - iii. This action would streamline HBRB membership while still being inclusive, keeping it internal to CSU. Proposal to include current DRC members:
 - 1) University Architect
 - 2) University Planner
 - 3) University Landscape Architect
 - 4) Environmental Graphics Designer/Inclusive Physical and Virtual Campus Committee Representative
 - 5) Staff Architect
 - 6) Remodel and Construction Services Design Representative
 - 7) Assistant Director for Engineering and Capital Construction
 - iv. And add representation as follows:
 - 1) Representative from CSU Department of Construction Management
 - 2) Representative from CSU Department of Design and Merchandising (Interior Architecture and Design)
 - 3) Representative from CSU Department of History
- d. Introduction to how the Design Review Committee functions/role in project development:
 - i. Design Review Committee primarily meets twice a month while the current Historic Building Review Board has not met in over a decade.

- ii. Design Review Committee weighs in on projects during different phases of design development, including schematic design and construction documents, and attempts to review at conceptual design. Offers recommendations that are aligned with CSU standards and aesthetics, so the campus can function with a sense of continuity from a design perspective.
- iii. This group could weigh in on historically significant elements external to or internal to the building's modification to make sure we are doing the right thing on behalf of the university for the long-term future.
- iv. Examples of internal modifications that the Historic Building Review Board may review:
 - 1) Removing a fireplace in a residence hall
 - 2) Ammons hall is an example of a historic bldg., which has the historic fabric that continues from the outside of the bldg. to the inside; there are features of the bldg. that are historic like the fountain, which have been adaptatively renovated and have been able to maintain overtime because of the historical significance.
- e. Shelly Carroll has been in dialogue with History Colorado (the renamed version of the Colorado Historical Society) to update the MOU; their comments have been incorporated and they are ready to sign.
 - i. As exterior modifications to historic buildings and demolitions to buildings on the register come up for review, those recommendations would come from the Historic Building Review Board to the Master Plan Committee and would be up to Master Plan Committee to approve.
 - ii. In the instance of a dispute, state statute says the governor has final authority.
- f. Approval requested – Recommendation to unofficially treat additional buildings on the Oval, those of Midcentury Modern and International styles (1950-1975) as if they are on the register and subject to HBRB review.
 - i. OVAL
 - 1) TILT
 - 2) Louis Weber Building
 - 3) Industrial Sciences Lab
 - 4) Sage Hall
 - 5) Occupational Therapy
 - 6) Heating Plant
 - 7) Alder Hall
 - 8) Glenn Morris Field House
 - 9) Student Services
 - 10) Centennial Hall
 - 11) Johnson Hall
 - 12) Administration
 - ii. Midcentury Modern or International – designed by James Hunter or Lamar Kelsey.
 - 1) Palmer Center
 - 2) Westfall Hall

- 3) Durrell Center
- 4) Durward Hall
- 5) Corbett Hall
- 6) Parmelee Hall
- 7) Allison Hall
- 8) Ingersoll Hall
- 9) Edwards Hall
- 10) Newsom Hall
- 11) Braiden Hall
- 12) Hartshorn
- 13) Moby Complex
- 14) Lory Student Center
- 15) LSC Theater
- 16) Engineering building
- 17) Danforth Chapel
- 18) WCNR
- 19) Morgan Library
- 20) Andrew Clark building
- 21) Plant Sciences
- 22) National Center for Genetic Resources
- 23) Plant Growth Facilities – University Greenhouses
- 24) Animal Sciences
- 25) Eddy Hall
- 26) Education building
- 27) Physiology building

g. Approval requested – To add monuments of historic significance to the HBRB purview, if the monuments need to be relocated.

- i. Pioneer Memorial (Old Main Drive)
- ii. Class of 1907 Memorial (Old Main Drive)
- iii. Jessie Harris Spring Memorial (Old Main Drive)
- iv. "Mama" cow Marker (Animal Sciences Buildings)
- v. University Park Plaque (1917) (West of LSC)
- vi. Living Spruce Plaque (1910) (West of LSC Theater)
- vii. Sherwood Forest Plaque (1930s) (Sherwood Forest)

h. Discussion

- i. Leslie Taylor recommends including an individual with an inclusivity/diversity background to the proposed group in addition to the representative from the Inclusive Physical and Virtual Committee. This person would contribute the perspective from a cultural and historical inclusivity/diversity standpoint while the person from the Inclusive Physical and Virtual Committee would represent more of a physical development inclusivity standpoint. There will be more instances as we move forward when there will be items of a historic nature due to diversity, inclusion, or multiculturalism – and sometimes this is forgotten when talking about historic preservation.

- ii. Steve Cottingham asks us to consider the whole Oval area to be designated as a historic district – not just the particular bldgs. but including features like the landscaping. It would not necessarily be a formal designation, but would treat it with historic significance as we are suggesting for the additional buildings and historical monuments.
 - 1) Mike Rush adds that designating it with historical significance gives us latitude in how we approach things in the future, while keeping the formal designation at bay.
 - 2) Fred Haberecht agrees that we generally are receptive to that and we do treat it today as a historic district but to change our language about it could be helpful.
 - 3) Fred and Mike share that these decisions are impactful to character of university and to how the university grows, and we're trying to be good stewards of the university not just for today but for a century from now. Campus is more unified and cohesive because of our acknowledgment of the midcentury modern bldgs.
- iii. Tracey Abel suggests that an alum could sit on the HBRB because of their experience in the halls and because of how many mid-century modern buildings are residence halls. It could be open to someone who has an interest in midcentury modern buildings.
 - 1) Fred Haberecht asks if it could be someone like Gordon (Hap) Hazard.
 - 2) Mike Rush replies that Hap would be an ideal candidate, a good resource.
 - 3) Fred adds that it would be from the perspective of what is historically important to campus through its arc of time.
 - 4) Mari Strombom writes in Teams chat, "Hap used to work for us in HDS (Conference Services) so that works well."
 - 5) Possibly reach out to Alumni Center/Kristi Bohlender for a recommendation.
- iv. David Hansen mentions that this list fails to recognize the Early Childhood Center, which is a standalone building off campus, and that evolves into a greater conversation about how to overlay with City processes.
 - 1) Fred Haberecht says, for this list, we concentrated on bldgs. within core campus, but David points out that there are bldgs. outside of the key annexation/core campus, that could be part of this, and we should be open to adding bldgs. over time. Don't need to determine all of that today.
- v. Jennifer Wright asks in Teams chat, "What is the current process for relocating monuments of historic significance? Will this process be changed with the proposal of relocating the monuments listed?"
 - 1) There was no process to begin with. To Fred's knowledge, there has only been one monument that has been relocated – the "Mama" cow (the lead milk producer in the nation) monument, which was at the Livestock Pavilion and was moved to the northside of the Animal Science bldg. The process used was to be as inclusive as possible when reaching out to College of Ag. Dept head verified there were no actual bones at the original monument.

- 2) Moving forward, Fred Haberecht says we would like this process to involve the HBRB rather than doing it administratively.
- 3) Jennifer Wright comments that there are history tours given on campus. They use the markers and where they are currently located to tell the story of CSU. If proposed to move, it would be helpful to let them know so they can rearrange the tours or story-tell in a different way.
- 4) Fred reiterates this idea, by asking the committee to consider how these monuments may be important to telling the story and as part of the campus experience, and how adding this in can allow the committee to have an extra level of control over them.
- 5) Jennifer Wright agrees the markers are helpful in the locations where they are currently at and they share historical pictures on the tour as well.
- vi. For the recommended list of buildings to add, Kristi Buffington points out in Teams chat that “National Center for Genetic Resources is not our building and it not on our land.”
- vii. **Action Item (Julia):** Mike Rush asks that we make this information (MOU, presentation) available to MPC in case anyone wants to review in more depth.
- i. Motion to approve modifications to MOU with History Colorado and approve additional buildings and historic monuments for review by HBRB. Also, adding an additional member to speak to inclusivity and diversity objectives, as well as an alum, within the Historic Building Review Board (which will be a subset of the Design Review Committee).
 - i. Steve Cottingham moves to adopt with amendments.
 - ii. Mari Strombom seconds the motion.
 - iii. Motion passed with no objections noted.
 - 1) Jan Nerger asks in Teams chat, “Do we have a quorum?” Approved contingent on quorum via email, providing more time for comment if needed.

MPC email sent on Mon 2/1/2021 10:58 AM by Julia Innes to the Master Plan Committee:

Dear Master Plan Committee,

There were a handful of MPC members that were unable to attend last week's meeting. **Please find the current and the updated MOU attached, along with the presentation to the group and the minutes of the meeting.**

The people who attended MPC voted to approve the following:

- 1. Motion to approve modifications to MOU with History Colorado and approve additional buildings and historic monuments for review by HBRB. Also, adding an additional member to speak to inclusivity and diversity objectives, as well as an alum, within the Historic Building Review Board (which will be a subset of the Design Review Committee).
 - a. Steve Cottingham moves to adopt with amendments.

- b. Mari Strombom seconds the motion.
- c. Motion passed with no objections noted.
 - i. Jan Neger asks in Teams chat, "Do we have a quorum?" Approved contingent on quorum via email, providing more time for comment if needed.

If you would like to weigh in, please take time to review the item up for approval and provide any further comment, questions, or concerns by 5 p.m. on Friday, 2/5.

If you attended the meeting, but don't see your name on the list of participants, please just let me know and I will add your name prior to finalizing the minutes and posting to the web. Thanks!

AGENDA ITEM APPROVED: No objections or concerns received via email.