
4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TREATMENT & USE

Following the Identification and Evaluation of Cultural Resources, decisions must be made concerning the treatment and use of these resources for the purposes of the Physical Master Plan. Because the Master Plan Process requires the balancing of numerous objectives, of which historic preservation is but one, Recommendations for Treatment & Use must outline an implementation strategy and consider priorities for the management of campus cultural resources.

4.1 CATEGORIZATION OF HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE AND LANDSCAPE RESOURCES

As decisions are made regarding the current and future use of buildings and landscapes, there will be diverse perspectives as to the significance, utility, function and worth of any given resource. While all resources that pass the test of the Georgia/National Register criteria are considered historic, they may not all be equally valued by the Institution or the Board of Regents.

The Institution is responsible for managing and considering the effects on all properties that are eligible for the GNRHP, but they are not required to maintain these buildings, landscapes, or sites in museum-quality condition, nor necessarily keep every such resource standing or intact. It is up to the individual Institutions in consultation with the BOR and HPD to decide how their cultural resources are managed within the requirements of applicable legislation and policy.

- *For more information on the management of cultural resources and Campus Master Plan implementation considerations, refer to Part II Process Guidelines, Section 2.7.*

To account for the other variables affecting a Physical Master Plan, the following Preservation Categories are used to distinguish the resources most significant to the definition and character of the Institution. All identified resources should be categorized accordingly.

4.1.1 CATEGORY I – LONG-TERM PRESERVATION

Buildings and landscapes that are worthy of long-term preservation and investment because they possess high integrity and meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Possess central importance in defining or maintaining the historic, architectural, natural, or cultural character of the Institution.
- Possess outstanding architectural, engineering, artistic, or landscape architectural characteristics.
- Possess importance to the interpretation of history, development, or tradition of the Institution.
- Have considerable potential for continued or adaptive reuse.
- Are otherwise highly valued by the Institution.

Buildings and landscapes falling under Category I should implement the following project-level procedures:

1. Nomination to Georgia/National Register of Historic Places
2. Develop Resource-Specific Preservation Maintenance Plan
3. Preservation and Rehabilitation through BOR Capital Program

4.1.2 *CATEGORY II – CONSIDERATION FOR LONG-TERM PRESERVATION*

All remaining identified historic buildings and landscapes fall under Category II. Buildings and landscapes that possess integrity, continuing or adaptive use potential, or other value to merit consideration for long-term preservation, but that do not meet the criteria for assignment to Category I. Examples of Category II resources have the following characteristics.

- Have historical or aesthetic value, but are not central to defining or maintaining the character of the Institution.
- Are good, but not outstanding examples of architectural styles, engineering methods, artistic values or landscape architecture.
- Can contribute to the interpretation of the history, development or tradition of the Institution but that are not necessary to that interpretation.
- Have some potential for continued or adaptive reuse.

Buildings and landscapes falling under Category I should implement the following project-level procedures as appropriate:

1. Nomination to Georgia/National Register of Historic Places
2. Develop Resource-Specific Preservation Maintenance Plan
3. Preservation and Rehabilitation through BOR Capital Program

4.2 TREATMENT OF HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE AND LANDSCAPE RESOURCES

According to the policy of the Board of Regents, treatment recommendations for historic properties follow the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. These Standards were developed to direct treatment of historic buildings, sites and landscapes that have been listed on or found eligible for listing on the GNHRP. Four distinct approaches have been established by the Standards and are broadly categorized as follows:

Preservation - focuses on the maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property's form as it has evolved over time.

Rehabilitation - acknowledges the need to alter or add to a historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the property's historic character.

Restoration - depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods.

Reconstruction - re-creates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes.

One approach to treatment is not mutually exclusive of another, and often an overall recommendation for treatment will combine aspects of multiple approaches. Treatment of an Institution's historic buildings will generally favor rehabilitation due to requirements for interior upgrades, but projects will necessarily include the preservation of surviving historic features such as stairways, windows, and other unique details. Most historic landscapes, however, will favor preservation through the development of specific maintenance plans that allow for the appropriate replacement of plant species and the repair of historic materials. Therefore, treatment recommendations for all cultural resources must be determined on a case-by-case basis.

4.3 USG TREATMENT DEFINITIONS

The unique characteristics of a historic building or landscape must be considered as part of any rehabilitation strategy. Character-defining features are those features that convey a resource's aesthetic quality, uniqueness, and/or significance and should therefore be preserved as part of this strategy. The following categories define general treatment strategies and propose appropriate degrees of intervention necessary for the planning of a historic building or landscape's continued or new

use. A treatment strategy should be recommended for each identified resource.

4.3.1 *EXTENSIVE REHABILITATION*

This treatment may include preservation, restoration, and/or reconstruction of historic features; modifications for adaptive use; mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and fire protection (MEP/FP) systems replacement; utility and drainage system replacement; potential major demolition; or grade alteration.

4.3.2 *MODERATE REHABILITATION*

This treatment may include preservation, restoration, and/or reconstruction of historic features; modifications for adaptive use; MEP/FP systems replacement or upgrade; utility and drainage system replacement or upgrade; minor or selective demolition; or grade alteration.

4.3.3 *MINOR REHABILITATION*

This treatment may include preservation, and/or restoration of historic features; MEP/FP systems replacement or upgrade; or utility and drainage system replacement or upgrade.

4.3.4 *CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE*

This treatment includes repairs typical of deferred maintenance, and preservation and/or restoration of historic features.

4.3.5 *DEMOLITION*

Although not the preferred treatment for any resource eligible for inclusion in the GNRHP, a recommendation for demolition may arise during the Physical Master Plan Process. In these cases, preservation planners should be fully consulted on these recommendations from their inception decisions, and able to provide recommendations for cultural resource mitigation.

4.4 **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USE OF HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE RESOURCES**

Preliminary recommendations for compatible use should be identified for each of the Institution's historic resources. It is essential that the unique characteristics and physical constraints often present in historic architecture be considered when identifying potential new uses for historic buildings. The assignment of an incompatible use for a historic building can lead to increased interventions and the loss of integrity. Therefore based on background research and preliminary field observations potentially compatible uses should be proposed for the Institution's historic buildings. Recommendations generally fall into the following seven categories or combinations thereof.

- Office/Administrative
- Office/Classroom
- Office/Laboratory/Studio
- Residential-Undergraduate
- Residential-Graduate/Faculty
- Recreation
- Assembly

4.5 CATEGORIZATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

In both survey and testing reports, archaeologists should make recommendations regarding necessary further work on site(s). There are generally three categories into which an archaeological site may fall. These include ineligible for nomination to the GNRHP, eligible for nomination to the GNRHP, and potentially eligible for nomination to the GNRHP or eligibility is unknown.

4.5.1 *INELIGIBLE FOR NOMINATION TO THE GNRHP*

Some sites discovered on survey can be determined almost immediately to be ineligible for nomination to the GNRHP. Most often these types of sites lack integrity due to severe erosion or extreme ground disturbance. In these dire cases, the most information that can be extracted is the location of the site and possibly the time period associated with it. Archaeologists complete GASF forms for such sites, document the sites in the report, and then recommend that no further investigation is needed. Once concurrence from consulting parties including HPD is received, construction and other ground disturbing activity can proceed.

4.5.2 *ELIGIBLE FOR NOMINATION TO GNRHP*

Sites can be recommended as eligible for nomination to the GNRHP after survey or testing has been completed. Occasionally sites investigated during survey level reveal intact stratigraphy, features or other components and are known to be associated with significant people or events in history, or represent the ability to provide new information about the past. Most often, however, this determination of eligibility is not reached until the testing phase, since that is when larger areas of ground are uncovered to search for the presence of features, and more in-depth research occurs. It is recommended that sites that are eligible for the GNRHP be preserved *in situ*. If an institution cannot preserve the site without ground disturbance or other adverse effects, the largest percent possible of the site should be excavated for data recovery. Once data recovery

excavations are completed, then construction or other ground disturbance can occur.

4.5.3 POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR NOMINATION TO THE GNRHP OR ELIGIBILITY FOR NOMINATION UNKNOWN

Most often sites are listed as potentially eligible for nomination to the GNRHP or as eligibility unknown. Both cases usually represent sites discovered during survey and additional work is required in the form of testing to be able to determine the site's integrity, period, association, and other key characteristics. Archaeologists traditionally recommend sites of unknown eligibility for either intensive shovel testing, and/or if that has been completed already, then for testing level investigations. Sites that are potentially eligible most often represent sites already intensively surveyed and are then recommended for testing. Once a site is tested, archaeologists then recommend it as either ineligible or eligible for the GNRHP, and if falls under the parameters outlined in 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 above.

- *For more information on criteria for eligibility, refer to Appendix J, "Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archaeological Properties."*

4.6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

Sites that are discovered but will not be subject to adverse impact can be preserved *in situ*. The *in situ* preservation of a site means that the site will be left in place exactly as it is, keeping all the soil strata, features and other components undisturbed. Such preservation can only be achieved, however, if the university or college is committed to using the site in a manner that will not impact it. Any activities such as laying utilities, grading, erecting posts, or other ground disturbances do not qualify as *in situ* site preservation. There are, however, good uses for sites preserved *in situ*. They can remain undisturbed as greenspace or interpreted with kiosks or signs on a walking trail. Furthermore, information derived from Archaeological Investigations can be utilized for campus exhibits or scholarly presentations.

- *For further discussion of cultural resources and educational opportunities, refer to Part I Cultural Resources, Section 5.*