

Chapter 2:

Preservation Tools

Introduction

Heritage preservation at the University of Kansas can take various paths and will involve overlapping interests associated with notable sites, distinguished buildings and period landscape treatments. Effective, long-term campus historic preservation does not require an absolute approach that freezes the past. However, such preservation does seek to avoid historic campus sites, buildings and landscapes being interpreted and re-interpreted as ever-changing resources, which compromises campuswide qualities. If, for example, building changes for existing buildings regardless of historic heritage were interpreted in the materials and techniques of the time, wood windows would be updated with composite materials or metals; doors might be replaced with modern materials and interior finishes interpreted in the color schemes of the time. A similar effect happens with the treatment of campus sites and in the landscape. The cumulative effect would be less consistent historic context; eventually the point of historic reference for buildings, sites and landscapes could be lost. Contemporary preservation practice allows numerous approaches to stewarding historic resources that consider contemporary and future uses. In the example above, modern materials in a design suitable to the proportion and style of historic windows may be deemed appropriate. The goal with suitable preservation practice is to raise the consciousness of designers, planners and decision makers regarding historically associated elements of the physical campus.

An institutional commitment toward continuity and maintenance of the highest-quality features may require changes in process, but changes in the physical composition consistent with historic attributes are also possible. In fact, refreshing and rehabilitating certain campus features while remaining conscious of historic context is necessary for nearly all significant historic attributes, the best examples being the restoration of notable buildings and the replanting of landscapes. Historically appropriate management of sites associated with buildings and related circula-

tion and pedestrian paths or imbued with their own distinct qualities are perhaps most important on this campus, for reasons we will justify in this report. These sorts of challenges are associated with preservation on a dynamic campus.

To help readers understand the historic contexts, site analysis, treatment and policy recommendations in the chapters to follow, we explore the tools available to KU to preserve buildings and landscapes. They can range from basic stabilization of buildings to detailed Historic Structures Reports and the larger scale capital planning needed to implement recommended investments. KU also has the option to nominate individual sites, landscapes and buildings to the National Register of Historic Places or to pursue the nomination of larger historic districts. Each of these approaches provides opportunities, but with the National Register listing there are also required guidelines to meet in the treatment of properties. Fortunately, National Register Guidelines also allow for many approaches to managing campus resources over time, but require attention to relevant historic context and character defining features. Regardless of formal process, restoration and preservation represent on-going investments in the physical environment. In the case of KU, certain qualities are difficult to replicate and certainly some cannot be maintained or replaced without appropriate historically relevant treatments and a preservation process.

Analysis and Stewardship Tools in Campus Heritage Planning

This Campus Heritage Plan follows established historic preservation planning processes of creating, in order: historic contexts, historic resource inventories, treatment suggestions, development guidelines and policies for long-term investment, project review and maintenance of historic trees, buildings, roads and other assets.

In brief, “Historic Contexts” are accounts that explore a place’s history within its historical and geographic setting. For instance, the contexts in this report examine the historic campus’s place within broader social and historical themes, such as the Free State Movement, and 19th and early 20th century architectural and community planning principles.

This report examines these contexts as a means of determining the “Character-Defining Features” from each of the University’s Periods of Development. These features are drawn from “historic resource inventories” of sites, buildings and landscapes. The NPS guidelines define “Historic Character” and its defining qualities as the sum of all visual aspects, features, materials and spaces associated with a property’s history, including losses and later changes.

Once developed, our understanding of historic contexts helps to define the campus's character-defining features, such as the topography of Mount Oread and red-tile roofs. We can then develop "Treatments" or recommended actions to steward them. Grounded in a logical base of research building and site inventory, the treatments and supporting campus policies can be flexible. This report provides specific treatment recommendations related to historic landscapes. The treatment recommendations for buildings are based on state and federal standards. More specific treatment recommendations for individual buildings will require additional study in the form of Historic Structures Reports (see "Recommendations"). For more information on this process, see "Preservation Planning" in Appendix G.

The Standards and Guidelines for Preservation/Stewardship Projects

Although America's historic preservation movement began with 19th century attempts to "save" George Washington's home at Mount Vernon, preservation laws and methods were not codified until the 1960's with the passage of the Historic Preservation Act. This act directed preservation oversight by the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service and provided for the creation of universal standards and guidelines.

These include the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Protection, Stabilization, Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction. The intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features. The Standards pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes and occupancy and encompass the exterior and interior of the buildings. They also encompass related landscape features and the building's site and environment, as well as adjacent or related new construction.

In addition to the national standards, the State of Kansas has developed the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on the Environs. Environs review is meant to protect individual historic properties and is not designed to be a holistic preservation planning or design-review tool. Projects are reviewed only for their impact on individually listed resources and associated environs. This uniquely Kansan term and process of environs review will be further explained in this and subsequent chapters.

Emerging Tools for Stewarding Historic Landscapes

Historic Landscape Preservation is a much newer field that examines landscapes ranging from formally designed estates and campuses such as KU to historic farmsteads, windbreaks and park plans. The Campus Heritage Plan is comprehensive in that it looks to sites, buildings and campus landscapes as an integrated whole based on qualities associated with the historic development of sites. It is one of the first heritage preservation plans for a large American university to take such an inclusive view.

Many of the following definitions and texts are drawn from national standards developed by the National Park Service. These include the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, published in 1976, and *Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*, published in 1996. The complete *Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* are available online at http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/hli/landscape_guidelines/. Likewise, the *Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* can be found online at <http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/TPS/tax/rhb/stand.htm>.

Because of this project's pioneering scope and the still emerging understanding of historic landscape preservation, there is room for flexibility and differing tools for the "treatment" and stewardship of landscapes. With several decades of precedents, the application of federal standards to buildings is now fairly defined with specific materials and procedures identified.

By contrast, historic landscapes are living settings that reflect an ecological process. They inevitably age over time and require different kinds of stewardship such as tree-pruning, scheduled replanting, soil aeration and removal of invasive species of plants. But a campus such as KU's provides opportunities to improve the public safety of landscapes, their ecological function and the natural habitats they offer. We can incorporate new knowledge about site design and sustainable planning while preserving their character-defining features. On the next page are definitions of the categories by which this study, following NPS procedures, will study KU's historic landscape character and make stewardship recommendations.

Preservation Planning Related to Cultural Landscapes

Careful planning prior to treatment can help prevent irrevocable damage to a cultural landscape. In an expanded interpretation for purposes of the work on this Getty Grant, we have interpreted the KU campus as a cultural location integrating contributing sites, buildings and landscapes. Professional techniques for identifying, documenting and treating cultural landscapes have advanced over the past 25 years and are continually being refined.

As described in the National Park Service publication Preservation Brief #36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes, the preservation planning process for cultural landscapes should involve: historical research; inventory and documentation of existing conditions; site analysis and evaluation of integrity and significance; development of a cultural landscape preservation approach and treatment plan; development of a cultural landscape management plan and management philosophy; development of a strategy for ongoing maintenance; and preparation of a record of treatment and future research recommendations.

In all treatments for cultural landscapes, the following general recommendations and comments apply:

Before undertaking project work, research of a cultural landscape is essential. Research findings help to identify a landscape's historic period(s) of ownership, occupancy and development, and bring greater understanding of the associations that make them significant. Research findings also provide a foundation to make educated decisions for project treatment, and can guide management, maintenance and interpretation. In addition, research findings may be useful in satisfying compliance reviews (e.g. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as amended).

Although there is no single way to inventory a landscape, the goal of documentation is to provide a record of the landscape as it exists at the present time, thus providing a baseline from which to operate. All component landscapes and features that contribute to the landscape's historic character should be recorded.

The level of documentation needed depends on the nature and the significance of the resource. For example, plant material documentation may ideally include botanical name or species, common name and size. To ensure full representation of existing herbaceous plants, care should be taken to document the landscape in different seasons.

Assessing a landscape as a continuum through history is critical in assessing cultural and historic value. By analyzing the landscape, change over time — the chronological and physical “layers” of the landscape — can be understood. Based on analysis, individual features may be attributed to a discrete period of introduction, their presence or absence substantiated to a given date, and therefore the landscape’s significance and integrity evaluated. In addition, analysis allows the property to be viewed within the context of other cultural landscapes.

For the landscape to be considered significant, character-defining features that convey its significance in history must not only be present, but they also must possess historic integrity. Location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association should be considered in determining whether a landscape and its character-defining features possess historic integrity.

Preservation planning for cultural landscapes involves a broad array of dynamic variables. Adopting comprehensive treatment and management plans, in concert with a preservation maintenance strategy, acknowledges a cultural landscape’s ever-changing nature and the interrelationship of treatment, management and maintenance.

DEFINING LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

The following are elements defined by the National Park Service that contribute to the historic character of historic landscapes. These are as follows:

Spatial Organization and Land Patterns

This includes the three-dimensional organization and patterns of spaces in a landscape, like the arrangement of rooms in a house. Spatial organization is created by the landscape’s cultural and natural features, some of which form visual links or barriers (such as fences and hedgerows); others create spaces and visual connections in the landscape (such as topography and open water).

Topography

The shape of the ground plane and its height or depth is a character-defining feature of the landscape. Topography may occur naturally or as a result of human manipulation.

Vegetation

Features that may be individual plants, as in the case of a specimen tree, or groups of plants such as a hedge, allee, agricultural field, planting bed or a naturally occurring plant community or habitat. Vegetation includes evergreen or deciduous trees, shrubs and ground covers, and both woody and herbaceous plants. Vegetation may derive its significance from historical associations, hor-

ticultural or genetic value, or aesthetic or functional qualities. It is a primary dynamic component of the landscape's character; therefore, the treatment of cultural landscapes must recognize the continual process of germination, growth, seasonal change, aging, decay and death of plants. The character of individual plants is derived from habitat, form, color, texture, bloom, fruit, fragrance, scale and context.

Circulation

Features may include roads, parkways, drives, trails, walks, paths, parking areas and canals. Such features may occur individually or be linked to form networks or systems. The character of circulation features is defined by factors such as alignment, width, surface and edge treatment, grade, materials and infrastructure.

Structures, Site Furnishings, Objects

These elements may contribute to a landscape's significance and historic character. Structures are non-habitable, constructed features, unlike buildings, which have walls and roofs and are generally habitable. Structures may be significant individually or they may simply contribute to the historic character of the landscape. They may include walls, terraces, arbors, gazebos, follies, tennis courts, playground equipment, greenhouses, steps, bridges and dams.

Water Features

Water features may be aesthetic as well as functional components of the landscape. They may be linked to the natural hydrologic system or may be fed artificially; their associated water supply, drainage and mechanical systems are important components.

For a more detailed account of these elements, see Appendix E.

Tools and Pathways to Stewarding KU's Historic Character

There are many treatment options and tools to preserve the character of the buildings and sites on the campus while allowing new programs and growth. Although treatment strategies for buildings and landscapes may differ in terms of specific actions (such as masonry repointing versus annual tree trimming), their general philosophies are shared.

Below are general treatment approaches as defined by the National Park Service. Each can be applied as appropriate for a building or landscape. A single approach need not be used for the entire campus or even a single area of campus. They can be tailored to projects at a much finer scale, as long as National Park Service guidelines are followed. These guidelines will be discussed in-depth later in this report.

The important message is that historic preservation can be flexible. Taken as a whole, these "treatments" represent a toolkit of approaches for facilitating change while preserving the character of KU's historic buildings and landscapes:

Preservation is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity and materials of a historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction.

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural or architectural values.

Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

Reconstruction is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

Oversight for Campus Stewardship

The Campus Historic Preservation Board (CHPB) fulfills an important statutory obligation at the University of Kansas. However, because of its legal obligations to remain objective, the University should consider establishing a separate committee to assist with additional stewardship responsibilities. This committee would be charged with leading or guiding future campus preservation efforts.

For example, this Campus Heritage Plan is a living and updateable document. It must be periodically reviewed and updated to reflect the changes to the campus that will occur over time. In addition, the committee could lead future initiatives to modify the definitions of the environs of the individually listed property or lead the effort to create a campus historic district with an appropriate environs definition. With KU's strong alumni network and Endowment Association, the committee might be charged with raising gifts and/or applying for grants that can be used to further develop the preservation initiatives on campus.

The Regulatory Tools of State and National Register Listing

It was during the nation's bicentennial that many states began to evaluate what important historic resources still remained. Kansas was no exception. In 1977 the Kansas legislature enacted the State Historic Preservation Act (K.S.A. 75-2715 through K.S.A. 75-2725). The state historic preservation law declared historic preservation to be public policy and in the public interest for the state to engage in a comprehensive program of historic preservation.

The State Historic Preservation Act mandates that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) review projects for their potential impact on State or

National Register listed properties and their environs. (The process for reviewing projects is discussed in detail in Appendix C.) The statute also enables the SHPO to sign agreements with communities and universities to act on its behalf in these reviews. At KU, the Campus Historic Preservation Board (CHPB) conducts these reviews.

While the State of Kansas may appear to be an unlikely location for innovative historic preservation legislation to occur, Kansas has had the foresight to engage in what many states have not yet become involved with — the protection of the “environs” of those properties listed on the State or National Registers of historic places. As part of the State preservation statute, the notion of environs assumes that the immediate area around historic properties affects their integrity. Thus, a listed building also entails review of changes to roads, sidewalks and other site features nearby. A 1988 amendment to the law further defined the protection of the “environs” of historic properties, requiring that the SHPO or its agent receive notice of any proposed project within 500 feet of a listed historic property. The proposed distance, while somewhat arbitrary, established a reasonable notification boundary. Therefore, the law requires that the CHPB not only be notified of and review projects that affect the listed historic property, but also those projects that lie within 500 feet of any of the campus’s five individually listed buildings.

It is important to note that the CHPB’s role is to provide advice to the State of Kansas; it does not have the authority to stop projects that might harm a listed historic property or its environs. However, if the CHPB determines the proposed project will encroach upon, damage or destroy the listed historic property or its environs, the Governor of Kansas is required to determine there are no feasible or prudent alternatives and that all possible planning has been undertaken to minimize harm before the project is allowed to proceed.

The Register of Historic Kansas Places

In Kansas, all properties that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places are also listed on the Register of Historic Kansas Places (state register). There are also some properties that are listed only on the state register, which the state historic preservation statute established in 1977. Although National Register listing does not generally provide protection for historic properties, except in cases of federally funded or federally permitted projects, the state preservation statute offers protection for register-listed properties.

Many see the regulatory tools associated with register listing as a positive preservation planning tool while others see it as impeding the potential for change. However, such tools provide the University of Kansas the opportunity to review and discuss the value of projects that might negatively affect listed historic properties or their environs before they proceed. Decisions are based on whether it is in the University’s best interest to proceed with the project or whether there are opportunities to revise the proposed project so less harm results. These sorts of deliberations will only benefit from the body of work provided by the Getty Grant and on-going discussions.

The National Register of Historic Places as a Preservation Tool

With the possible application of tax credits for investment and national recognition, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) can be an important planning tool for KU. The NRHP is the roster of more than 80,000 of the nation's cultural resources deemed by the National Park Service to be worthy of preservation. The register includes districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects that are significant in the areas of history, architecture, engineering, archeology and culture. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA – 1966) established the National Register program and put forth criteria for eligibility.

To qualify for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, a property must meet two overriding criteria. First, it must generally be at least 50 years old. Secondly, it must retain integrity — the features that portray the property's historic significance. In addition, eligible properties must meet one of four additional criteria:

Criterion A – Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (historical significance); or

Criterion B – Association with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

Criterion C – Embodiment of distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (architectural significance); or

Criterion D – That have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history (usually reserved for archeological sites).

Some historic properties (buildings, landscapes, sites, objects) are designated individually. In order to be eligible for individual listing on the National Register of Historic Places, a building must retain integrity on both its exterior and interior. There are currently five KU buildings that are individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. This study has identified an additional 14 buildings as potentially eligible for individual National Register listing.

Historic Districts as a Preservation Tool

Historic properties may also be listed on the NRHP as part of historic districts — collections of buildings, landscapes, sites and objects that fall within a designated geographic area. This scale of planning is especially relevant for KU's interwoven fabric of historic buildings and landscapes.

Depending upon their age and integrity, features within a historic district are identified as either “contributors” or “non-contributors” to historic districts. Contributing elements can include buildings, landscapes (such as Marvin Grove), objects and structures. Only those features that are designated as contributors to a district will qualify for preservation funding through the rehabilitation tax

credit and other grant programs. Whereas individual listing requires both exterior and interior integrity, historic districts generally focus on building exteriors at the time of listing. Because features within historic districts are evaluated based upon their contribution to the whole, buildings or features that may not be eligible for individual listing may qualify for listing as contributors to historic districts.

Communities often pursue historic district nomination of core neighborhoods and downtowns as economic development tools — ways to qualify the maximum number of historic buildings for preservation funding (see “Tax Credits” below) and to streamline the design-review process. This study has identified 11 KU buildings that would not be individually eligible for listing but could be designated as contributors to a historic district. Such a listing would help streamline state preservation statute project review by treating the campus holistically rather than using a piecemeal approach prescribed for a collection of individual buildings and their environs (see below).

National Register nominations, for individual properties or districts, include narrative architectural descriptions and narrative histories, known as “statements of significance.” For historic districts, an architectural description and history of each building is provided, in addition to a historic context for the district. The historic context provided in this report could serve as a jumping-off point for a historic district nomination.

The Financial Benefits of State and National Register Listing

Kansas has developed some of the nation’s most progressive tools for historic preservation. Among these is the state rehabilitation tax credit program. Properties that are listed individually or as contributors to a State or National Register-listed historic district are eligible for the program, which is administered by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The state rehabilitation tax credit program provides income tax credits equal to 25% of qualified rehabilitation expenditures on qualified historic structures.

Because the tax credits are transferable, they apply to projects on non-income-producing properties — or projects undertaken by non-income-producing entities. The Kansas Department of Revenue has ruled that historic university buildings, such as those found on the KU campus, qualify for the program. If, as in the case of the University of Kansas, the owner has no state tax liability, it may transfer or sell the credits by requesting a transfer from the SHPO. As discussed above, historic district listing will qualify the most KU buildings for this generous funding program.

The state rehabilitation tax credit program is discussed in further detail in Appendix C.

Working with the Kansas Preservation Statute and “Environs”

As noted above, one of the obligations of listing properties on the NRHP and the Register of Historic Kansas Places is the uniquely Kansan concept:

“environs.” As part of the state preservation statute, this concept assumes that the immediate area around historic properties affects their integrity.

The University is required by law to notify the Campus Heritage Preservation Board (CHPB) whenever it plans on undertaking a project within 500 feet of the five buildings currently listed on the State or National Registers of historic places. These projects range from small projects such as the repair or replacement of sidewalks, to much larger projects that might involve the construction of new buildings or site features. Whether small or large, the CHPB is responsible for determining whether the proposed project encroaches upon, damages or destroys the listed historic property or its environs. The CHPB uses the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs, developed by the Kansas State Historic Preservation Office, to determine the effect of the proposed project. However, the Standards and guidelines do not provide the CHPB with the information necessary to determine whether the area or location where the project is proposed is actually a part of the “environs” of the listed property or whether it is affecting an element that is considered a character-defining feature of the historic property’s environs.

Because of this, the CHPB may spend a great deal of its time reviewing projects that are insignificant or do not affect the environs of the listed property. Just as significant, the CHPB may not be notified of projects that fall outside of the 500-foot notification boundary but are truly a part of the listed historic property’s environs. This Campus Heritage Plan includes a proposal to aid KU’s CHPB in reviewing the environs impact of projects. It is recommended that by providing clear definitions of each listed building’s environs that embrace not only the mandated 500-foot notification boundary, but also important views into and out from the building, a more relevant and effective review can be achieved.

Establishing the “viewsheds” and related contributing sites for each listed historic building on the campus begins to clarify and define the important relationships within the campus setting. The viewshed concept is extremely relevant when taking into account KU’s topography. While the viewshed begins to more accurately define the boundary of the environs for each listed building, it is only the first step. Once established, the next step is to define the character-defining features and site contribution within the viewsheds. This includes identifying surrounding buildings, landscapes and site features that create the environs. With its strong emphasis on KU’s historic sites and landscapes, this study pioneers a more comprehensive and clearer set of standards for review of the landscapes within environs and other historic areas of campus. Besides KU’s five NRHP listed buildings, this study examines potentially eligible buildings and landscapes for inclusion on the National Register, either individually or as historic districts. Campus landscapes are analyzed with “Treatment Zones,” roughly 15 areas determined by similarity of history and current use.

This type of information can be invaluable to members of the CHPB who may not fully understand the history of the campus development or the important character-defining features of the KU campus. The CHPB can then apply the standards and guidelines in an appropriate manner.

Of course, preservation standards, like much of law, are open to interpretation.

From much of the campus, one can see across broad river valleys and downtown Lawrence. Because not all of these areas can be addressed, effective preservation decision-making at KU should be based on reasoned judgments, priority setting and the determination of the most important character-defining features from each of the campus's Periods of Development that merit stewardship.

Considerations for a Historic District

An analysis of the 500-foot notification boundary around the five listed buildings reveals that a large portion of the campus falls under the review of the CHPB. However, with the current limitations of an environs review noted above, there are significant challenges for completing the reviews in a relevant and effective manner. While the option noted above for defining the environs of each individual property is a step in the right direction, a more appropriate preservation planning tool would be to establish a historic district.

A historic district nomination would assist the CHPB in completing its reviews by clearly defining the contributing and non-contributing features within the district. The district nomination would fully integrate the historic buildings and landscapes in a way the "environs" review process cannot. And finally, the establishment of a historic district would allow the University to participate in financial assistance programs such as the state preservation tax incentives program.

Frequently Used Preservation Terms

Campus Historic Preservation Board (CHPB) — The KU board responsible for carrying out reviews in accordance with the state preservation statute. This board acts as an agent of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and is required to meet certain professional qualifications identified in an agreement with the SHPO.

Character-defining feature — A prominent or distinctive aspect, quality or characteristic of a cultural landscape that contributes significantly to its physical character. Land use patterns, vegetation, furnishings, decorative details and materials may be such features.

Component landscape — A discrete portion of the landscape that can be further subdivided into individual features. The landscape unit may contribute to the significance of a National Register property, such as a farmstead in a rural historic district. In some cases, the landscape unit may be individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, such as a rose garden in a large urban park.

Contributing Feature — Building, structure or feature in historic district that has historic, architectural, cultural or archeological significance.

Cultural landscape — A geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein) associated with a historic event, activity or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are

four general types of cultural landscapes, not mutually exclusive: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes and ethnographic landscapes.

Cultural Resources — Sites, structures, buildings, landscapes, or features that are significant to a culture or community.

Ethnographic landscape — A landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources. Examples are contemporary settlements, sacred religious sites and massive geological structures. Small plant communities, animals, and subsistence and ceremonial grounds are often components.

Feature — The smallest element(s) of a landscape that contributes to the significance and that can be the subject of a treatment intervention. Examples include a woodlot, hedge, lawn, specimen plant, alley, house, meadow or open field, fence, wall, earthwork, pond or pool, bollard, orchard or agricultural terrace.

Historic designed landscape — A landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, engineer or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition. The landscape may be associated with a significant person, trend, or event in landscape architecture; or illustrate an important development in the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Aesthetic values play a significant role in designed landscapes. Examples include parks, campuses and estates.

Historic district — An area that generally includes within its boundaries a significant concentration of properties linked by architectural style, historical development, or a past event.

Historic vernacular landscape — A landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped it. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, a family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological and cultural character of everyday lives. Function plays a significant role in vernacular landscapes. This can be a farm complex or a district of historic farmsteads along a river valley. Examples include rural historic districts and agricultural landscapes.

Historic site — A landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity or person. Examples include battlefields and presidential homes and properties.

Kansas State Historic Preservation Statute — State law establishing the Register of Historic Kansas Places and establishing a process for review of projects affecting listed properties and their environs (KSA-75-2715 to 75-2726).

Integrity — The authenticity of a property's historic identity, evinced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic or prehistoric period. The seven qualities of integrity as defined by the National Register Program are location, setting, feeling, association, design, workmanship and materials.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) – Federal law establishing national historic preservation policy, creating the National Register of Historic Places and establishing a process for review of federally funded and federally permitted projects for their effect on historic properties.

National Register of Historic Places — Official inventory of “districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture.” (16 U.S.C. § 470a/36 C.F.R. Part 60)

Significance — The meaning or value ascribed to a cultural landscape based on the National Register criteria for evaluation. It normally stems from a combination of association and integrity.

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) — A state office designated by the National Historic Preservation Act that assists the National Park Service in carrying out the nation’s historic preservation programs, including the National Register of Historic Places and related protections for historic properties. In Kansas, the SHPO is located at the Kansas State Historical Society.

Treatment — Work carried out to achieve a particular historic preservation goal.

Environs review — Meant to protect individual historic properties. It was not designed to be a holistic preservation planning or design-review tool. Projects are reviewed only for their impact on individually listed resources. Because only those projects within 500 feet of listed buildings are reviewed, this approach to campus preservation is arbitrary.