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OTHER NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC PROPERTIES

While the Academic Historic District and its adjacent buildings described in Volume 1 represents the most well known collection of historic buildings on the NMSU campus, it is by no means the only historic property or district located on the main campus. The follow section describes three additional historic districts that, according to the NMSU architectural survey (Appendix C, this volume), appear to meet the criteria for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

West Side Farm Historic District

The West Side Farm Historic District is comprised of buildings associated with the university’s agricultural heritage spanning a period of significance from 1890 to 1959. It includes the Seed House (Nematology Building) – NMSU’s oldest structure – two utility farm buildings (the Incubator Building and the Farm Poultry Building), and agricultural fields that have been farmed for over a century.

CONTRIBUTING BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLD. #</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEMATOLOGY LAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SEED HOUSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>INCUBATOR BLDG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>POULTRY FEED BLDG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Map of West Side

Of related interest is the Cotton Ginning Research Laboratory, however, since it is owned by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and not NMSU, it is not included in this preservation plan (Figure 89). Similarly, the Las Cruces Lateral, which runs through the west end of the district, played an
important role in the development of this district; however, it is owned by the Elephant Butte Irrigation District and thus is not under NMSU’s authority (Figure 90).

Figure 2: Cotton Ginning Research Laboratory, constructed in 1949, was one of only four in the nation and served New Mexico, west Texas, Arizona, and California.

Figure 3: Las Cruces Lateral constructed in 1890 with improvements made between 1919 and 1925. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Under an agreement with NMSU, the City of Las Cruces has a 99-year lease for an 8.8 acre parcel of land for the construction of new convention center. This land is located on former university agricultural fields within the West Side Farm Historic District. Under the terms of the lease agreement, NMSU is responsible for ensuring that any building or usage of the land conforms to the university’s Master Plan, while the city is responsible for compliance with applicable environmental and historic preservation laws.¹

Building 2: Seed House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Name</th>
<th>Nematology Lab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>Circa 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Adobe, stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Individually eligible for its History and Architecture (A and C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Seed House

Architectural Description: The Seed House is a single-story, roughly L-shaped New Mexico Vernacular building with a stone foundation, stucco-covered adobe, and a hipped, asphalt shingle roof with a slight overhang and covered rafter ends. The larger, north leg of the L angles obliquely to the west and as a result is not quite perpendicular to the smaller, south section of the building, which is aligned on an east-west axis. Windows on all elevations have been filled in with CMU; the concrete sills underscoring these blind windows are still visible. At the south façade, paired wood doors with single lights in the upper third allow access to the building; a single wood door with a light in the upper third allows access at the east elevation of the north leg of the building. Small metal chimneys or vent pipes protrude from the roof in several places.

Major Alterations: Walls stuccoed, windows filled in, removal of chimney and roofline altered (Figure 5).

Historic Significance: This building was given to the newly founded college in 1889 as part of the original land donation that included the Jacob Schaublin ranch. It was the first building on campus and is the only remaining nineteenth century structure.
Character Defining Features:
- Tall one story massing
- Hipped roof with slight overhang
- Fenestration pattern with outline of original windows and sill projections
- Visible rubble foundation line

Recommendations: It is recommended that the Seed House maintain its original L-shape and be restored to its 1890 character. This would include opening the closed fenestration and install 2/2 vertical wood windows, paired wood panel doors (on south), and reconfigure roofline to historic with flared gable and clipped hip roof on end with clapboard inset on wall and aligning with roof.

With the proposed construction of the Las Cruces Convention Center, the building could be developed for interpretation of NMSU agricultural history.
Building 38: Incubator Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Name</th>
<th>Soil Instrument Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>CMU, roll roofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district for its History (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Incubator Building

Architectural Description: The incubator building is a rectilinear CMU structure with a gabled roll roofing, vertical boards in the gable end and enclosed rafter tails (Figure 6). The window openings have been filled-in, but the concrete sills still protrude from the façade. The door is wood.

Major Alterations: None

Historic Significance: The incubator building was associated with NMCA&MA's poultry raising projects at the agricultural experimental station.

Character Defining Features:
- One story simple rectilinear massing
- CMU walls with fenestration pattern

Recommendations: The building has structural damage: not only are stepped cracks developing, but the CMUs are moving outward from the wall plane (Figure 6).
Building 40: Poultry Feed Building

Architect: unknown
Building Number: 40
Date of Construction: 1953
Name Origin: Named for use
Primary Materials: CMU, corrugated metal
National Register Criteria: Contributes to district for its History (A)

Architectural Description: The Poultry Feed Building is a simple front-gabled, single-story, painted CMU building resting on a concrete slab. Main entry is sliding, paired wood garage doors with a steel rail on the east elevation; the gable-end above is sheathed in corrugated metal. There are two square windows each at the north and south elevations covered with plywood, as well as single, flush steel blank doors on each of these elevations. The west elevation has a rectangular opening into the loft. The whole is surmounted by a corrugated metal roof.

Major Alterations: None.

Historic Significance: The Poultry Feed Storage Building is significant for its association with the university’s agricultural research mission and helps anchor the district with regard to historic usage.

Character Defining Features:
- CMU walls
- Corrugated metal gable roof, with corrugated metal in the gable end
- Sliding wood door on steel rail.

Recommendations: The building is in fair condition, there are no specific recommendations.
Animal Sciences Historic District

This district is associated with research into animal husbandry and its significance is derived not only from its architecture, but also its arrangement of buildings, animal pens, chutes, and other typical livestock structures, which when viewed as a whole represent a historical pattern of use relating to animal science research.

CONTRIBUTING BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLD. #</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>ANIMAL HUSBANDRY BARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>AGRIC. SCIENCE BLDG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>BULL BARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>SHEEP BARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>LIVESTOCK JUDGING PAVILION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>FARM RESIDENCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Map of the Animal Sciences Historic District

Based on aerial photographs and historic Sanborn Insurance Maps, most of the buildings and structures found in this area (including those that now meet National Register criteria) replaced earlier penning structures and large livestock barns beginning in the mid-1950s and continuing until the early 2000s. The present historic district is marked by livestock pens and chutes made of tubular steel used to separate and confine livestock animals (Figure 96-97). Flat-roofed, open-sided shade structures are commonly found in the pens. Other structures include concrete feed troughs and feed storage facilities such as hay barns and grain silos. These structures are arranged according to the needs of the livestock managers and research projects.

The livestock pens and feed structures found in the Animal Husbandry Area comprise a cultural landscape related to the teaching mission of NMSU. The arrangement of pens, storage areas, circulation paths and equipment, as well as the buildings discussed below, reveal logical decisions made by livestock managers and caretakers. The functional patterning of these structures and buildings relating to contemporary animal husbandry is a cultural landscape that should be documented prior to any major alterations in the area, as suggested in the university’s 2006 Master Plan. Documentation should include plan drawings, photographs, and interviews.
in order to better understand the functional rationale behind the placements and uses of pens, buildings, structures, and equipment.

Figure 96: Animal Sciences Area features

Figure 9: Livestock pens
Building 162: Animal Husbandry Barn

Current Name | Feed Mill
---|---
Architect | unknown
Building Number | 162
Date of Construction | 1950
Name Origin | Named for its use
Primary Materials | CMU, stucco, corrugated metal roof
National Register Criteria | Contributes to district for its History (A)

Figure 10: Feed Mill

Architectural Description: This is a specialized stuccoed CMU farm building that is rectilinear in plan with a corrugated metal salt-box roof (Figure 103). There is a large corrugated-metal sliding door in the north and south elevations and a smaller one at the top of a raised concrete landing in the north elevation. Two metal casement windows exist in the east gable end and one in the north. The wing consists of four open stalls in the center and an enclosed tack room and stable in the south. Fenestration includes symmetrical metal sliding windows just below the eaves, running the length of the west elevation; they also appear in the south and east elevation of the tack room. Steel pipe stock pens and gates are attached to the rear of the building.

Major Alterations: None

Historic Significance: This building is a contributing property for its association with animal husbandry research and helps anchor the district with regard to historic usage.

Character Defining Features:
- Raised concrete floor
- Metal casement windows
- Wood doors
- Salt-box corrugated metal roof
- Steel pipe stock pens on east

Recommendations: This building is in overall good condition, therefore there are no specific repair recommendations.
Building 164: Agricultural Science Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Name</th>
<th>Neale Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>C.H. Leavell &amp; Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Professor P.E. Neale, Animal Husbandry Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Stuccoed masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district for its History (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Neale Hall

Architectural Description: Neale Hall is a one-story Regional Modernist building constructed of stuccoed masonry walls, featuring a flat roof and a red clay-tile coping atop the parapet (Figure 104). The entry façade using Territorial Revival detailing is at the south end of the east elevation. The entrance is gable with a red tail roof and protrudes slightly from building. It includes paired, fully glazed steel doors flanked by pilaster under simple capitals supporting a blind arch over the doors. The archway is flanked by small metal sconces. Stepping back in plan and flanking the gabled entry are fixed 2/1 casement windows with projecting, pediment-like molded concrete window heads, pilasters, and sills. Over the eastern window are dimensional letters spelling out “NEALE HALL.” A pair of simple wrought-iron railings flanks the concrete walkway leading to the entryway.

The building extends to the north and steps back in plan again. The elevation is fairly plain, but includes seven horizontal ribbons in a row of block glass lights with a continuous concrete sill, concrete mullions separating each ribbon from the next, and a simple continuous cornice along the window heads. On the south elevation, there is a row of 2/1 casement windows with a simple concrete sill continue along the south elevation of the building. The west elevation exhibits a stepped configuration that allows for entrances and livestock ramps into the laboratories.
There is a square second-story at the northwest corner constructed of materials similar to that of the original building, including a parapet with red clay-tile coping and block-glass windows (Figure 12).

**Livestock ramp**  **North end of west elevation - labs**  **South end of east elevation**

*Figure 12: Neale Hall architectural features*

**Major Alterations:** A recent masonry stucco addition on the north end of Neale Hall contains neither fenestration nor cornice and, as such, is distinctive from the historic building fabric and does not detract from the historical integrity.

**Historic Significance:** This building is associated with research into the study of the slaughtering, curing, and processing of animals and meat products. It also included a wool lab and poultry pathology lab. It architectural styling blends with Spanish Renaissance Revival idiom found on campus.

**Character Defining Features:**
- One story massing
- Flat roof with red clay tile parapet coping
- Stuccoed walls with fenestration pattern
- Glass-block ribbon windows
- Entry with concrete arch, Territorial Revival columns and paired doors
- Window pediments
- Band of stuccoed concrete molding
- Glass block fenestration on rear of building
- Livestock ramp into building

**Recommendations:** The building is in good overall condition and there are no specific recommendations at this time.
Building 199: Farm Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>CMU, stucco walls, brick, steel windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district for its History (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Farm Residence

Architectural Description: The Farm Residence is a simple Territorial Revival, one-story building with a concrete foundation, stuccoed CMU walls and a flat roof with a double-coursed brick coping on a parapet (Figure 106). In the façade is a wood flush entry protected by a glazed metal storm door. North of this door is a picture window framed by four fixed lights, and south of the door is a projecting bay with a blank north elevation and a nine-light casement window in the south elevation. The entrance has an uncovered porch featuring a stuccoed knee-wall topped with brick, echoing the coping atop the house walls.

Along the north elevation are two bays, each with nine-light casements underscored with brick sills. The south elevation features two more identical nine light casements at the east and west ends, flanking an off-center four-light casement window. These windows also each feature a brick sill.

At the west elevation is a flat-roofed porch extending into the residence’s backyard, which is bordered by a wood stave fence. The porch is supported by five slender 4x4 posts. Under the porch are two wood doors, both padlocked shut on the outside. These doors pierce a shallow wooden projection of vertical planks added to the back of the stuccoed masonry building and painted white.

The porch and the projection that it covers extend about two thirds of the way north along the west elevation. The stucco wall resumes beyond the end of the porch and the projection. In the middle of the stucco wall at the north end of the west elevation is a single 9-lite steel casement window, underscored by a brick sill.
Major Alterations: None

Historic Significance: This residential structure has served as the Herdsman’s Residence since 1957, as such is contributes to the Agricultural Historic District.

Character Defining Features:
- One story, residential massing
- Flat roof with brick coping
- Stucco walls with simple fenestration pattern
- Steel casement windows with brick sills

Recommendations: The building appears to be in overall good condition, there are no specific recommendations at this time.
Building 193: Bull Barn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name Origin: Named for its use
Primary Materials: Poured concrete, stucco, asphalt shingle roofs
National Register Criteria: Contributes to district for its History (A)

Architectural Description: The Bull Barn is a stuccoed poured concrete (most likely with some CMU components) building with an asphalt shingle roof, consisting of a two-story central front-gabled section flanked by two long, single-story wings surmounted by gable roofs perpendicular to the roofline of the central section. The gable roofs have a small overhang and boxed rafter ends (Figure 107).

Fenestration in the central section along the west façade includes a pair of six-panel panel wood sliding entry doors, flanked by single 2/1 metal awning windows, and surmounted by a pair of six-panel wood sliding doors on the second story, somewhat off-center from the entryway below, providing entry to the hay-mow. Wooden louver air vents flank this second-story entryway. The north elevation has a single nine-panel wood sliding door. The length of the east elevation, including the first story of the east elevation of the central section, consists of open stalls.

Major Alterations: None

Historic Significance: The Bull Barn contributes to Agricultural Historic District through its use an agricultural laboratory and helps anchor the district with regard to historic usage.

Character Defining Features:
- Two story massing, flanked by one story wings
- Gabled roof with eave
- Fenestration pattern on east
- Sliding garage doors
- Double doors to hay mow
Recommendations:

The stucco at grade on the west elevation is deteriorating. If it gets much worse, it should be patched (Figure 15). If building is slated for stucco repair in the near future, special attention should be paid to grade conditions.

Figure 15: Deteriorating stucco at Bull Barn

The wood doors and other features are weathering and should be sanded, properly prepared and repainted (Figure 16).

Figure 16: Bull Barn door
Building 195: Livestock Judging Pavilion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>CMU, stucco, red tile roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district for its History (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Livestock Judging Pavilion](image_url)

**Architectural Description:** This is a rectilinear, single-story, stuccoed CMU structure (Figure 110). It includes concrete window sills, a flat roof with cornice molding and a red clay-tile coping at the parapet. The east elevation has five bays with paired 8 light steel ribbon windows in each bay. The central bay has paired metal doors with vision panels in the upper halves. Centered above the entryway is a simple modern light fixture. At the north and south elevations are wood panel sliding garage doors allowing access to the interior space, which is an open-span room with concrete bleachers. An entry well leads to a small basement at the south elevation.

**Major Alterations:** None

**Historic Significance:** The Judging Pavilion features Spanish Renaissance Revival styling that harmonizes with other historic campus buildings. Its use has contributed to agricultural education at the university and thus contributes to the Agricultural Historic District.

**Character Defining Features:**
- Two story massing
- Flat roof with red clay tile coping and slight overhang
- Stuccoed walls
- 8 pane steel windows set in a ribbon pattern
- Plaster cornice molding
- Wood panel sliding garage doors

**Recommendations:** On the interior the Judging Pavilion retains its original layout of one open span room with concrete bleachers on the northwest side, which should be preserved.
Building 194: Sheep Barn

Architect: unknown
Building Number: 194
Date of Construction: 1957
Name Origin: Named for its use
Primary Materials: Stuccoed concrete blocks
National Register Criteria: Contributes to district for its History (A)

Architectural Description: The Sheep Barn is large, rectilinear CMU structure with a gabled hay loft, surmounted by an asphalt tile monitor roof and clerestories filled in with corrugated metal under the eaves (Figure 111). This central structure is flanked by asphalt tile shed roof bays. The north elevation has three metal roll-up overhead doors, one at the center and one at each side-bay. Over the central door there is a second story is a large metal louvered vent above the central door underscored by a concrete sill. East and west elevations are identical and consist of seven bays separated by masonry piers; each bay is accessed via a metal roll-up overhead garage door.

Major Alterations: Skylights on the roof

Historic Significance: The Sheep Barn contributes to the Agricultural Historic District for its use as an outdoor agricultural laboratory and helps anchor the district with regard to historic usage.

Character Defining Features:
- Stuccoed walls
- Monitor roof with clerestories
- Seven bay fenestration on east and west elevations

Recommendations: Overall good condition; there are no specific recommendations.
The Sutherland-Tom Fort Historic District
This historic district is comprised of the Sutherland Village and Tom Fort married student housing developments and associated landscape. The two housing complexes, built in 1958 and 1959 respectively, represent examples of low-cost, affordable married student housing built during a period of rapid university growth in the 1950s. The very nature of these simple, masonry houses, built in a simplified Ranch style have precluded any significant architectural modifications and thus preserved the historic integrity of these structures. In addition, the layout of these homes, i.e., uniform lot size and setbacks on slightly curvilinear streets, are representative of post-war suburban residential housing development.

Figure 19: Sutherland-Tom Fort Historic District boundaries
Preciado Park (Unnumbered Feature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Name</th>
<th>Sutherland Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>grassy park with mature deciduous trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district for its History (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Preciado Park

Architectural Description: The park is approximately six acres in size and features mature deciduous trees dispersed throughout the grounds with grass cover in between. The park is rectangular in shape, bounded by Williams Avenue on the east, Gregg Street on the south, Sweet Avenue on the west, and O'Donnell Hall on the north. Its informal design – without axes or symmetry – is typical of suburban park design of the 1950s. Tree planting locations avoid lines and geometric patterns. Such an informal design has its roots in the English pastoral landscape tradition that sought to imitate nature rather than making nature conform to a rigid geometry. Within the park, picnic table, a shade structure, volleyball courts, a basketball court, plastic playground equipment, and scattered seating benches provide recreation and relaxation. None of the park furniture or equipment is historic.

Major Alterations: None

Historic Significance: Immediately after World War II, the site of this Sutherland Park contained a temporary housing village for married students, known as “Aggieville” or White Rock. When Sutherland Village and Tom Fort Village were completed in 1958 and 1959 respectively the temporary structures were removed and the area converted into Preciado Park to create a
residential neighborhood setting for NMSU students and their families. The park contributes to the NMSU Residential Historic District for its association with Sutherland Village and Tom Fort Village housing developments.

**Character Defining Features:**
- Open space with grass and trees

**Recommendations:** Because this park has intrinsic value as open space on campus, it is recommended for preservation, should the Sutherland Village and Tom Fort Village housing be demolished. Preciado Park would lose its historic association.
Building Group 206: Sutherland Village

Architect | unknown
Building Number | 206
Date of Construction | 1958
Name Origin | W.A. Sutherland, former member of the Board of Regents
Primary Materials | concrete block, concrete slab foundation
National Register Criteria | Eligible as a district for its History and Architecture (A and C)

Figure 21: Sutherland Village residence

Architectural Description: Sutherland Village, a district of houses for students with families, consists of 200 identical single-story, rectilinear painted CMU buildings on a concrete slab with an overhanging flat roof. The primary elevation of each building features two steel casement windows, one of 8 lights and the other of 16 lights, asymmetrically flanking a wooden flush entry door with an aluminum screen door. There are also three casement windows on the rear elevations and a wooden flush door. Important landscape features associated with the buildings include: front yard setbacks, some with shade trees, fenced-in rear yards with shade trees, storage sheds, children’s play equipment, and spaces for entertaining family and guests.

Major Alterations: None.

Historic Significance: Sutherland Village was constructed in response to the steady rise in the student population in the 1950s. Its simple design and construction, together with its slightly curvilinear street patterning, reflects the mass-produced “subdivision” housing development pattern occurring throughout the United States at this time. The housing units themselves are remarkable for their lack of alterations to both the interior and exterior features of the buildings. The subdivision is also noteworthy for its role in promoting educational opportunities for married students and students from a diversity of cultural and socio-economic classes by providing these groups with low-cost housing on campus.

Character Defining Features:
- One story rectilinear massing
- Flat roof with overhang
- Fenestration pattern
- Steel casement windows
- Front and rear yard areas

Original features on interior:
- Cabinetry/counters in kitchens
- Doors/hardware
- Closet doors
- Built-in wood phone niches in hallways

**Recommendations:** These buildings are in overall good condition with no specific repair recommendations. The NMSU Master Plan calls for complete redevelopment of this area within the next 20 years. It is recommended that alternatives be explored as to how these redevelopment plans can consider the historic significance of this housing area. Alternatives could include preserving a small area of housing that is representative of the larger subdivision, providing interpretive signage on the subdivision's significance to the university, or, if demolition is the only feasible alternative, document and record the subdivision in accordance with HABS/HAER standards for archival purposes.
Building Group 214: Tom Fort Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Tomlinson Fort, former member of Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Concrete block resting on concrete slabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Eligible as a district for its History and Architecture (A and C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Tom Fort Village

Architectural Description: Tom Fort Village consists of 100 identical single-story, rectilinear painted CMU buildings on a concrete slab with a flat roof with and a overhang. Each house has a small yard set back from the street. The primary elevation of each building features two aluminum slider windows, asymmetrically flanking a wooden flush entry door with an aluminum screen door. There are also three aluminum windows on the rear elevations and a wooden flush door.

Major Alterations: None.

Historic Significance: Like Sutherland Village, Tom Fort Village was constructed in response to the steady rise in the student population in the 1950s. Its simple design and construction, together with its slightly curvilinear street patterning, reflects the mass-produced “subdivision” housing development pattern occurring throughout the United States at this time. The housing units themselves are remarkable for their lack of alterations to both the interior and exterior features of the buildings. The subdivision is also noteworthy for its role in promoting educational opportunities for married students and students from a diversity of cultural and socio-economic classes by providing these groups with low-cost housing on campus.

Character Defining Features:
- One story rectilinear massing
- Flat roof with overhang
- Fenestration pattern
- Aluminum slider windows
Original features on interior:
- Cabinetry/counters in kitchens
- Doors/hardware
- Closet doors
- Built-in wood phone niches in hallways

Recommendations: See recommendations for Sutherland Village.
NMSU PROPERTIES NOT ON MAIN CAMPUS

Fabian Garcia Horticultural Farm Historic District

In addition to the four historic districts located on NMSU’s main campus, there are additional historic properties located on NMSU property outside this boundary. One example, recorded by the NMSU survey team, is located at the Fabian Garcia Research Center, approximately a mile west of NMSU’s main campus. Named the Fabian Garcia Horticultural Farm Historic District, this collection of historic agricultural buildings and associated landscapes was established by the university in 1904 for the purposes of agricultural research. It is named after Fabián García who was instrumental in creating the farm and guided research there for many years. His innovative research and crop development was recognized throughout the Southwest’s agricultural community. Today, the Horticultural Farm includes agricultural fields, storage buildings, and the “Landscape Garden” (small botanical garden). The contributing buildings in the district represent excellent examples of early and mid-century Southwestern vernacular styling – a style commonly found on New Mexico farms.

![Figure 23: Fabian Garcia Historic District boundaries](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLD. #</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>COLD STORAGE SHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>PACKING SHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>FERTILIZER STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>IMPLEMENT SHED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horticultural Fields (Unnumbered feature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district under Criteria A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24: Onion fields in the Horticulture District

Architectural Description: The landscape of Fabián García’s Farm is comprised of horticultural fields that grow a variety of vegetables for research purposes. An important part of the Fabián García Farm is the small botanical garden fronting on the main access road to the farm. The majority of the plants are drought tolerant plants suitable for gardening in the Southwest. The plan of the garden is a formal biaxial plan with walks at 90 degrees. The garden contains a gazebo, fountain, and at the center of the axes, a very large palm tree.

Major Alterations: None

Historic Significance: The Fabián García Farm is one of the major examples remaining on the main NMSU campus of the agricultural history of the State’s only land grant college.

Character Defining Features:
- Fields with crops in rows
- Landscape garden

Recommendations: Continue to use area as horticultural fields. Although the landscape garden is not been in existence long enough to be considered individually for the National Register, it is an important property located within the Horticultural Farm.
### Building 28: Horticulture Farm Cold Storage Shed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Stuccoed adobe, concrete foundation, gabled corrugated steel roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district under Criteria A and C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 25: Horticulture Farm Storage Shed**

**Architectural Description:** The Horticulture Farm Storage Shed is simple and rectilinear with stuccoed concrete walls resting on a concrete foundation that projects slightly from the wall. The south elevation of the building has a wood screen door and the north elevation has a two panel tongue-in-groove wood door; east and west elevations have no fenestration. At the south and north elevations at the base of the foundation are two ventilation holes flanking the door. The gable ends are clad in shiplap wood siding, and contain paired wood loft doors flanked by square wood vents. Directly under the line of the shiplap cladding are two additional ventilation holes directly above those at the foundation. The corrugated metal roof is surmounted by four symmetrically spaced vent cupolas with wood louvers, each with its own corrugated metal gabled roof with a roofline paralleling that of the building as a whole. The eaves of the building feature exposed rafters, with the rafter tails protected by simple barge-boards.

**Major Alterations:** None
Historic Significance: This building contributed to early research into cold storage technology for preserving crops for agricultural experiments. The building also represents a fine example of vernacular New Mexico farm architecture.

Character Defining Features:
- Single story, rectilinear massing
- Stuccoed walls
- Wood doors
- Shiplap wood cladding in gable ends
- Ventilation cupolas with louvered vents and gabled roof

Recommendations:

Vents are deteriorating. The paint is failing, wood beginning to weather, and the corrugated gable is lifting from the structure. The wood should be properly prepared and repainted; replace pieces only if deteriorated beyond repair. Affix corrugated roofing properly.

Figure 26: Deteriorating ventilation cupola

The utility boxes and electrical meter for this area are located on the east elevation of the cold storage shed. Ideally these should be moved to another location the next time upgrades are made in this district.

Figure 27: Meter and boxes on east elevation

On the interior the original wood and metal cold storage doors manufactured by the York Corporation should be preserved.
**Building 155: Horticulture Farm Packing Shed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Concrete, stucco, wood doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district under Criteria A and C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 28: Horticulture Farm Packing Shed**

**Architectural Description:** This packing shed is a rectilinear farm building constructed with a concrete foundation and stuccoed concrete walls on a concrete foundation with a raised finish floor that allows for dock loading on all elevations. The building has a gable roof with a shed roof extension covered with rolled roofing; the short eaves include fascia boards on all elevations except the north which has exposed rafter tails. The roofline is oriented along the building’s east-west axis and includes four symmetrically placed wood cupola vents, with gable roofs that aligned parallel with the main roof. There are two sliding wood garage doors at the north elevation, and a single sliding wood garage door flanked by two 8-light metal casement windows at the east elevation. At the south and west elevations is an open inset porch with metal supports screened with a wire mesh. Set back under the porch at the west elevation is a large, wood double sliding door.

**Major Alterations:** None

**Historic Significance:** The Packing Shed contributes to the historic district for its close association with the university’s mission as an agricultural research institution. The building also represents a fine example of vernacular New Mexico farm architecture.

**Character Defining Features:**
- Single story massing with gabled roof extending to shed roof on west
- Ventilation cupolas
- Stuccoed walls with steel casement windows
- Paired wood sliding doors, door rails and raised finished floor height
- Open porch on west

Figure 29: Packing shed porch

Recommendations:

There is a structural crack on the southeast corner of the building. This should be studied by a structural engineer and recommendations for repair made. The repair should meet the Secretary’s Standards.

Figure 30: Structural crack

Prepare and paint wood elements to prevent damage, especially if the end grain is exposed to the weather. In badly damaged areas replace damaged wood with wood to match historic.

Figure 31: Damaged wood flooring
The roof on the packing shed seems to have been replaced fairly recently with roll roofing and a galvanized drip edge; however the substrate and the fascia boards are damaged. These should be sanded to sound wood and repainted. Where deteriorated beyond repair; monitor the damage. Repair may require affecting the new roof system.

**Figure 32: Damaged substrate and fascia**

The wood door rail is deteriorating and pulling from the wall. New rails that match the historic configuration with the same dimensional lumber pieces should be installed.

**Figure 33: Deteriorating sliding door rail**

Inspect and repair ventilation cupolas when working on the ventilation cupolas for the Cold Storage Building.
Building 156: Horticulture Farm Fertilizer Storage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>CMU, stucco, steel casement windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to district under Criterion A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 34: Horticulture Farm Fertilizer Storage

Architectural Description:
This rectilinear single-story, CMU building rests on a concrete slab foundation. It has two metal sectional roll-up garage doors in the west elevation; two small, square, 4-light metal casement windows and a small louvered attic vent in the gable-end on the north elevation; casement windows on the east and south elevations and a composition shingle side-gabled roof with barge boards at all elevations.

Major Alterations: None

Historic Significance:
The Fertilizer Storage Building contributes to the Fabian Garcia Horticulture Historic District for its association with the operation of the farm and helps anchor the district with regard to historic usage.

Character Defining Features:
- One story massing
- Gable roof
- Garage door fenestration pattern
Building 168: Horticulture Farm Implement Shed

| Architect  | unknown |
| Building Number | 168 |
| Date of Construction | 1955 |
| Name Origin | Named for its use |
| Primary Materials | CMU, stucco, steel casement windows |
| National Register Criteria | Contributes to district under Criteria A |

**Architectural Description:** This side-gabled, rectilinear garage is constructed of stuccoed CMU on a concrete slab. There are three sectional roll-up garage doors each on the east and west elevations, and two steel paired 4 light casements with a fixed two light panel above on the north and south elevations; these windows are underscored by concrete sills. There are single louvered metal attic vents in the gable-ends, and the roof is rolled roofing with partially exposed rafter ends at the east and west elevations.

**Major Alterations:** None

**Historic Significance:** The Implement Shed contributes to the Fabian Garcia Farm Historic District for its association with the operation of the farm and helps anchor the district with regard to historic usage.

**Character Defining Features:**
- One story massing
- Gable roof
- Steel casement windows with concrete sills
- Garage door fenestration pattern.

**Recommendations:** The building is in good overall condition with no specific recommendations.
Traditional Cultural Properties

Tortugas Pilgrimage Path (unnumbered feature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>Individually eligible for History (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 36: Pathway along Tortugas Arroyo

Description: Undeveloped section of the Tortugas Arroyo that cuts across the southeast corner of NMSU campus (Figure 130).

Major Alterations: None

Historic Significance: The village of Tortugas is situated just south of Las Cruces and the NMSU campus. Many of its residents are descendents of the Mission Indians living in the El Paso valley who have over the years have integrated into the Hispanic community that has resulted in a mix of Native and Hispanic customs and traditions. This group moved into the Mesilla valley in the late 1800s and settled in two villages – San Juan and Guadalupe – now commonly referred to as Tortugas. Today, an organization known as Los Indigenes de Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe keeps alive the traditions of this unique community. Beginning on December 10 of each year, the residents of Tortugas celebrate a three-day long fiesta honoring the Virgin of Guadalupe. On the second day of the celebration, the people of the community use the Tortugas Arroyo as a pilgrimage path to reach the summit of Tortugas Mountain (also known as “A” Mountain) where two alters dedicated to la Virgen are located. Following the ascension, personal prayers are offered and a mass is held on the peak. Following this day-long event, the participants retrace their four-mile journey back down the mountain, through the arroyo and
return to the *La Casa del Pueblo* (community house) in the village. The route through the arroyo is an integral part of this annual pilgrimage.

**Character Defining Features:**
- The arroyo alignment and natural setting

**Recommendations:** Coordinate any development of the arroyo or this part of campus with the Tortugas Indian community to insure that a suitable pilgrimage path is maintained for them.
OTHER MAIN CAMPUS PROPERTIES

Heritage Conservation Places
Heritage Conservation Places do not meet the rigorous historical or architectural standards required of National or State Register properties; however, they do contribute to overall heritage of the university and thus should be considered by campus planners for preservation (See Appendix B). They offer tangible symbols of NMSU’s history and are visible reminders of that history.

Memorial Tower (Unnumbered Feature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named in honor of all NMSU students, faculty, and staff who died serving in the military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Stuccoed masonry with red tile roof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37: Memorial Tower

Architectural Description: Tall, slender tower designed in an Art Deco style (Figure 135). Its vertical massing is accentuated by projecting pilasters that terminates in an octagonal room at its apex. The silver-colored finial at the top of the roof accentuates the verticality of the structure. The tower features a red terra cotta roof, stucco exterior, and planters at the corners of the top of the tower. It features its original double-leaf entry doors.

Major alterations: The tower was originally built onto the west stands of the first Aggie Memorial Stadium located in the northeast part of the campus. The stadium was eventually replaced by a
new stadium in the campus’ southeast corner; however, the tower was left standing. It was eventually incorporated into the design of the Health and Social Services Building constructed in 2004.

**Heritage Significance:** The tower is dedicated to those students, faculty and staff who lost their lives in military service. The first-floor lounge contains photographs of almost all of the 126 “Aggies” who died serving their country in World War II. In the 1950s and 60s, it was a landmark feature on the campus as it stood above every building except the tower on Goddard Hall.

**Character Defining Features:**
- Three to four story massing
- Art Deco verticality
- Stuccoed walls and vertical fenestration pattern
- Main entry doors
- Octagonal, red tile roof, its offset and color differentiation from the new building (Figure 136).

Figure 38: Memorial Tower in 2008
“A” Mountain Viewshed (Unnumbered feature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1890 – 1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Asphalt, trees, grass, the “A” on Tortugas Mountain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heritage Significance:** The “A” Mountain Viewshed is comprised of three components that preserve the history of the university’s axial east-west alignment and provide a strong heritage focal point for the campus. Although built at different times and during different stages of campus development, the four components – “A” Mountain, the International Mall, The Horseshoe, and the Pike – combine to reinforce the historicity of the university’s traditional east-west alignment. From the earliest days, when students stepped off the train at the Mesilla Valley depot, the Pike directed them towards the small cluster of college buildings. By following the Pike and keeping an eye on the highest point of Tortugas Mountain, students and faculty found their way to the fledgling campus. As Henry Trost developed a new, more formal campus plan, he aligned The Horseshoe along the same east-west coordinates as the Pike thus maintaining a viewshed in line with Tortugas Peak. In the 1920s, this peak became formalized into campus lore when students whitewashed rocks to form the letter “A” on the slope facing campus. As the campus expanded eastward from The Horseshoe, the International Mall was designed by campus architect Martin Hoffmeister to extend this east-west alignment.

The Pike (Unnumbered Feature)

“The Pike” (the historic name for present-day College Drive) was originally an old farm road serving the Schaublin farm, which in 1890 was incorporated into the newly created NMSU campus. The Pike, or College Drive, runs a little over one-half mile west from Interstate 10 to the intersection of Espina Street and The Horseshoe. Historic photographs from 1930 show the Pike as a dirt road lined with trees with college farm fields located on either side. Although now
asphalt paved, the road is still lined with recently planted pecan trees, and farm fields still dominate the landscape west of El Paseo Street.

The Horseshoe: See detailed description under The Academic Historic District.

“A” (at highest point of Tortugas Mountain)

![Figure 40: “A” Mountain](image)

The “A” is a whitewashed letter (approximately 300 feet high by 80 feet wide) on the west side Tortugas Mountain, near the crest, and three miles east of the campus (Figure 132). More than just a letter, it represents a tradition of “Aggie Pride” within the student body. The letter was laid out on March 31, 1920, using a survey transit in the tower of Goddard Hall and a three mile long human chain to pass on directions (*Roundup*, April 13, 1955). The “A” is at the apex of a line of sight that runs straight from the west end of College Drive (The Pike) and through the center of The Horseshoe.

International Mall (Unnumbered Feature)

![Figure 41: International Mall](image)
The International Mall is a pedestrian mall created in the 1980s, which runs approximately one-half mile in length from the east end of The Horseshoe to the Pan American Center. A continuous line of buildings defines the north boundary: Guthrie Hall, the English and Speech buildings, Monagle Hall, and Garcia Hall. The south boundary passes near Hardman Hall, Milton Hall, Corbett Student Center, and the Educational Services Center. Between Corbett and the Educational Services Center, the Mall runs adjacent to the open area marked by the Corbett Student Center, Regents Grove, and the Duck Pond. Trees and planters dot both sides of the walkway, which is stamped concrete.

**Recommendation:** The unobstructed alignment of the “A” Mountain Viewshed is an important heritage conservation landscape feature which should be maintained.
Story Tree (Unnumbered feature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Tree was gathering place for readings by State College Story League, a literary society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Cedar of Lebanon tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 42: Story Tree

Description: The Story Tree is located in a tiny park situated between the Las Cruces lateral and the Seed (Nematology) Building (the oldest building on campus). The Cedar of Lebanon tree, which towers over the area, and adjacent mulberry trees provide a canopy of shade and shelter from the wind. The tree’s lowest branches are approximately eight feet above the ground; these and the surrounding shrubs lend a feeling of being in a cozy room. The Las Cruces lateral runs just west of the Story Tree and crosses under College Road. Because the lateral (an acequia) is banked up, the Story Tree site is lower than the water level in the ditch and this provides a cooling effect to escape the desert heat.

Major Alterations: None

Heritage Significance: According to university lore, the a campus literary group called the State College Story League gathered to read literature aloud underneath the tree branches in the late 1920s. A commemorative plaque mounted on a rock marks the location.

Character Defining Features:
- Cedar of Lebanon species
- Plaque about literary society

Recommendations: Maintain tree. As it comes to the end of its life, plant a new tree of the same species nearby.
McFie Circle (Unnumbered Feature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1960s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>John R. McFie, a founder of the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Asphalt parking with planting strips and edges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 43: McFie Circle

Architectural Description: McFie Circle is bounded by Corbett Student Center and Garcia Annex on the east, Breland Hall, the Student Health Center, and Zuhl Library on the south, and the Zohn-Jacobs-Hardman complex on the west. Milton Hall was originally located within the circle; however, recent development has obscured this part of the circle’s arc. In addition to Milton Hall, the circle features a parking lot which is accessed by Jordan Drive to the north (Figure 137). A bronze statue of former university president John Milton stands west of the building named for him.

Major Alterations: McFie Circle first appears in aerial photos in the 1960s and continued as a traffic pattern and parking plan until disrupted by the expansion of Zuhl Library in the early 1990s. Remnants of the original circular pattern are visible in the curving street/pedestrian way between the Zohn-Jacobs buildings and Milton Hall and on the south side of Zuhl Library. A pedestrian walkway also extends from Corbett Student Center to the Milton-Zuhl plaza and scattered trees occur in the parking islands. The circular orientation of McFie Circle has been obscured by buildings and parking lots. Additional information on the development of this feature can be found in the Landscape Design section of this report (above).

Heritage Significance: McFie Circle is a gathering place recognized by students on campus. It is rapidly developing into a campus heritage area.
Character Defining Features:
- Open space
- Semi-circular shape

Recommendations: The location of McFie Circle and the adjacent campus features makes it potentially the major public space for the upper campus. The Master Plan calls for its redesign and relocation of parking to another site. From a campus landscape standpoint, this change would be an enormous improvement. While the student body was small, The Horseshoe could serve as the major landscaped open space. As the campus grows, the community needs more than one “town plaza.” The redesign of this area should integrate the front yard of Garcia Annex.
Regents’ Grove and Duck Pond (Unnumbered Feature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Martin Hoffmeister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1980s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name Origin

Primary Materials: Plantings

Description: Open space with grass and gentle slopes. The grove is a group of pines with labels of past regents. The duck pond is to the east of the grove and has an asymmetrical shape with trees at the edge. These open spaces do not have boundaries or definition.

Major Alterations: None known.

Heritage Significance: An important open space for the campus; the grove honors past regents.

Character Defining Features:
- Open space
- Grouping of trees at the grove
- Duck pond shape

Recommendations: The Regents’ Grove is a very pleasant landscape and should be enhanced with more trees and places to sit. The logistics of having a tree for each regent are very difficult and probably cannot be sustained. The number of trees could become inappropriately large through the years. Another approach, often used in memorial gardens, is to have a stand alone plaque that can receive additional names as regents serve their terms. A group of regents could plant one tree rather than have a tree for each person.

The Duck Pond offers a body of water that provides a welcome oasis for the campus. As funds permit, more amenities for sitting and picnicking can be added. Depending upon whether more ducks are welcomed, planting near the water’s edge would provide nesting places. A variety of edge treatments could be added as well.
Heritage Conservation Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>1862 Cannon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>The Academic Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Placement</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Cast iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Connection to Civil War history in New Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This enigmatic object has obvious historic value, having been made in 1862, but its historical association with NMSU is unclear. Interestingly, a historic photograph of the first Hadley Hall shows two canons flanking the building’s main entry (see Figure 15). It is recommended that more research be conducted to try and place this object in its historical context and then find an appropriate place in which to display it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Learning Statue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>The Academic Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Placement</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Representation of learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This statue was mentioned by several participants in the public meeting as having heritage qualities despite its relatively recent placement on campus. It is recommended that the statue be maintained in place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Pioneer Class Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>The Academic Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Placement</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for 1890 class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Stone and bronze plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Alumni donated object.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is very little historical information about this memorial; however, it does have heritage qualities and should be maintained in place. It is noteworthy that the base for the plaque also supports the flagpole in The Horseshoe, which is a traditional feature of this historic landscape. It is recommended that additional research be conducted to try and develop a historical context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>WPA sidewalk stamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>The Academic Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Placement</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Historical development of The Horseshoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When sidewalks are replaced, an attempt to should be made to retain historic WPA stamp in place. If this is not possible, the stamp should removed and curated as a historical object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Burrall Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>The Academic Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Placement</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Stone and bronze plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Donated memorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Name</td>
<td>Experimental radio pad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Goddard Hall courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Placement</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Early engineering history on campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor Ralph W. Goddard was a pioneer in radio communication and this object is the surviving remnant of his experimental work at NMSU. It represents the base of the transmitter for the first radio station on campus.
Properties of Interest

In addition to identifying and evaluating properties for eligibility in the National Register, the NMSU Architectural Survey identified a number of buildings that have importance to the NMSU campus for their architecture or associating with events on campus, but (a) have been constructed within the past 50 years, and do not meet the National Register requirement for “exceptional importance,” (b) are of local importance, or (c) have too many alterations to meet National Register requirements. These properties are important representations of how architectural design and its prominence as a component of the university image changed over time. If they are razed or altered to the extent that they are no longer recognizable, the Modernism architectural vocabulary of NMSU during the late 1950s to the late 1960s will be lost. Special attention should be paid to these buildings when designing alterations. If they must be razed, it is recommended that they be documented according to HABS/HAER standards.

Although VCHP recognizes the potential significance of such properties, the focus of this preservation plan is on buildings, structures, and objects either listed on or eligible for listing in the National Register. Buildings identified by the NMSU survey as possibly eligible for the State Register are considered in this plan as “properties of interest” and are described below. The buildings discussed in this section are those that were identified in the NMSU architectural survey as potentially eligible for the State Register of Cultural Properties.
New Mexico State University Heritage Preservation Plan

PROPERTIES OF INTEREST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLD. #</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>GERALD THOMAS HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>BRANSON LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>JACOBS HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>GUTHRIE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>MILTON HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>REGENTS ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>MONAGLE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>RENTFROW GYM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>GARCIA HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>PAN AMERICAN CTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>CURTIS BLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>STORAGE QUONSET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>WALDEN HALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building 83: Milton Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect: 1941</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect: 1959</td>
<td>Wolgamood &amp; Millington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1941, 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>John Milton, university president (1938-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Stuccoed masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Features:
- Two story massing
- Fenestration pattern
- Terra-cotta tile gabled roofs with brackets under the eaves
- Flat roofs with concrete coping
- Pent roofs with mission tile
- Arched openings
- Cartouches
- Concrete urns
- Covered porch with square posts and corbelled capitals

Comments: Milton Hall with its addition is the embodiment of the shift in the overall look of the campus from the Trost-McGhee period seen in buildings such as Kent Hall, Dove Hall, and Young Hall, to the modernist idiom seen in the Astronomy and Chemistry buildings and Gardiner Hall. It is important as a building that represents both the Renaissance Revival architecture of the 1906 Regents and the 1950s Modern Regionalism as desired by President Corbett. It also has a prominent place on McFie Circle and as such should be preserved.

The Master Plan discusses demolition of at least a portion of this building. If it is to be demolished, a more thorough history of the building should be written and documentation completed using HABS standards.
Building 153: OFS Storage Quonset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>Circa 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its style and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Corrugated metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFS Storage Quonset

Important Features:
- Metal cladding
- Barrel vault shape
- Fenestration pattern

Comments: The EPPWS Shop is a good example of a Quonset hut converted to an adaptive use and is representative of the post-World War II period on campus, as such it should be preserved.
## Building 152: OFS Custodial Quonset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Named for its style and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Rounded corrugated metal sheets resting on concrete slab foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFS Custodial Quonset**

### Important Features:
- Barrel-vault shape
- Corrugated metal
- Steel awning windows

**Comments:** This building is in overall good condition with no specific recommendations.
Building 278: Branson Library

| Architect: 1951 | Schaefer and Merrell |
| Architect: 1953 | Wolgamood and Millington |
| Architect: 1966 | Loren Mastin |

| Building Number | 278 |
| Date of Construction | 1951, 1953, 1966, 1974 |

| Name Origin | John W. Branson, university president (1949-55) |
| Primary Materials | Concrete, textile block, metal |
| Area of Interest | Architectural styles; changes made over time |

Important Features:
- Two story massing
- Flat roof
- 1951 fenestration pattern hidden behind textile block screen
- Plate glass windows
- Canopy of geometrically patterned tubular steel at south entrance

Comments: Branson Library represents the changing approaches to Modern architecture and the changing values of the university in a relatively short period. This is an interesting structure because of those alterations and merits further study and theoretical/historical architectural analysis.

In 1996, murals by the distinguished El Paso artist Tom Lea were hung in the lobby of the Branson Library. These murals were painted in 1934 under a WPA grant for Young Hall Library. “Conquistadors” depicts the conquest by DeVargas and Onate, along with the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 and the Reconquest. “Old Mesilla” depicts various scenes in Mesilla, including the celebration of the Gadsden Purchase. These murals should be preserved.
Building 211: Rentfrow Gym

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Era Rentfrow, university registrar (1922 – 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Steel truss, stuccoed masonry walls, flat composition roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>First women's gymnasium on campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rentfrow Gym

Important Features:
- Gymnasium massing with one story office massing to south and west
- Stuccoed walls
- Brick surrounds
- Ceramic tile mullions
- Jalousie windows
- Sidelights and transom window

Comments: Rentfrow Gymnasium is slated for demolition in the Master Plan. It should be documented using HABS standards. The name of the structure, Era Rentfrow, should be carried forward on another campus building of similar visibility and import. Ms. Rentfrow not only served a 40-year career with NMSU, but she personally made loans to students to help with tuition, board or books. After she passed away in 1988 an endowment was created in her name. She is an important figure in the history of NMSU and the honor of her name should continue.
Building 248: Regent’s Row

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name Origin: Regents Row

Primary Materials

Area of Interest: Architectural style

Important Features:
- Two story massing with H-shaped plan
- Slightly gabled roof with overhang
- Open central courtyards
- Exterior staircases and balconies
- Brick window sills
- Textile-block screens

Comments: Regents Row is an example of Modernist dormitory architecture from the 1960s. It was part of a general effort to articulate NMSU's development as a modern university campus. This building is slated for demolition in the Master Plan. Ideally it would be documented using HABS standards prior to being razed.
Building 244: Gerald Thomas Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Wolgamood and Millington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Gerald Thomas, university president (1970-84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Features:
- Three story, rectilinear massing
- Flat roof with coping on parapets
- Central entrance with flanking ribbon window bays
- Horizontal banding

Comments: Gerald Thomas Hall exemplifies the Modernist design adopted by NMSU to symbolize its status as a university with a new emphasis on engineering and the sciences. This building brought the many departments of agricultural education (from as many as 17 different buildings) under one roof for the first time. Attention to its architecture should be paid when making alterations.
## Building 250: Jacobs Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Carl Jacobs, university professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Concrete, stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Jacobs Hall](image)

### Important Features:
- Round building
- Concrete pilasters,
- Murals of music themes circling the building by Ken Barrick

### Comments:
Jacobs Hall is an expression of the Modernism that NMSU adopted to articulate its new status as a full-fledged university. It may also be eligible for its murals, painted by Kenneth Barrick (1913-2007). Barrick, a former student of Grant Wood, painted numerous murals on the NMSU campus and in southern New Mexico, using a potassium silicate paint that he developed to withstand the harsh environment of the desert southwest.

This building is slated for demolition in the Master Plan. It should be documented using HABS standards prior to razing.
Building 260: Monagle Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Jack Monagle, professor of chemistry &amp; dean of the College of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Steel with Masonite panel, textile block, stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monagle Hall**

**Important Features:**
- Masonite panel sheathed walls
- Stuccoed walls
- Textile-block screens and gabled entries that extend from main wall
- Three-light, aluminum awning windows
- Three courtyards

**Comments:** Monagle Hall is important for its modern design that represented a design response to NMSU's new status as a full-fledged university and the growth of its student body. This building is slated for demolition in the Master Plan. It should be documented using HABS standards prior to razing.
Building 276: Walden Hall

Architect: Jerome Hartger
Contractor: Hesselden Construction Company
Building Number: 276
Date of Construction: 1966

Name Origin: Earl Walden, professor of mathematics and dean of College of Arts and Sciences
Primary Materials: Concrete, glass
Area of Interest: Architectural style

Figure 45: Walden Hall

Important Features:
- Two story rectilinear massing
- Flat roof with overhang and boxed eaves
- Undulating New Formalist pilasters
- Fenestration pattern with concrete belt course
- Symmetry
- Covered entrance on north

Comments: Walden Hall is important because of its outstanding New Formalist design (Figure 45). This architectural style is unique on campus and represents a period when the architecture that was valued for academic institutions was Modernism completed in a grand and formal vocabulary.
Building 275: Garcia Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Lake and Henderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Fabian Garcia, professor of agriculture and horticulturalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Concrete, pebble dash panels, metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garcia Hall

**Important Features:**
- Glass curtain wall above entrance ways in recessed porticos
- Pebble wall masonry panels with curvilinear lines
- Asymmetrical arms & legs separating pebbled sections
- Enclosed balconies with metal geometric railings
- Courtyards

**Comments:** Garcia Hall is important for its articulation of the Modernist phase of the development of the NMSU campus. Attention to its architectural features should be paid in alterations.
# Building 288: Guthrie Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Loren Mastin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>G. L. Guthrie, dean of the College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Masonry, stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Important Features:
- Vertical glass stairwell
- Ribbon windows with deep reveals
- Incised horizontal banding
- False balconies

## Interior:
- Artwork on the ceiling in the landings between the first and second stories and on the mezzanine level

## Comments: Guthrie Hall may is an excellent expression of the Modernism and the first building to house the business and economic program. This building is an example of how NMSU articulated its new status as a university with an emphasis on the modern fields of science, engineering, and business. Attention should be paid to its original detailing as alterations are made to the building.
Building 284: Pan American Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>W.C. Kruger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Origin</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Materials</td>
<td>Concrete, glass, metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
<td>Architectural style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Features:
- Tall two story massing
- Curtain wall on north elevation
- Grand two story pilasters
- Steel “architrave with triglyphs in frieze”
- Open interior span

Comments: The Pan American Center is important to the campus as the first indoor arena and is a good example of W.C. Kruger's work. When completed, the building was described in the NMSU newspaper, the Round Up, as "equal to two side by side football fields." Moreover, the paper claimed that the ten 300-foot-long trusses were the largest of their kind in the United States. The Pan American Center has served as a facility for basketball, special events, and graduations since its opening in 1968. It is also an interesting example of New Formalism applied to a field house.
Comparison with Master Plan
The Master Plan divides the NMSU campus into “districts” and discusses the planning issues and proposals associated with these districts. The following discussion summarizes these issues and is followed by an analysis of the planning topics with regard to their effects on historic properties, historic districts, and heritage conservation places. This preservation plan only discusses those districts that affect historic resources and points out the preservation issues associated with each district.

Figure 46: Master Plan Districts
Source: NMSU Master Plan

Master Plan District 1: University Avenue
Summary: This district affects the Academic Historic District and individually eligible properties on campus. The Master Plan envisions the area along University Avenue as a rich automobile and pedestrian environment where the city and the university work together to encourage mixed
use development that serves faculty, staff and student needs and emphasize “town and gown” interaction. According to the Master Plan:

1) City of Las Cruces plans to:
   i) Modify the overlay district rules to encourage mixed use development that would place parking behind the buildings and sidewalks with a landscape edge adjacent to the street.
   ii) Provide a landscape median and a bike lane on both sides of University Avenue.
   iii) Incorporate Road Diet and traffic calming methods along this corridor.

2) The university plans to:
   i) Increase the number of university buildings along University Avenue and create orientations that address both the street and the campus with multiple entrances that allow access onto the campus.
   ii) Develop a landscape verge for shade trees along the street with sidewalk adjacent and pedestrian scaled lighting.
   iii) Reconfigure the entrance at Jordan Street to serve as the primary entry for the campus.

**Analysis:** (1) The city items are outside the boundaries of the NMSU historic districts and do not appear to be likely to have an adverse effect on those districts.

(2.i) The university’s plans clearly call for increasing the building density along University Avenue in order to emphasize the “town and gown” interface. While this will enhance interaction between the city and university, NMSU planners and architects should take into the account the scale, massing, and architectural styling of the smaller scale historic buildings that already exist along this corridor, specifically Kent Hall, Gardiner Hall, the O’Laughlin House, and the President’s House (Nason House). In addition to these historic properties found on University Avenue streetscape, university planners should also consider the effects of building scale and massing on the YMCA Building and Gymnasium Building (the Music Building’s practice hall), which although are not located directly on University Avenue, could be adversely affected by inappropriately scaled buildings to their north.

It should be noted that both the YMCA Building and the President’s House are listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the State Register of Cultural Properties, therefore any expenditure of federal or state funds for new construction in their immediate vicinity would be subject to review by the SHPO.

(2.ii) Developing a landscape border and updating the pedestrian needs on the University Avenue corridor will most likely not have an adverse effect on the NMSU historic districts. Historically this edge of the campus was tree-lined. In addition there are a series of stone walls along this corridor (as well as other edges of the campus), which have been highlighted in this plan as noteworthy landscape features which contribute to the heritage character of the university. By emphasizing these features in the new design, the university has an opportunity to blend the old with the new and perpetuate a campus landscaping tradition.

(2.iii) The reconfiguration of the Jordan Street entrance to become the new main entryway into campus has many merits. The Master Plan discusses creating multiple story buildings and a
parking garage in the area around Jordan Street. Once again, however, planners and architects should take into consideration the historic Rhodes, Garrett and Hamiel dormitory complex to minimize any adverse effects on this historic property. Most notably, new construction plans should carefully consider the scale of the historic buildings and their open courtyard and design any new structures to account for a change in scale if necessary. For example, new, larger-scale buildings or structures that face the historic buildings could be stepped back as they rise in stories above the elevations of Rhodes, Garrett and Hamiel Halls. Any building placed in the parking lot to the east the dormitories would have less of an adverse effect on the historic character and may not require such design considerations.

Master Plan District 2: Existing Housing

Summary: In this area, the Master Plan proposes developing mixed use housing and a new signature entry to the campus. The plan calls for creating an open/green space in the area of McFie Circle. This open space would be reinforced through the architectural definition of buildings that face onto it. Specifically the plan calls for:

1) Preserving the Rhodes, Garrett and Hamiel complex and Garcia Hall;
2) Refurbishing Regent’s Grove and expanding the Duck Pond; and,
3) Enhancing the International Mall.

Analysis: (1) As noted above, when redesigning the new Jordan Street gateway entrance, the university and their consultants should consider scale and massing of any new construction and its potential effects upon the historic qualities of Rhodes, Garrett and Hamiel Halls. Specific preservation recommendations and a list of character defining features for this dormitory complex are noted earlier in this report.

(2) Based on input derived from the public meeting and an analysis of this cultural landscape, Regent’s Grove and the Duck Pond are considered heritage conservation places. The grove of trees (with their identification plaques), the pond and accompanying open space at this end of campus are considered important elements to the overall heritage of the campus. The Master Plan supports the heritage value of this area and calls for the enhancement of outdoor space in order to make it even more desirable to students, faculty, and staff. If the Master Plan’s recommendations for this area are followed, this area will grow in popularity as well as its importance as a campus heritage place on campus.

(3) International Mall has also been identified as a heritage conservation place. The most important aspect from a heritage viewpoint is to maintain the mall’s linear orientation that honors the original axis of the Pike and provides an attractive pedestrian corridor for the campus community. According to the recommendations in the Master Plan, the university would continue to develop this corridor with a canopy of trees and to create an improved interface with Regent’s Grove and the Duck Pond of the mall’s east end. As with Regents Grove and the Duck Pond, improvements to the International Mall will undoubtedly result in its increase in popularity and importance as a heritage place on campus.
Master Plan District 4: Academic

Summary: The Master Plan proposes several infill projects, the demolition of buildings, and the removal of small parking lots. Proposed renovation or new projects that affect the historic character of the district include:

1) The phased construction of a new Arts Complex at the corner of Espina Street and University Avenue;
2) Construct new academic facilities southwest of the intersection of Espina and Frenger streets;
3) Maintain historic pattern of buildings and courtyards around The Horseshoe;
4) Maintain International Mall and Frenger Mall as east-west pedestrian corridors;

Analysis: (1) Proposed construction of a new Arts Complex at the corner of University Avenue and Espina Street will have an effect on The Academic Historic District. Of particular importance will be the scale and massing of the proposed Arts Complex and how that will affect the architectural and historic integrity of the three historic properties located adjacent to this site – the YMCA Building (Conroy Honors Center), NMSU’s first Gymnasium (now part of the Music Building), and the President’s House (Nason House). Of particular concern is the YMCA Building, the oldest original university building and an iconic example of Trost’s architectural heritage at NMSU. Although not specifically stated in the Master Plan, from a historic preservation viewpoint new development in this area should respect the YMCA building’s setting and its importance to the campus heritage encouraging a building design with massing and scale that honors Trost’s architectural plans.

This north side of The Horseshoe has already seen considerable new development some of which has significantly altered the historic visual effects of this critically important area of the campus. For example, the Old Gymnasium lost much of its prominence when it was completely cut-off from visual and physical access to The Horseshoe during its incorporation into the Music Building.

(2) Immediately southeast of The Academic Historic District, the 2006 Master Plan calls for the demolition of the buildings, pens, chutes, and feed structures in order to construct new academic facilities. The loss of these buildings and structures will significantly impact the Animal Sciences Historic District – an area that many in the general public as well as preservationists have deemed important to the university’s heritage. It is recognized that (a) this is area is a valuable piece of campus real estate, which may be better used by the university, and (2) the curriculum content of the animal science program has changed dramatically over the past fifty years. As such, it is inevitable that this area will be redeveloped in the future. At the same time, however, this area is a reflection of not only the history and heritage of the university’s main campus, but also reflects the changing history of agricultural education. It is therefore recommended that the buildings, livestock pens, feed structures, and circulation paths be documented prior to any major alterations in the area. Documentation should include of plan drawings, photographs, and a written history that includes faculty, staff, and student interviews in order to better understand the functional rationale behind the placements and uses of pens, buildings, structures, and equipment.

(3) Retaining the historic pattern of buildings and courtyards around The Horseshoe will not only
maintain the strong edges to the most important open space on campus, but also creates the opportunity for many small courtyards which are also a feature of the Master Plan. Maintaining the architectural integrity of the historic buildings around The Horseshoe is extremely important for the perpetuation of this historic district. As other buildings and courtyards are added to the area, the cumulative effects of these actions should be taken into account early in the planning process.

(4) In order to enhance International Mall and Frenger Street Mall as the two primary east/west pedestrian corridors, Frenger Mall will need infill development to help define its edges. This, together with landscaping features, is called out in the 2006 Master Plan. Development of Frenger Mall as noted in the plan does not appear to include items that would have an adverse effect on the adjacent Academic Historic District.

**Master Plan District 5: Academic / Research**

**Summary:** The Master Plan recommends that this area be the focal point of new academic and research building expansion on the campus. Using this area would allow NMSU to expand its facilities and still maintain a comfortable walking distance to the center of campus. It would also offer an improved visual image of the university from Interstate 10. This new construction would necessitate the demolition of the contributing buildings and landscapes to the Sutherland-Tom Fort Historic District.

**Analysis:** The Master Plan recommendations will affect the Sutherland-Tom Fort Historic District by essentially removing any vestiges of these historic properties. It is recommended that university planners and architects begin a discussion as to how to mitigate the effects of this redevelopment upon the contributing properties of the district. It is recommended that this discussion include not only the university planning staff, but historic preservation professionals, and other interested parties or stakeholders in this project. This group discussion should center on ways to find “common ground” that address the historic preservation issues while allowing for development.

**Master Plan District 8: West Campus**

**Summary:** Currently, the far west side of campus is used predominantly for the cultivation of feed for animals being kept by the Department of Animal Sciences. The Master Plan recommends that:

1) The area continues to reflect the university’s agricultural heritage;
2) The Las Cruces Center and NMSU hotel/conference center be sited in this area;
3) The conference center “should reflect the regional influences that shaped the campus celebrating the links to its agricultural past;”
4) College Avenue at Interstate 10 be reconfigured so traffic will be directed towards The Horseshoe and the center of campus;
5) The historic Seed House (Nematology Building) be preserved, and that access to the historic Cotton Ginning building and adjacent labs via the existing road alignment be maintained;
6) The view east from El Paseo Road to the Organ Mountains should be preserved to
create a buffer zone for this viewshed.

7) El Paseo Road, the proposed primary entrance to the convention complex, be designed to preserve the view of the campus and Organ Mountains from College Drive.

Analysis: (1) This area has the strongest historical ties to the university’s role in agricultural education and research and is one of the last intact vestiges of this agricultural legacy on campus. Thus the Heritage Preservation Plan and the Master Plan are in agreement that this area should continue to reflect this significant chapter in the university’s heritage.

(2-3) The proposed convention center complex – located on 8.8 acres of historic agricultural fields north of the Pike and east of the acequia to El Paseo Avenue – will impact the cultural landscape that comprises portions of the West Side Farm Historic District. Development of the complex could also affect the historic Seed House and historic viewshed along College Drive.

Planning and design of the new convention center complex should carefully consider how to implement the Master Plan’s recommendations. Specifically, university and city planners should address how the:

a) Center can celebrate the university’s links to its agricultural past;
b) Design of the new complex can reflect the university’s agricultural heritage;
c) University can preserve the Seed House and alignment of the Pike; and
d) University can develop a new entrance sequence at the intersection of El Paseo Avenue and College Drive that will preserve the historic viewshed of the campus and “A” Mountain (Figure 155).

To meet the first and second qualities, the Convention Center could be developed with more of an urban edge facing the corner of University Avenue and El Paseo Avenue, but step down and open out in plan towards the remnant agricultural fields on its south and southwest sides. Such a site plan could commemorate these fields as an integral part of the campus heritage.
The conceptual idea is to integrate the facility and its landscape design with the campus’ agricultural heritage to the greatest extent possible. The university could provide interpretation of their agricultural heritage by showcasing the first building on campus (the Seed House), outlining the development of Acala cotton, explaining the historic significance of the work done at the Cotton Gin, and emphasizing the viewshed of the Pike. Ideally, the Seed House would be restored to match the historic photographs. The building could be dedicated to interpretation of the early campus agricultural research and provide space for activities that would support the preservation of the agricultural fields. These and other heritage places (such as, the Story Tree and the acequia) could be tied to convention center complex with walking trails and interpretive signage for those interested in learning about the early history of the university and its role developing arid lands agriculture.

One goal of the 2006 Master Plan is sustainability. One option NMSU may want to explore in this direction is to use the university’s existing agricultural fields to grow food crops that could be used by the hotel and convention center kitchens. Historically there were many different crops planted on these fields that would be desired in a modern commercial kitchen. This would not only enhance and showcase the heritage of the area, but it would support sustainability of the center.

(4) With regard to traffic flow and the preservation of the “A” Mountain viewshed, the new entrance at the intersection of El Paseo Avenue and College Drive (the Pike) could greatly enhance the quality of this area, not to mention the safety of those driving along College Drive and crossing El Paseo Avenue. The viewshed from the fields to the “A” on Tortugas Mountain is the most important historical axis on the campus. The new intersection should be designed to highlight this feature. By encouraging more people to experience this view, the university will promote a better understanding of its campus heritage. The most difficult portion of the project
will be to integrate surface parking into the landscape. Ideally, cars would be stored in multi-level garages to avoid using up large tracts of land. If surface parking is used, landscape buffers should be designed to reduce the “sea of cars” visual effect. The tradition of using lines of Afghan Pines and other tree rows could be employed to visually break up any surface parking.

Finally, the planning of these new facilities, especially on its west end, will require consultation with the SHPO regarding the effects of the development on the Las Cruces Lateral (the Acequia), which is listed on the National Register.

Conclusions: the Master Plan and Historic Preservation

The Academic Historic District
The Master Plan calls for substantial new construction on the north side of The Horseshoe. The university planning staff should carefully consider the effect of new construction on the historic buildings which represent Trost’s original campus plan, particularly the President’s House (Nason House), the old Gymnasium (now part of the Music Building), and the YMCA Building (Conroy Honors Center). The Master Plan recognizes the historical significance of The Horseshoe and these historic buildings and supports their preservation. The Preservation Plan recommends that a “green” buffer be maintained whenever possible around building perimeters and that particular attention be given to the scale and massing of any new building so as not to adversely affect these important historic buildings.

West Side Farm Historic District
The historical integrity of this district will be affected by the proposed development of a convention center complex on former agricultural fields. Care should be taken to integrate this complex into the university’s agricultural heritage; there is an opportunity to highlight this heritage not only by building design, but through interpretive displays, signage and the use of the remaining fields. The Master Plan supports the preservation of this area in light of its importance to the university’s agricultural history.

Animal Sciences Historic District
The Master Plan calls for the demolition of this entire area for redevelopment. The buildings, structures, pens, and layout of this area all address the historic usage of this area for livestock research. This usage has traditionally been a cornerstone of NMSU’s educational heritage and the loss of it will have a significant visual impact on the campus’ overall layout. If this area cannot be incorporated into future planning as presently configured, the Preservation Plan recommends a detailed documentation of the area’s historical significance prior to demolition. Such documentation would provide an archival record of this aspect of the university’s history.

Sutherland -Tom Fort Historic District
Based on recommendations in the Master Plan, this historic district is planned to be razed and redeveloped for academic and research purposes. Although the two housing subdivisions –
Sutherland Village and Tom Fort Village – do not represent a well-recognized “high style” of architecture and are of relatively recent construction, they, together with Preciado Park, nonetheless are properties and have an important place in the heritage of the university. Based on the public meeting held in conjunction with the preparation of this plan, it became clear that there is a level of community support for maintaining these homes, which further underscores their contribution to the university’s heritage. While the Master Plan does not support preservation of this area; the Preservation Plan urges university planners to consider these historic properties and explore alternatives to mitigate the adverse effects of proposed development in this historic district.

**Other Historic Buildings & Heritage Conservation Places**

The Master Plan acknowledges the importance of other historic buildings, such as the Rhodes-Garrett-Hamiel complex and the Garcia Annex, which are not located within a historic district. The Preservation Plan discusses how best to preserve and maintain these historic buildings. In addition, the Master Plan recognizes campus landscapes such as the International Mall, Frenger Mall, Regent’s Grove, and the Duck Pond as having value. These landscapes areas have also been highlighted in the Preservation Plan as Heritage Conservation Places, and offers recommendations for their preservation and enhancement.

In summary, the Master Plan and the Preservation Plan are in agreement on the need for preserving historic buildings, districts, and heritage places. The challenge will be in exactly how these historically significant properties and landscapes are to be considered and affected by future development.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

The historic significance of buildings, structures, and objects are generally judged within a fifty-year time window. In other words, buildings are not to be evaluated with regard to historic significance until they have reached fifty years old. This, of course, is a moving time target, and therefore the university must be constantly evaluating its campus buildings and updating its inventory of historic places. It is recommended that the university plan for future historic preservation surveys every five years.

Critical to evaluating the historical significance of buildings, landscapes, and places is understanding the historic context in which these properties were built and used. There are certain facets of the university’s history that need further study, which in turn will assist the historic preservation process. These studies include:

- Agricultural educational practices, such as irrigation techniques, crop research, and animal husbandry, on campus dating from the nineteenth through the twenty-first centuries. How have these practices changed over time and been reflected in the university’s curriculum and patterning of fields and support buildings.

- The educational and training activities on campus during World War II and how these activities affected the university’s built environment.

- During the research for this plan, VCHP found numerous maps and historic photographs that need to be dated, analyzed, and catalogued. This effort would greatly enhance future preservation studies.

Finally, the university’s other campuses and properties (see below) should be evaluated to determine if there are significant historic buildings located on their campuses (such as the Fabian Garcia Research Center). Of particular interest are the buildings constructed in the early 1920s and now associated with the Alcalde Center for Sustainable Agriculture located in northern New Mexico. Other historic buildings may also include some of the ranch buildings associated with NMSU’s research centers located in rural areas across the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Campuses</th>
<th>New Mexico Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMSU – Las Cruces</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMSU – Alamogordo</td>
<td>Alamogordo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMSU – Carlsbad</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMSU – Grants</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMSU – Doña Ana Community College</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Center</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mesa Center</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Street Center</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsen Center</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunland Park Center</td>
<td>Sunland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaparral Center</td>
<td>Chaparral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campuses</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabian Garcia Research Center</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Farm</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton Livestock Research Center</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalde Center for Sustainable Agriculture</td>
<td>Alcalde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Center for Rangeland Sustainability</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jornada Ranch Agricultural Research Center</td>
<td>Dona Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyendecker Plant Science Center</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovis Agricultural Research Center</td>
<td>Clovis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucumcari Agricultural Research Center</td>
<td>Tucumcari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Lunas Agricultural Research Center</td>
<td>Las Lunas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Agricultural Research Center</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia Agricultural Research Center</td>
<td>Artesia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Properties</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache Point Observatory</td>
<td>Cloudcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Ranch Demonstration Site</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Affairs Offices</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service Offices</td>
<td>All 33 counties and 5 tribal offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORIC PRESERVATION MAINTENANCE RECOMMENDATIONS & DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

Management Approach

Ideally, the university should integrate routine maintenance and guidance developed for this Heritage Preservation Plan into daily campus maintenance and yearly development plans. University task forces and committees responsible for studying and making recommendations to future campus development plans and staff at Physical Plant charged with maintaining real property at the university should incorporate historic preservation ideas in daily operations.

The most efficient way to accomplish this goal is to incorporate *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation Planning* and the Secretary’s Standards for the *Treatment of Historic Properties* into the day-to-day operations of the university so that historic preservation is not a later “add-in” to a project, which can result in costly redesigns; or overlooked in daily maintenance routines or project planning, which can result in a loss of historic character (see Appendix A). Most historic buildings and landscapes lose aspects of historic integrity because maintenance staff has not been informed on how daily maintenance should be conducted to preserve significant building features. If maintenance staff is made aware of the historic preservation issues for the properties they care for, they can incorporate them into their daily, weekly and yearly routines. The best method to bring historic preservation to their attention is through training sessions that use craftsmen, preservation specialists, and/or product representatives who know the specific preservation issues and provide hands-on training on how to work with historic materials.

Maintenance staff, architects, engineers, planners and facilities/physical plant administrators can be informed about historic preservation regulatory requirements and university policies on campus heritage preservation. This could include classroom training sessions, site visits to discuss issues specific to a property, developing a familiarity with this Heritage Preservation Plan, and working closely with the State Historic Preservation Office and other preservation-oriented groups to gain additional insight about historic preservation in general. To incorporate historic preservation into the university culture – beyond training and using this Heritage Preservation Plan – Physical Plant should work to design a system that ensures 1) compliance with the regulations; 2) university policy; and 3) the recommendations of this Heritage Preservation Plan. The system should track maintenance and new projects from their inception through completion and inform all parties that have responsibility for the repair and alteration of historic properties on campus.
General Historic Preservation Development Guidance

Historic preservation at the university should employ a philosophy that unites the Regents, administrators, building stewards, and maintenance staff in the overall goal to provide modern facilities and retain the historic qualities of the campus’ buildings and landscapes that provide a sense of place and heritage. Heritage preservation on campus is not intended to make the institution a “museum” or a place where changes cannot be made, but rather is intended to engender a pride and understanding of the historic architecture and important landscapes that provide a nationally unique environment within which academics take place. As such, preservation standards, the regulatory process, and this Heritage Preservation Plan should be seen as development tools for the university—allowing for changes to the campus which honors the past and is valued by alumni, students, faculty, and the general public in Las Cruces and the State of New Mexico.

Additions to historic buildings or new buildings located in historic districts should respect the massing and proportion of the existing buildings in the district through such elements as setbacks, fenestration patterns, and detailing. New development and architectural design should not mimic the architecture of Trost, McGhee, or Wolgamood, which would create a false sense of history, but rather should honor its temporal environment and architecture while using the concepts and elements of the architectural styles.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation Planning (see Appendix A) can aid the university in moving forward with future plans, however, some specific guidelines for development are provided below in Table 2.

Table 1: Development Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect important landscape views when infilling and developing the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it is possible to introduce grass species that require less water, it should be done as a way to conserve water. However, the species of grass introduced should be one that covers evenly, rather than grows in clumps. The species selected must withstand student use of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMSU ground mounted signs and planting may change in design through the years; however, the scale of this feature should not be larger than its present prominence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a Landscape Plan: As a further development of the recent Master Plan, a Master Landscape Plan should be undertaken to establish the principles of development of the major pedestrian malls, the Duck Pond/Regents’ Grove open space, parking lot design, connecting outdoor spaces, and other landscape features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A palate of designs for retaining walls, benches, and shade structures, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other pedestrian amenities should be defined to help tie the campus together while allowing for the design of individual projects.

Preservation of Special Specimen Trees: Because so many resources are tied up in maintaining mature trees, they should be carefully protected in the development of new structures and landscape features. Shade is a valuable commodity in the Las Cruces climate, and it takes a long time for a tree to provide really usable shade. For example, the Master Plan calls for the redevelopment of McFie Circle. The mature Arizona Sycamores there should be protected in this process.

**Building Development**

For additions to the south of historic buildings: at least 4 hours of solar access on December 21 of each year should be received on the portion of the roof closest to the new building or addition. This provision will allow for the addition of solar panels (not visible from the ground) to the roof of the protected buildings.

On all other elevations, the building envelope for a proposed building should fall below a place drawn along the top of the historic building’s adjacent wall and 45 degrees to the ground.

Energy

Window Efficiency: look to other project examples that have preserved historic windows and overall building character while upgrading the R-value of their building systems to meet modern energy requirements. An example is the Naval Yard in Washington D.C., where new energy efficient windows were added on the interior of the building to allow the exterior to retain its historic character.

Walls: It is best to use an insulation system on the interior of a wall system or by furring out an interior wall. In general, historic buildings should not be covered with an EIFS system to produce higher energy efficiency; however, if the university were to choose such a system, the final look should match the historic texture and color of stucco.

Energy

Roofs: Most buildings on campus can be retrofitted with a tapered insulation system that ensures water drainage and promotes a higher R-value. These can be hidden behind parapets and do not affect the overall historic character of the buildings. Avoid spray foam systems; if a rubber roofing system is used, pay special attention to flashing details and ensure system cannot be seen from grade.

Accessibility

Ramps should be designed to have the least possible visual impact on historic properties. Rather than ramping straight into buildings at the center walkway, consider an L- or U-shaped ramp that would allow the ramp to run parallel to the building for most of its length. Use short landscape walls and plantings to hide ramps and reduce their visual profile.

Elevators should be added to the least visible elevation and the addition should match the massing and overall composition of the historic property.

Where possible, retain historic hardware. If the historic hardware must be replaced, salvage the historic (perhaps for curation), and replace with a modern accessible unit that blends with the character of the door.
Routine Maintenance

All maintenance and repair to historic structures at the university should work to make an efficient contemporary use of the historic properties, while preserving their historic, architectural and cultural values. The *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (and more specifically the standard for Rehabilitation) can lead university building planners and maintenance staff through this process. The standards are included in Appendix A of this Heritage Preservation Plan. Table 3 outlines general preservation practice for routine maintenance projects on university historic properties. Maintenance staffs should be encouraged to utilize the following general guidelines when carrying out their activities:

**Table 2: General Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GENERAL INSPECTIONS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Inspect pitched and flat roofs, including underside of substrate if it can be seen on interior, once each year for leaks and deteriorating roofing, flashing, and other components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Monitor cracks in stucco. Inspect the wall surface every six months, particularly at corners where cracking from foundation settling can often appear. If stucco cracks are moving and/or growing, contact an engineer for advice on building stabilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Inspect windows yearly for operability and a proper seal. Also inspect paint and overall window condition, to ensure there is no moisture, insect or use damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Inspect doors yearly for operability and a proper seal. Also inspect paint and overall condition, to ensure there is no moisture, insect or use damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Inspect basements and foundations every six months to ensure that they are dry. If there is cracking, monitor as with stucco above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porches</td>
<td>Inspect porch columns and architectural features yearly for moisture and insect damage, condition of paint, and structural soundness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Defining Features</td>
<td>Inspect all character defining features yearly, including decorative elements, to ensure that they are not suffering from moisture damage, sunlight, use or other types of deterioration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL MAINTENANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Landscape</strong></th>
<th>Tree health shall be maintained with appropriate watering and attention to prevention and treatment of disease.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Prior to the end of the natural life of trees in important landscapes, a replacement tree of the same or similar species should be planted nearby. Tree replacement should be spaced in time to avoid the maturing and death of several trees at once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat roofs can use modern materials, such as rubber roofing, as long as they are not visible from grade. Ensure that roof and flashing materials are compatible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove insect hives and screen openings at eaves where bats, birds and insects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
might gain access to the interior.

| Walls | Stucco colors and texture should be analyzed on a building-by-building basis throughout the campus to determine historic colors and textures. The older stuccos tended to have a smooth texture and generally lighter tans, while modern stucco has a pebble-dash texture and typically darker browns. When re-stuccoing buildings, the historic colors and textures should be used to maintain and restore architectural character. |
| Walls | When repairing stucco, match color, texture, and composition of the historic stucco. Cut deteriorated material from wall to provide preparation prior to initiating patch. Provide test panels to ensure the best possible mix and technique, prior to completing repairs on historic buildings. Once the staff has identified a good stucco mix and application technique, document it and use as standard repair method. |
| Windows | Clean cracks and crevices at windows yearly to maintain operability. If window is inoperable, repair using materials that match historic. When replacing hardware, the new hardware should match the historic. When re-glazing, install new panes using clean putty lines. When repainting, properly prepare the surface, scraping loose paint, repairing deteriorated wood (with epoxy resins or Dutchmen that match the original wood species and window component profiles), sanding and repainting. When painting, use clean lines and be sure to remove any residue from glazing. When adding screens or energy-efficiency devices, install on interior to minimize visual impact on exterior. |
| Doors | When replacing hardware, the new hardware should match the historic. If ADA hardware is required, choose hardware that is compatible with the historic in color, material and overall design. When installing screens or storm units, purchase units that fill the frame; or units where the panels and mullions line up with the historic panels and proportions of the doors. When repainting, properly prepare the surface, scraping loose paint, repairing deteriorated wood (with epoxy resins or Dutchmen that match the original wood species and window component profiles), sanding and repainting. When painting use clean lines and be sure to remove any residue from glazing or adjacent trim. |
| Foundation | Patch minor cracks to match the surrounding concrete in texture and color. Patches will last longer and be less likely to cause damage to surrounding historic material, if the concrete matches the original in composition. If concrete is deteriorated on the surface, scrape loose concrete from wall and repair with concrete mix that closely matches the original. Concrete that matches original in composition will last longer and be less likely to cause damage to surrounding historic material. |
| Character Defining | Many of the buildings in this plan have a number of character defining features that are not included in the above categories. If the features are concrete, maintain as noted in |
| Features | foundations, but also ensure that the lines of the features are kept intact. If the features are wood, follow the painting and patching recommendations noted under windows. |
GLOSSARY

adverse effect
Alteration to a historic property that damages the characteristic-defining feature(s) of the property, which makes it eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

arcade
A series of continuous arches; a covered passageway, with open archways on one or both sides.

architrave
A molded trim band surrounding the outside of a rectangular wall opening.

awning window
A section of window that pivots from the top and opens outward.

balconet
A low railing outside a window to mimic the appearance of a balcony.

balustrade
An entire railing system (as along the edge of a balcony) including a top rail and its balusters, and sometimes a bottom rail.

barge board
sometimes called a vergeboard. Sloped board at the edge of a projected eave at a gable end; covers rafter ends. Sometimes highly decorated, carved.

bas relief
Low-relief carving, of which no portion is undercut or separated from the background plane of material.

bilaterally symmetrical
Having identical parts on each side of an axis (syn: bilateral, isobilateral, bilaterally symmetric).

blind arch
An arch with the opening sealed with the same material as the wall. May be recessed.

bracket
An angled support that helps transfer the load of a horizontal structural member to a vertical one; similarly, various decorative elements in the corner of an opening or below a projection; types include angle bracket, console, cut bracket.

bullnose
A rounded plaster edge.

capital
The upper decorated portion of a column or pilaster on which the entablature rests.

casement
A window sash that opens on hinges fixed to its vertical edge.
**cast concrete**
Concrete that is poured into a form and cured.

**character-defining feature**
Prominent or distinctive aspect, quality, or characteristic of a historic property that contributes significantly to its physical character.

**Churrigueresque**
A highly ornamental Spanish and Mexican Baroque style, dating from the early 18th century and featured in later Spanish Renaissance revival styles.

**cinquefoil**
A five-lobed (or five-cusped) ornamental circular window.

**clerestory**
An upper zone of wall pierced with windows that admit light to the center of a lofty room.

**column**
In structures, a relatively long, slender structural compression member such as post, pillar, or strut; usually vertical, supporting a load which acts in (or near) the direction of its longitudinal axis.

**composition shingles**
Various types of shingles made with fibers and binder materials, such as asphalt. Date from late 19th c.

**coping**
Protective covering running along top of wall, parapet, chimney, pilaster, often made of wood, stone, terra cotta, concrete or metal.

**corbel**
A member which projects from within a wall and supports a superincumbent weight. Generally a corbel has sections that extend farther outward as it stacks upward toward the load it is carrying.

**cornice**
The projection at the top of a wall; the top course or molding of a wall when it serves as a crowning member. Two general type of cornices are the box cornice and the open cornice. A cornice along the slope (rake) of a gable or pediment is termed a raking cornice. Also, the upper projection of the entablature in classical architecture.

**curvilinear**
Consisting of or bounded by curved lines: represented by a curved line.

**curtain wall**
A non-load-bearing exterior wall supported by the skeleton frame of a building; typically used in mid-rise and high-rise buildings; may be of any material, including masonry or glass.

**dentil**
Small decorative blocks alternating with a blank space, often with moldings above and/or below.

**double hung**
A window with two sashes that slide past each other vertically; either both sashes are hung with cord, pulley, and counterweight on each side, or the bottom sash has cords and counterweights on each side; typically the lower sash is in inside the upper sash; window types are usually expressed by the number of panes, for example: one over one.
escutcheon
Protective plate around a keyhole, a door handle, etc.; also a shield on which armorial designs are depicted.

facade
The main, or front elevation of a building, where the main entryway is located.

fanlight
Refers to any curved window over a door – was once restricted to curved windows with radial muntins.

fascia board
Board forming a horizontal band at edge of an eave.

fenestration
The arrangement and design of windows in a building.

finial
Pointed ornament, often at top or peak of a roof or parapet wall.

flat roof
A roof with a low enough pitch that it can be walked upon – may be flat or may have a very shallow incline for drainage.

gable
The triangular portion of wall at the gable end under the roof overhang, between the two inclined roof slopes meeting at the roofline.

gabled roof
A pitched roof with two sloping planes meeting at the roofline, forming a vertical gable at each end.

glass blocks
Hollow glass masonry units that admit light but ensure privacy, installed with mortar joints.

glazing
The glass of windows and doors.

Gothic Revival
The revival of medieval Gothic architectural motifs and styles, beginning at the beginning of the 19\textsuperscript{th} c., becoming widespread through middle of 19\textsuperscript{th} c. Essentially an outgrowth of the picturesque or Romantic reaction against the rise of industrialism and scientific rationalism, which began in 18\textsuperscript{th} c. Symmetrical facades, gable dormers, steeply pitched roofs, cross gables, scrollwork bargeboards.

HABS/HAER
See Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record

Heritage Conservation Places (HCPs)
Properties that contribute to overall heritage of the university. Although these places, viewsheds and objects do not meet the rigorous historical or architectural standards required of National or State Register properties, these properties offer tangible symbols of NMSU’s history and are visible reminders of that history.

hipped roof
Roof that slopes inward from all exterior walls. See gabled roof.
Historic American Building Survey / Historic American Engineering Record
A program of the National Park Service that established standards for recording and documenting historic buildings and engineering structures. See Appendix A of this Plan.

historic property
A building, structure, object, district, or site that meets National Register criteria and is thus included or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. It also includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to or located within such properties. It also includes properties of traditional, religious, and cultural importance to an Indian tribe that meets the National Register criteria.

hopper window
A window that pivots from the bottom and generally opens in towards the building.

International Style
A form of Modernism that strives to depart from historical styles and detailing; a reaction to the various historical revival movements in architecture. Typically non-load-bearing walls, projecting asymmetrical geometric forms, flat walls, flat roofs; horizontal bands of windows set flush with exterior wall surfaces. Common materials include concrete, steel, glass.

Italian Villa Style
Also sometimes referred to as Italianate Style, this is an eclectic country-house design style. Low-pitched, heavily bracketed roofs, asymmetrical plan, square towers, rounded arch windows.

jalousie
An enclosed porch or balcony with fixed louvered panels and adjustable slats.

knee wall
A low wall that does not extend to a ceiling; or, a wall that extends from a floor to meet a steeply sloped ceiling, as in an attic; or, an exterior wall that does not extend upward a full story.

lintel
A horizontal structural member that supports a load over an opening; usually made of wood, stone, steel, or concrete; may be exposed or obscured by wall covering.

lite
The individual glass panes in a window or door are referred to as “lites.” A multi-paned window would be referred to as a multi-lite window (or door).

louvered vent
Angled slats fixed to a window opening in a stacked arrangement, with spaces between them to admit ventilation to an interior space.

mascaron
Spanish; a decorative element in the form of a human head, rendered grotesquely; Renaissance Revival keystones, Spanish Colonial door knockers.

massing
The composition of the exterior volumes of a building, especially when the building has multiple “massed” elements (e.g., a central block plus wings)

Mission Style
An architectural style characterized by stucco walls, round arches supported by piers, continuous wall surface forming parapets, hip roof with red tile roof covering, decorative stringcourse outlining the arches,
and overhanging eaves with exposed rafters. (Towers, curvilinear gables, and gablets found in larger examples of this style.)

**mitigation**  
The act of eliminating, minimizing, or otherwise accounting for an adverse effect upon a historic property.

**Modernism**  
Not to be confused with Modern houses, in the sense of post-World War II subdivision development styles such as ranch houses. “Modernist” structures are from earlier in the 20th c. (1920-1940) and can be broken out into styles such as Art Deco and Moderne. “Art Deco” featured zigzags and other geometric motifs, smooth stucco wall surfaces, and towers and other vertical projections. “Moderne” structures featured smooth stucco wall surfaces, flat roofs, ledge coping, horizontal grooves, and balustrades. Regional Modernism partakes of modernist elements and locally available materials and styles, e.g. “Pueblo Deco,” a style sometimes practiced by Henry C. Trost.

**monitor roof**  
A raised, linear section of roof with a band of clerestory windows, to admit natural light to interior.

**mullion**  
Vertical member separating (and often supporting) window, doors, or panels set in series.

**muntin**  
A secondary framing member, typically horizontal, to hold panes within a window, widow wall, or glazed door. (mullions are the vertical members)

**National Register criteria**  
The criteria established by the Secretary of the Interior for use in evaluating the eligibility of properties for the National Register.

**National Register of Historic Places (National Register; NRHP)**  
A list of eligible historic properties maintained by the Secretary of the Interior.

**newel post**  
The vertical post that terminates a stair railing, at bottom and at each point where railing turns.

**New Formalism**  
A form of modernist architecture that is characterized by buildings that are freestanding blocks with symmetrical elevations, level rooflines with heavy, projecting roof slabs, many modeled columnar supports, and frequent use of the arch as a ruling motif to produce a kind of classicism without classical forms.

**parapet**  
A low wall or protective railing; often used around a balcony or balconet, or along the edge of a roof.

**pediments**  
Triangular gable ends on classical building or same form used elsewhere, as over a door or a window.

**penthouse**  
A small, sloping roof attached to a wall at its higher end; or, a structure on the top of a flat-roofed building. pent roof. Either a **shed roof**, with a single incline, or the roof of a **penthouse**.
pilaster
a column with a base and capital that is "engaged" (attached) to the wall behind it; usually ornamental, although sometimes it also serves a structural purpose.

portal
A monumental gateway or entrance, especially one with a classical enframement.

Prairie Style
A style founded by Frank Lloyd Wright, inspiring many imitators in early 20th c. America. Rejected historical styles; featured low-pitched hipped roofs, wide eaves, casement ribbon windows, right angles with no ornamentation.

Quarter round cornice molding
A cornice molding that is approximately a quarter circle in cross section.

quatrefoil
A four-lobed (or four-cusped) ornamental circular window.

Queen Anne Style
A building style of the Victorian era, a reinterpretation of an earlier architectural era dating to the reign of England’s Queen Anne from 1702-1714. Victorian Queen Anne revival buildings feature asymmetrical exteriors; gabled, hipped, and mansard roofs, sometimes all in one structure; scrollwork brackets, trim, porches, bay and oriel windows, turrets, carvings. Interior floor plans are often laid out in a “pinwheel” pattern typical of Queen Anne houses.

quoins
At the corners of a building, large rectangular blocks of masonry that perform both a structural and aesthetic function; often arranged in an alternating pattern. Typical of Renaissance architecture and in Renaissance revival structures. Brick, wood, stucco, other materials.

ribbon casements
Horizontal arrangement of casement windows without intervening structural elements; casements are windows with one or more sashes that swing open along their entire length, usually swinging via a hinge at the side of the opening to which they are fixed.

salt box roof
Steeply pitched side-gable roof, usually on a one-story lean-to addition that continues the back roof slope of a two-story gable down to the first story.

sconce
An electric lamp, resembling a candlestick or a group of candlesticks, which is designed and fabricated for mounting on a wall.

scrolls
A spiral decoration, as in a bas-relief end-view of a parchment roll, or a spiral banister rail-end, etc.

segmental arch
An arch the curvilinear portion of which forms less than a half-circle.

shed roof
See also pent roof. A roof with one slope; rafters span from one outside wall to opposite wall.
sill
A horizontal timber, at the bottom of the frame of a wood structure, which rests on the foundation; or the horizontal feature at the base of a window or door.

dsill course
A masonry stringcourse that either continues, or is immediately below, the windowsills; sometimes forms a band across an elevation or around building.

spandrel
The area between two stories of windows filled in with a decorative panel; at NMSU it is typically a concrete panel with a decorative, geometric pattern.

Spanish Baroque
See Churrigueresque. A highly ornamental style of architecture dating to the late renaissance; elaborate symmetrical ornamentation and scrolls, curves, and distorted classical forms.

Spanish Eclectic Style
A style of architecture most commonly found in the American Southwest and in Florida, that features decorative details borrowed from the history of Spanish architecture, usually featuring low-pitched roof with little to no eave overhang, prominent arches above door or a main window, with an asymmetrical façade. Features Mission or Spanish tiles and often elaborately ornate entryways in “Churrigueresque” ornamental style. Early 20th c.

Spanish-Pueblo Revival
A style indigenous to the American Southwest with identifying features such as a flat or parapet roof, adobe or stucco exterior, projecting vigas, kiva fireplaces, portales and Zapata corbels.

Spanish Renaissance Revival
A historical revival movement characterized by detailing and features that included large, elaborate entryways (see Churrigueresque), symmetrical massing and facades, smooth stucco or brick elevations, and low-pitched, hipped, red clay-tile roofs. Is closely related to California Mission Revival and Italian Renaissance revival.

springline
The imaginary line drawn horizontally from the top of the vertical elements of an archway; the point at which the arch’s curvilinear segment “springs” from the two vertical supporting legs of the archway.

stretcher bond
Masonry unit (such as brick) laid horizontally along its length in the direction of the plane of the wall.

terrazzo
A floor finish of stone (usually marble) chips laid in a mortar bed, ground and polished smooth.

Territorial Collegiate
More the spirit of local boosterism than a style, Territorial Collegiate expressed the desire of promoters especially in new states and territories to make a statement that they were building social and civic institutions to take their place alongside established cultural centers (i.e., the Northeast). Thus, in New Mexico, early institutional buildings did not borrow from local or regional styles and materials but instead mimicked national styles, such as Richardsonian Romanesque.

Territorial Revival
Revival of the provincial Greek Revival of 1846-80 and the Territorial style that came with the American military in the mid-1800s, defined by John Gaw Meem and Gordon Street as form of regional classicism.
for the New Deal (WPA) Federal presence in New Mexico. This style omits pitched roofs, emphasizes flat roofs, buff stucco, brick copings, and white porches, and pedimented lintels.

**Tongue-in-groove soffit**
Tongue-in-groove wood joints feature a projecting “tongue” on the edge one board that fits into a recessed “groove” on another to form a tightly fitting joint. A soffit is the flat underside of a roof eave or overhang.

**transom**
A glazed unit above a window or door; may be fixed or operable.

**trefoil**
A three-lobed (or three-cusped) ornamental circular window.

**tympanum**
Wall panel below an arch and above transom over a doorway.

**undertaking**
A project, activity or program funded in whole or part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of a Federal agency, including those carried out by or on behalf of a Federal agency; those carried out with Federal financial assistance; and those requiring a Federal permit, license or approval.

**viewshed**
A particular landscape vista that has meaning to a culture, group, or community and is thus important to their heritage conservation.

**vision panel**
A glazed window slit, usually in an institutional building door, to allow a view to the other side of the door.

**wainscot**
A wood covering of an interior wall; most often paneling; may cover all or the lower portion of the wall; originally a high-quality oak imported into England from Scotland for paneling (wain scot-oak).

**zapata**
A Spanish Colonial style holster above a wood column; typically with flat sides and scroll-cut ends, often in the profile of a console or cyma.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FEDERAL GUIDELINES FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

APPENDIX B: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES & HERITAGE CONSERVATION PLACES

APPENDIX C: RESULTS OF THE NMSU ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY

APPENDIX D: HISTORIC CAMPUS MAPS
APPENDIX A

FEDERAL GUIDELINES FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

A Summary of Applicable Federal and State Historic Preservation Laws

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation (HABS/HAER)
The preparation of the New Mexico State University Heritage Preservation Plan is guided by principles set forth in both federal and state historic preservation legislation. As NMSU formulates its own institutional guidelines regarding heritage conservation, it should be cognizant of the applicable federal and state laws and regulations. This is particularly true of university-owned historic properties (such as the YMCA Building, the President’s House, and Goddard Hall) that are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the New Mexico State Register of Cultural Properties.

**Federal and State Historic Preservation Statutes**
The federal and state statutes most applicable to the historic properties located on the NMSU campus are:
- The National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470, as amended);
- The New Mexico Cultural Properties Act (N.M. Stat. §§ 18-6-1 through 18-6-17, as amended); and
- The New Mexico Prehistoric and Historic Sites Protection Act (N.M. Stat. §§ 18-8-1 through 18-8-8).

In addition, the review process for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act has been set forth in the *Code of Federal Regulations* (30 CFR Part 800), “Protection of Historic Properties.” There are also numerous guidelines published by the National Park Service dealing with eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places and similar issues that determine whether or not a property is historically significant under federal legislation.

**Guiding Principles**
The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is the guiding force behind the federal historic preservation policy. In Section 1(b), the Act states in part:
- The spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage;
- The historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life;
- Historic properties significant to the Nation’s heritage are being lost or substantially altered, if inadvertently, with increasing frequency; and
- The preservation of this irreplaceable heritage is in the public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, aesthetic, inspirational, economic, and energy benefits will be maintained and enriched for future generations of Americans.

The New Mexico Cultural Properties Act (NMCPA) was created in 1969 in response to the NHPA passed some three years earlier. The Act declares that the state’s historical and cultural heritage is one of its “most valued and important assets,” and that the public has an interest in preserving historic sites, structures, objects, and similar places. Furthermore, the Cultural Properties Act provides for the preservation, protection, and enhancement of structures, sites, and objects of historic significance in a manner conforming with the provisions of the NHPA.

The Cultural Properties Act was been supplemented in 1978 by the passage of the New Mexico Prehistoric and Historic Sites Protection Act that states that any program or project using state funds must attempt to preserve, protect or minimize harm to prehistoric or historic sites that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and the State Register of Cultural Properties (State Register).
Review Process
In addition to creating guiding principles for historic preservation, the National Historic Preservation Act, New Mexico Cultural Properties Act, and the New Mexico Prehistoric and Historic Sites Preservation Act all set up similar processes to identify historic resources and review the effects of federal or state projects (defined as “undertakings”) on these resources. These statutes establish registers of cultural and historic properties worthy of preservation, known at the National Register and the State Register, respectively. These acts call for the state historic preservation officer (SHPO) and/or the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to be given a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed effects of any modifications to a building, structure, site, or object listed on either the National or State register. The federal review process has been codified in 36 CFR Part 800.

Definitions
The NMCPA and the NHPA define specific categories of historic resources or groups of resources. These terms are commonly used by historic preservation specialists and should be familiar to NMSU staff working with such properties:

- “Historic resource” or “historic property” (NHPA) means any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for, inclusion on the National Register, including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a resource or property. It also includes any properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to Indian tribes or other groups/communities that meets the National Register criteria.

- “Cultural property” (NMCPA) means a structure, place, site, or object having historic, archaeological, scientific, architectural or other cultural significance.

- “Registered cultural property” (NMCPA) means a cultural property that has been placed on the State Register on either a permanent or temporary basis by the state’s Cultural Properties Review Committee.

- “Building”, “Structure”, and “Site” refer to different categories of historic properties. Buildings are places that shelter human activity, while structures are related to purposes other than human shelter. Sites are locations of significant events (prehistoric or historic in time) with historical, archaeological, or cultural value, regardless of whether or not there is a standing building or structure.

- “Individually eligible property” (NHPA) means a single building, structure, site, or object that meets the National Register criteria. If such a property is a building or a structure, it may include interior as well exterior features, and may also include landscaping features immediately surrounding the property. Whether such features are significant is determined by the university in consultation with the SHPO, and defined on the evaluation form.

- “Historic district” (National Register) means a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. An historic district has prescribed geographical boundaries, and may be comprised of resources that are not “individually eligible,” but when considered as a whole are historically significant. A district can consist of “contributing” and “noncontributing” buildings, structures, sites, objects, or landscapes.
Contributing features are those that complement the historical or architectural nature of the district. Noncontributing features are those that do not contribute to the district’s historic significance, for example, because they were added to the district at a later date, are in a style not relevant the district’s historic design, or have been modified to such an extent that they have lost their historic significance. All features – buildings, structures, and landscapes – located within an historic district should be identified as “contributing” or “noncontributing.” Noncontributing resources are not considered to be historic properties, and thus are not subject to the NHPA review process.

- “Cultural landscapes” are a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals herein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person, or that exhibit 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. This type of property is often referred to as a “Traditional Cultural Property” or TCP, which reflects its religious or cultural importance to an Indian tribe or traditional community. Such a property must meet the standard criteria for National Register eligibility to be considered a “historic property.”

- “Cultural resources” are commonly considered under the same definition as “cultural property” or “historic resource”; however, the term often has a broader definition that includes those features of both the natural and built environment that have a cultural value to some socio-cultural group. This concept incorporates the larger mosaic of things, values, beliefs, perceptions, customs, traditions, and symbols that make the cultural environment.

No matter what term is used, it is important to note that when someone is talking about cultural or historic properties, cultural resources, or historic districts, they are talking about specific classes of buildings or structures that have certain safeguards designed to protect their significant historic qualities under state and federal law. Therefore, facilities managers, their staff, and university planners must know which properties are “historic,” the process for getting approval of projects that affect them, and the standards that must be used in their rehabilitation and maintenance.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties

Another valuable information resource for NMSU architects, planners, and facilities managers are the standards set forth in The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (1995). It presents guidelines for preserving, rehabilitating, restoring, and reconstructing historic buildings, and is the standard used by the SHPO for reviewing proposed modifications to historic properties. These guidelines should be consulted for any maintenance or rehabilitation project being undertaken by the university on one its historic buildings. The Secretary’s Standards consist of four treatment categories.

(1) Preservation. This standard is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property.
Although upgrading mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems are permitted, additions to the building are usually not allowed under this standard. In general, this standard allows very little flexibility with regard to materials, use, and form.

(2) Rehabilitation. This standard 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 which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

(3) Restoration. This standard 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. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.

(4) Reconstruction. This standard 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.

Of the four standards, the Rehabilitation Standard is the one most likely to be used on the NMSU camps. It is advisable that when considering modifications to an existing historic campus building that university architects and planners consult with the SHPO during the initial design phase regarding the appropriate treatment plan.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Rehabilitation Standards

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Rehabilitation Guidelines
When repair and replacement of deteriorated features are necessary; when alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use; and when its depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate, Rehabilitation may be considered as a treatment. Prior to undertaking work, a documentation plan for Rehabilitation should be developed.

Choosing Rehabilitation as a Treatment
In Rehabilitation, historic building materials and character-defining features are protected and maintained as they are in the treatment Preservation; however, an assumption is made prior to work that existing historic fabric has become damaged or deteriorated over time and, as a result, more repair and replacement will be required. Thus, latitude is given in the Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation to replace extensively deteriorated, damaged, or missing features using either traditional or substitute materials. Of the four treatments, only Rehabilitation includes an opportunity to make possible an efficient contemporary use through alterations and additions.

Identify, Retain, and Preserve Historic Materials and Features
Like Preservation, guidance for the treatment Rehabilitation begins with recommendations to identify the form and detailing of those architectural materials and features that are important in defining the building's historic character and which must be retained in order to preserve that character. Therefore, guidance on identifying, retaining, and preserving character-defining features is always given first. The character of a historic building may be defined by the form and detailing of exterior materials, such as masonry, wood, and metal; exterior features, such as roofs, porches, and windows; interior materials, such as plaster and paint; and interior features, such as moldings and stairways, room configuration and spatial relationships, as well as structural and mechanical systems.

Protect and Maintain Historic Materials and Features
After identifying those materials and features that are important and must be retained in the process of Rehabilitation work, then protecting and maintaining them are addressed. Protection generally involves the least degree of intervention and is preparatory to other work. For example, protection includes the maintenance of historic material through treatments such as rust removal, caulking, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coatings; the
cyclical cleaning of roof gutter systems; or installation of fencing, alarm systems and other temporary protective measures. Although a historic building will usually require more extensive work, an overall evaluation of its physical condition should always begin at this level.

**Repair Historic Materials and Features**

Next, when the physical condition of character-defining materials and features warrants additional work *repairing* is recommended. Rehabilitation guidance for the repair of historic materials such as masonry, wood, and architectural metals again begins with the least degree of intervention possible such as patching, piecing-in, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing or upgrading them according to recognized preservation methods. Repairing also includes the limited replacement in kind—or with compatible substitute material--of extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes (for example, brackets, dentils, steps, plaster, or portions of slate or tile roofing). Although using the same kind of material is always the preferred option, substitute material is acceptable if the form and design as well as the substitute material itself convey the visual appearance of the remaining parts of the feature and finish.

**Replace Deteriorated Historic Materials and Features**

Following repair in the hierarchy, Rehabilitation guidance is provided for *replacing* an entire character-defining feature with new material because the level of deterioration or damage of materials precludes repair (for example, an exterior cornice; an interior staircase; or a complete porch or storefront). If the essential form and detailing are still evident so that the physical evidence can be used to re-establish the feature as an integral part of the rehabilitation, then its replacement is appropriate. Like the guidance for repair, the preferred option is always replacement of the entire feature in kind, that is, with the same material. Because this approach may not always be technically or economically feasible, provisions are made to consider the use of a compatible substitute material. It should be noted that, while the National Park Service guidelines recommend the replacement of an entire character-defining feature that is extensively deteriorated, they never recommend removal and replacement with new material of a feature that--although damaged or deteriorated--could reasonably be repaired and thus preserved.

**Design for the Replacement of Missing Historic Features**

When an entire interior or exterior feature is missing (for example, an entrance, or cast iron facade; or a principal staircase), it no longer plays a role in physically defining the historic character of the building unless it can be accurately recovered in form and detailing through the process of carefully documenting the historical appearance. Although accepting the loss is one possibility, where an important architectural feature is missing, its replacement is always recommended in the Rehabilitation guidelines as the first or preferred, course of action. Thus, if adequate historical, pictorial, and physical documentation exists so that the feature may be accurately reproduced, and if it is desirable to re-establish the feature as part of the building's historical appearance, then designing and constructing a new feature based on such information is appropriate. However, a second acceptable option for the replacement feature is a new design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic building. The new design should always take into account the size, scale, and material of the historic building itself and, most importantly, should be clearly differentiated so that a false historical appearance is not created.
Alterations/Additions for the New Use
Some exterior and interior alterations to a historic building are generally needed to assure its continued use, but it is most important that such alterations do not radically change, obscure, or destroy character-defining spaces, materials, features, or finishes. Alterations may include providing additional parking space on an existing historic building site; cutting new entrances or windows on secondary elevations; inserting an additional floor; installing an entirely new mechanical system; or creating an atrium or light well. Alteration may also include the selective removal of buildings or other features of the environment or building site that are intrusive and therefore detract from the overall historic character. The construction of an exterior addition to a historic building may seem to be essential for the new use, but it is emphasized in the Rehabilitation guidelines that such new additions should be avoided, if possible, and considered only after it is determined that those needs cannot be met by altering secondary, i.e., non character-defining interior spaces. If, after a thorough evaluation of interior solutions, an exterior addition is still judged to be the only viable alternative, it should be designed and constructed to be clearly differentiated from the historic building and so that the character-defining features are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed. Additions and alterations to historic buildings are referenced within specific sections of the Rehabilitation guidelines such as Site, Roofs, Structural Systems, etc., but are addressed in detail in New Additions to Historic Buildings.

Energy Efficiency/Accessibility Considerations/Health and Safety Code Considerations
These sections of the guidance address work done to meet accessibility requirements and health and safety code requirements; or retrofitting measures to improve energy efficiency. Although this work is quite often an important aspect of Rehabilitation projects, it is usually not a part of the overall process of protecting or repairing character-defining features; rather, such work is assessed for its potential negative impact on the building's historic character. For this reason, particular care must be taken not to radically change, obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining materials or features in the process of meeting code and energy requirements.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning
To assist architects and planners working in the field of historic preservation, the Secretary of the Interior has published Standards for Preservation Planning through the National Park Service. These standards are reproduced below. Preservation planning is a process that organizes preservation activities (identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of historic properties) in a logical sequence. The Standards for Planning discuss the relationship among these activities while the remaining activity standards consider how each activity should be carried out. The Professional Qualifications Standards discuss the education and experience required to carry out various activities. The Standards for Planning outline a process that determines when an area should be examined for historic properties, whether an identified property is significant, and how a significant property should be treated. Preservation planning is based on the following principles:
- Important historic properties cannot be replaced if they are destroyed. Preservation planning provides for conservative use of these properties, preserving them in place and avoiding harm when possible and altering or destroying properties only when necessary.
If planning for the preservation of historic properties is to have positive effects, it must begin before the identification of all significant properties has been completed. To make responsible decisions about historic properties, existing information must be used to the maximum extent and new information must be acquired as needed.

Preservation planning includes public participation. The planning process should provide a forum for open discussion of preservation issues. Public involvement is most meaningful when it is used to assist in defining values of properties and preservation planning issues, rather than when it is limited to review of decisions already made. Early and continuing public participation is essential to the broad acceptance of preservation planning decisions.

Preservation planning can occur at several levels or scales: in a project area; in a community; in a State as a whole; or in the scattered or contiguous landholdings of a Federal agency. Depending on the scale, the planning process will involve different segments of the public and professional communities and the resulting plans will vary in detail. For example, a State preservation plan will likely have more general recommendations than a plan for a project area or a community. The planning process described in these Standards is flexible enough to be used at all levels while providing a common structure which promotes coordination and minimizes duplication of effort. The Guidelines for Preservation Planning contain additional information about how to integrate various levels of planning.

**Standard I. Preservation Planning Establishes Historic Contexts**

Decisions about the identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of historic properties are most reliably made when the relationship of individual properties to other similar properties is understood. Information about historic properties representing aspects of history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture must be collected and organized to define these relationships. This organizational framework is called a "historic context." The historic context organizes information based on a cultural theme and its geographical and chronological limits. Contexts describe the significant broad patterns of development in an area that may be represented by historic properties. The development of historic contexts is the foundation for decisions about identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of historic properties. This portion of preservation planning was carried out under the Getty Grant and through the student project at the School of Architecture and Planning.

**Standard II. Preservation Planning Uses Historic Contexts To Develop Goals and Priorities for the Identification, Evaluation, Registration and Treatment of Historic Properties**

A series of preservation goals is systematically developed for each historic context to ensure that the range of properties representing the important aspects of each historic context is identified, evaluated and treated. Then priorities are set for all goals identified for each historic context. The goals with assigned priorities established for each historic context are integrated to produce a comprehensive and consistent set of goals and priorities for all historic contexts in the geographical area of a planning effort.

The goals for each historic context may change as new information becomes available. The overall set of goals and priorities are then altered in response to the changes in the goals and priorities for the individual historic contexts.
Activities undertaken to meet the goals must be designed to deliver a usable product within a reasonable period of time. The scope of the activity must be defined so the work can be completed with available budgeted program resources.

This portion of preservation planning was carried out under the Getty Grant, but can be revisited on individual buildings or districts when specific actions are being planned.

**Standard III. The Results of Preservation Planning Are Made Available for Integration Into Broader Planning Processes**

Preservation of historic properties is one element of larger planning processes. Planning results, including goals and priorities, information about historic properties, and any planning documents, must be transmitted in a usable form to those responsible for other planning activities. Federally mandated historic preservation planning is most successfully integrated into project management planning at an early stage. Elsewhere, this integration is achieved by making the results of preservation planning available to other governmental planning bodies and to private interests whose activities affect historic properties.

If the recommendations of this Heritage Preservation Plan are carried out, this standard will be met through inclusion of preservation in day-to-day activities for university groups involved in planning and maintenance on historic properties, as well as inclusion of preservation in future development plans.

**Preservation Planning Guidelines**

These Guidelines link the Standards for Preservation Planning with more specific guidance and technical information. They describe one approach to meeting the Standards for Preservation Planning. Agencies, organizations or individuals proposing to approach planning differently may wish to review their approaches with the National Park Service.

The Guidelines are organized as follows:

- Managing the Planning Process
- Developing Historic Contexts
- Developing Goals for a Historic Context
- Integrating Individual Historic Contexts-Creating the Preservation Plan
- Coordinating with Management Frameworks
- Recommended Sources of Technical Information

**Managing the Planning Process**

The preservation planning process must include an explicit approach to implementation, a provision for review and revision of all elements, and a mechanism for resolving conflicts within the overall set of preservation goals and between this set of goals and other land use planning goals. It is recommended that the process and its products be described in public documents.

**Implementing the Process**

The planning process is a continuous cycle. To establish and maintain such a process, however, the process must be divided into manageable segments that can be performed, within a defined period, such as a fiscal year or budget cycle. One means of achieving this is to define a period of time during which all the preliminary steps in the planning process will be completed. These preliminary steps would include setting a schedule for subsequent activities.
Review and Revision
Planning is a dynamic process. It is expected that the content of the historic contexts described in Standard I and the goals and priorities described in Standard II will be altered based on new information obtained as planning proceeds. The incorporation of this information is essential to improve the content of the plan and to keep it up-to-date and useful. New information must be reviewed regularly and systematically, and the plan revised accordingly.

Public Participation
The success of the preservation planning process depends on how well it solicits and integrates the views of various groups. The planning process is directed first toward resolving conflicts in goals for historic preservation, and second toward resolving conflicts between historic preservation goals and other land use planning goals. Public participation is integral to this approach and includes at least the following actions:

1. Involving historians, architectural historians, archeologists, folklorists and persons from related disciplines to define, review and revise the historic contexts, goals and priorities;
2. Involving interested individuals, organizations and communities in the planning area in identifying the kinds of historic properties that may exist and suitable protective measures;
3. Involving prospective users of the preservation plan in defining issues, goals and priorities;
4. Providing for coordination with other planning efforts at local, State, regional and national levels, as appropriate; and
5. Creating mechanisms for identifying and resolving conflicts about historic preservation issues. The development of historic contexts, for example, should be based on the professional input of all disciplines involved in preservation and not be limited to a single discipline. For prehistoric archeology, for example, data from fields such as geology, geomorphology and geography may also be needed. The individuals and organizations to be involved will depend, in part, on those present or interested in the planning area.

Documents Resulting from the Planning Process
In most cases, the planning process produces documents that explain how the process works and that discuss the historic contexts and related goals and priorities. While the process can operate in the absence of these documents, planning documents are important because they are the most effective means of communicating the process and its recommendations to others. Planning documents also record decisions about historic properties.

As various parts of the planning process are reviewed and revised to reflect current information, related documents must also be updated. Planning documents should be created in a form that can be easily revised. It is also recommended that the format language and organization of any documents or other materials (visual aids, etc.) containing preservation planning information meet the needs of prospective users.

Developing Historic Contexts

General Approach
Available information about historic properties must be divided into manageable units before it
can be useful for planning purposes. Major decisions about identifying, evaluating, registering and treating historic properties are most reliably made in the context of other related properties. A historic context is an organizational format that groups information about related historic properties, based on a theme, geographic limits and chronological period. A single historic context describes one or more aspects of the historic development of an area, considering history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture and identifies the significant patterns that individual historic properties represent, for example, Coal Mining in Northeastern Pennsylvania between 1860 and 1930. A set of historic contexts is a comprehensive summary of all aspects of the history of the area.

The historic context is the cornerstone of the planning process. The goal of preservation planning is to identify, evaluate, register and treat the full range of properties representing each historic context, rather than only one or two types of properties. Identification activities are organized to ensure that research and survey activities include properties representing all aspects of the historic context. Evaluation uses the historic context as the framework within which to apply the criteria for evaluation to specific properties or property types. Decisions about treatment of properties are made with the goal of treating the range of properties in the context. The use of historic contexts in organizing major preservation activities ensures that those activities result in the preservation of the wide variety of properties that represent our history, rather than only a small, biased sample of properties.

Historic contexts, as theoretical constructs, are linked to actual historic properties through the concept of property type. Property types permit the development of plans for identification, evaluation and treatment even in the absence of complete knowledge of individual properties. Like the historic context, property types are artificial constructs which may be revised as necessary. Historic contexts can be developed at a variety of scales appropriate for local, State and regional planning. Give the probability of historic contexts overlapping in an area, it is important to coordinate the development and use of contexts at all levels. Generally, the State Historic Preservation Office possesses the most complete body of information about historic properties and, in practice, is in the best position perform this function.

The development of historic contexts generally results in documents that describe the prehistoric processes or patterns that define the context. Each of the contexts selected should be developed to the point of identifying important property types to be useful in later preservation decision-making. The amount of detail included in these summaries will vary depending on the level (local, State, regional, or national) at which the contexts are developed and on their intended uses. For most planning purposes, a synopsis of the written description of the historic context is sufficient.

Creating a Historic Context
Generally, historic contexts should not be constructed so broadly as to include all property types under a single historic context or so narrowly as to contain only one property type per historic context. The following procedures should be followed in creating a historic context.

1. Identify the concept, time period and geographical limits for the historic context
Existing information, concepts, theories, models and descriptions should be used as the basis for defining historic contexts. Biases in primary and secondary sources should be identified and accounted for when existing information is used in defining historic contexts.
The identification and description of historic contexts should incorporate contributions from all disciplines involved in historic preservation. The chronological period and geographical area of each historic context should be defined after the conceptual basis is established. However, there may be exceptions, especially in defining prehistoric contexts where drainage systems or physiographic regions often are outlined first. The geographical boundaries for historic contexts should not be based upon contemporary political, project or other contemporary boundaries if those boundaries do not coincide with historical boundaries. For example, boundaries for prehistoric contexts will have little relationship to contemporary city, county or State boundaries.

2. Assemble the existing information about the historic context
   a. Collecting information: Several kinds of information are needed to construct a preservation plan. Information about the history of the area encompassed by the historic context must be collected, including any information about historic properties that have already been identified. Existing survey or inventory entries are an important source of information about historic properties. Other sources may include literature on prehistory, history, architecture and the environment; social and environmental impact assessments; county and State land use plans; architectural and folklife studies and oral histories; ethnographic research; State historic inventories and registers; technical reports prepared for Section 106 or other assessments of historic properties; and direct consultation with individuals and organized groups.

   In addition, organizations and groups that may have important roles in defining historic contexts and values should be identified. In most cases a range of knowledgeable professionals drawn from the preservation, planning and academic communities will be available to assist in defining contexts and in identifying sources of information. In other cases, however, development of historic contexts may occur in areas whose history or prehistory has not been extensively studied. In these situations, broad general historic contexts should be initially identified using available literature and expertise, with the expectation that the contexts will be revised and subdivided in the future as primary source research and field survey are conducted. It is also important to identify such sources of information as existing planning data, which is needed to establish goals for identification, evaluation and treatment, and to identify factors that will affect attainment of those goals.

   The same approach for obtaining information is not necessarily desirable for all historic contexts. Information should not be gathered without first considering its relative importance to the historic context, the cost and time involved, and the expertise required to obtain it. In many cases, for example, published sources may be used in writing initial definitions of historic contexts; archival research or field work may be needed for subsequent activities.

   b. Assessing information: All information should be reviewed to identify bias in historic perspective, methodological approach, or area of coverage. For example, field surveys for archeological sites may have ignored historic archeological sites, or county land use plans may have emphasized only development goals.

3. Synthesize information
   The information collection and analysis results in a written narrative of the historic context. This narrative provides a detailed synthesis of the data that have been collected and analyzed. The
narrative covers the history of the area from the chosen perspective and identifies important patterns, events, persons or cultural values. In the process of identifying the important patterns, one should consider:

- Trends in area settlement and development, if relevant;
- Aesthetic and artistic values embodied in architecture, construction technology or craftsmanship;
- Research values or problems relevant to the historic context; social and physical sciences and humanities; and cultural interests of local communities; and
- Intangible cultural values of ethnic groups and Native American peoples.

4. Define property types

A property type is a grouping of individual properties based on shared physical or associative characteristics. Property types link the ideas incorporated in the theoretical historic context with actual historic properties that illustrate those ideas. Property types defined for each historic context should be directly related to the conceptual basis of the historic context. Property types defined for the historic context "Coal Mining in Northeastern Pennsylvania, 1860-1930" might include coal extraction and processing complexes; railroad and canal transportation systems; commercial districts; mine workers' housing; churches, social clubs and other community facilities reflecting the ethnic origins of workers; and residences and other properties associated with mine owners and other industrialists.

a. Identify property types: The narrative should discuss the kinds of properties expected within the geographical limits of the context and group them into those property types most useful in representing important historic trends. Generally, property types should be defined after the historic context has been defined. Property types in common usage ("Queen Anne House," "mill buildings" or "stratified sites") should not be adopted without first verifying their relevance to the historic contexts being used.

b. Characterize the locational patterns of property types: Generalizations about where particular types of properties are likely to be found can serve as a guide for identification and treatment. Generalizations about the distribution of archeological properties are frequently used. The distribution of other historic properties often can be estimated based on recognizable historical, environmental or cultural factors that determined their location. Locational patterns of property types should be based upon models that have an explicit theoretical or historical basis and can be tested in the field. The model may be the product of historical research and analysis ("Prior to widespread use of steam power, mills were located on rivers and streams able to produce water power" or "plantation houses in the Mississippi Black Belt were located on sandy clay knolls"), or it may result from sampling techniques. Often the results of statistically valid sample surveys can be used to describe the locational patterns of a representative portion of properties belonging to a particular property type. Other surveys can also provide a basis for suggesting locational patterns if a diversity of historic properties was recorded and a variety of environmental zones was inspected. It is likely that the identification of locational patterns will come from a combination of these sources. Expected or predicted locational patterns of property types should be developed with a provision made for their verification.
c. Characterize the current condition of property types: The expected condition of property types should be evaluated to assist in the development of identification, evaluation and treatment strategies, and to help define physical integrity thresholds for various property types. The following should be assessed for each property type:
   1. Inherent characteristics of a property type that either contribute to or detract from its physical preservation. For example, a property type commonly constructed of fragile materials is more likely to be deteriorated than a property type constructed of durable materials; structures whose historic function or design limits the potential for alternative uses (water towers) are less likely to be reused than structures whose design allows a wider variety of other uses (commercial buildings or warehouses).
   2. Aspects of the social and natural environment that may affect the preservation or visibility of the property type. For example, community values placed on certain types of properties (churches, historic cemeteries) may result in their maintenance while the need to reuse valuable materials may stimulate the disappearance of properties like abandoned houses and barns.
   3. It may be most efficient to estimate the condition of property types based on professional knowledge of existing properties and field test these estimates using a small sample of properties representative of each type.

5. Identify information needs
Filling gaps in information is an important element of the preservation plan designed for each historic context. Statements of the information needed should be as specific as possible, focusing on the information needed, the historic context and property types it applies to, and why the information is needed to perform identification, evaluation, or treatment activities.

Developing Goals for a Historic Context
A goal is a statement of preferred preservation activities, which is generally stated in terms of property types. The purpose of establishing preservation goals is to set forth a "best case" version of how properties in the historic context should be identified, evaluated, registered and treated.

Preservation goals should be oriented toward the greatest possible protection of properties in the historic context and should be based on the principle that properties should be preserved in place if possible, through affirmative treatments like rehabilitation, stabilization or restoration. Generally, goals will be specific to the historic context and will often be phrased in terms of property types. Some of these goals will be related to information needs previously identified for the historic context. Collectively, the goals for a historic context should be a coherent statement of program direction covering all aspects of the context.

For each goal, a statement should be prepared identifying:
   1. The goal, including the context and property types to which the goal applies and the geographical area in which they are located;
   2. The activities required to achieve the goal;
   3. The most appropriate methods or strategies for carrying out the activities;
   4. A schedule within which the activities should be completed; and
5. The amount of effort required to accomplish the goal, as well as a way to evaluate progress toward its accomplishment.

**Setting priorities for goals**

Once goals have been developed they need to be ranked in importance. Ranking involves examining each goal in light of a number of factors.

1. **General social, economic, political and environmental conditions and trends affecting (positively and negatively) the identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of property types in the historic context.**
   
   Some property types in the historic context may be more directly threatened by deterioration, land development patterns, contemporary use patterns, or public perceptions of their value, and such property types should be given priority consideration.

2. **Major cost or technical considerations affecting the identification, evaluation and treatment of property types in the historic context.**
   
   The identification or treatment of some property types may be technically possible but the cost prohibitive; or techniques may not currently be perfected (for example, the identification of submerged sites or objects, or the evaluation of sites containing material for which dating techniques are still being developed).

3. **Identification, evaluation, registration and treatment activities previously carried out for property types in the historic context.**
   
   If a number of properties representing one aspect of a historic context have been recorded or preserved, treatment of additional members of that property type may receive lower priority than treatment of a property type for which no examples have yet been recorded or preserved. This approach ensures that the focus of recording or preserving all elements of the historic context is retained, rather than limiting activities to preserving properties representing only some aspects of the context. The result of considering the goals in light of these concerns will be a list of refined goals ranked in order of priority.

**Integrating Individual Contexts-Creating the Preservation Plan**

When historic contexts overlap geographically, competing goals and priorities must be integrated for effective preservation planning. The ranking of goals for each historic context must be reconciled to ensure that recommendations for one context do not contradict those for another. This important step results in an overall set of priorities for several historic contexts and a list of the activities to be performed to achieve the ranked goals. When applied to a specific geographical area, this is the preservation plan for that area.

It is expected that in many instances historic contexts will overlap geographically. Overlapping contexts are likely to occur in two combinations-those that were defined at the same scale (i.e., textile development in Smithtown 1850-1910 and Civil War in Smithtown 1855-1870) and those defined at different scales (i.e., Civil War in Smithtown and Civil War in the Shenandoah Valley). The contexts may share the same property types, although the shared property types will probably have different levels of importance, or they may group the same properties into different property types, reflecting either a different scale of analysis or a different historical perspective. As previously noted, many of the goals that are formulated for a historic context will focus on the property types defined for that context. Thus it is critical that the integration of goals...
include the explicit consideration of the potential for shared property type membership by individual properties. For example, when the same property types are used by two contexts, reconciling the goals will require weighing the level of importance assigned to each property type. The degree to which integration of historic contexts must involve reconciling property types may be limited by the coordinated development of historic contexts used at various levels.

**Integration with Management Frameworks**

Preservation goals and priorities are adapted to land units through integration with other planning concerns. This integration must involve the resolution of conflicts that arise when competing resources occupy the same land base. Successful resolution of these conflicts can often be achieved through judicious combination of inventory, evaluation and treatment activities. Since historic properties are irreplaceable, these activities should be heavily weighted to discourage the destruction of significant properties and to be compatible with the primary land use.

**Recommended Sources of Technical Information**


*Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning.* (formerly National Register Bulletin 24). Anne Derry, H. Ward Jandl, Carol D. Shull, and Jan Thorman; revised by Patricia L. Parker, 1985. *Local Historic Preservation Plans: A Selected Annotated Bibliography.* Neil Gagliardi and Stephen Morris, 1993. Provides an overview of the range of local historic preservation plans from across the country, including information on how a number of communities have addressed various issues in their preservation plans.


Use of the National Park Service Thematic Framework need not be limited to the federal level, as the conceptualization it provides can equally inform preservation and interpretation at local, state, and regional levels. *Preparing a Historic Preservation Plan.* Bradford J. White and Richard J. Roddewig. Planning Advisory Service Report No. 450, 1994. Describes components that are important in a good preservation plan and explains how several communities have carried out preservation planning activities. Available from the American Planning Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1600, Chicago, Illinois 60603-6107; (312) 786-6344.


Describes a strategic planning approach designed to provide practical guidance to SHPOs in managing growth and change.
Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation (HABS/HAER)

When a historic property undergoes unavoidable adverse effects, either through significant building alteration or demolition, a standard mitigation alternative is to document the property prior to it undergoing change. The Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, has established standards for documenting such historic properties.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation

These standards concern the development of documentation for historic buildings, sites, structures and objects. This documentation, which usually consists of measured drawings, photographs and written data, provides important information on a property's significance for use by scholars, researchers, preservationists, architects, engineers and others interested in preserving and understanding historic properties. Documentation permits accurate repair or reconstruction of parts of a property, records existing conditions for easements, or may present information about a property that is to be demolished.

These Standards are intended for use in developing documentation to be included in the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Collections in the Library of Congress. HABS/HAER, in the National Park Service, have defined specific requirements for meeting these Standards for their collections. The HABS/HAER requirements include information important to development of documentation for other purposes such as State or local archives.

Standard I. Documentation Shall Adequately Explicate and Illustrate What is Significant or Valuable About the Historic Building, Site, Structure or Object Being Documented.

The historic significance of the building, site, structure or object identified in the evaluation process should be conveyed by the drawings, photographs and other materials that comprise documentation. The historical, architectural, engineering or cultural values of the property together with the purpose of the documentation activity determine the level and methods of documentation. Documentation prepared for submission to the Library of Congress must meet the HABS/HAER Guidelines.

Standard II. Documentation Shall be Prepared Accurately From Reliable Sources With Limitations Clearly Stated to Permit Independent Verification of the Information.

The purpose of documentation is to preserve an accurate record of historic properties that can be used in research and other preservation activities. To serve these purposes, the documentation must include information that permits assessment of its reliability.


The size and quality of documentation materials are important factors in the preservation of information for future use. Selection of materials should be based on the length of time expected for storage, the anticipated frequency of use and a size convenient for storage.

Standard IV. Documentation Shall be Clearly and Concisely Produced.

In order for documentation to be useful for future research, written materials must be legible and understandable, and graphic materials must contain scale information and location references.
Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation

Introduction

These Guidelines link the Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation with more specific guidance and technical information. They describe one approach to meeting the Standards for Architectural Engineering Documentation. Agencies, organizations or individuals proposing to approach documentation differently may wish to review their approaches with the National Park Service. The Guidelines are organized as follows:

Definitions

Architectural Data Form-a one page HABS form intended to provide identifying information for accompanying HABS documentation.

Documentation-measured drawings, photographs, histories, inventory cards or other media that depict historic buildings, sites, structures or objects.

Field Photography-photography, other than large-format photography, intended for the purpose of producing documentation, usually 35mm.

Field Records-notes of measurements taken, field photographs and other recorded information intended for the purpose of producing documentation.

Inventory Card-a one page form which includes written data, a sketched site plan and a 35mm contact print dry-mounted on the form. The negative, with a separate contact sheet and index should be included with the inventory card.

Large Format Photographs-photographs taken of historic buildings, sites, structures or objects where the negative is a 4 x 5, 5 x 7" or 8 x 10" size and where the photograph is taken with appropriate means to correct perspective distortion.

Measured Drawings-drawings produced on HABS or HAER formats depicting existing conditions or other relevant features of historic buildings, sites, structures or objects. Measured drawings are usually produced in ink on archivally stable material, such as mylar.

Photocopy-A photograph, with large format negative, of a photograph or drawing.

Select Existing Drawings-drawings of historic buildings, sites, structures or objects, whether original construction or later alteration drawings that portray or depict the historic value or significance.

Sketch Plan-a floor plan, generally not to exact scale although often drawn from measurements, where the features are shown improper relation and proportion to one another.

Goal of Documentation

The Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) are the national historical architectural and engineering documentation programs of the National Park Service that promote documentation incorporated into the HABS/HAER collections in the Library of Congress. The goal of the collections is to provide architects,
engineers, scholars, and interested members of the public with comprehensive documentation of buildings, sites, structures and objects significant in American history and the growth and development of the built environment.

The HABS/HAER Collections
HABS/HAER documentation usually consists of measured drawings, photographs and written data that provide a detailed record which reflects a property’s significance. Measured drawings and properly executed photographs act as a form of insurance against fires and natural disasters by permitting the repair and, if necessary, reconstruction of historic structures damaged by such disasters. Documentation is used to provide the basis for enforcing preservation easement. In addition, documentation is often the last means of preservation of a property, when a property is to be demolished, its documentation provides future researchers access to valuable information that otherwise would be lost.

HABS/HAER documentation is developed in a number of ways. First and most usually, the National Park Service employs summer teams of student architects, engineers, historians and architectural historians to develop HABS/HAER documentation under the supervision of National Park Service professionals. Second, the National Park Service produces HABS/HAER documentation, in conjunction with restoration or other preservation treatment, of historic buildings managed by the National Park Service. Third, Federal agencies, pursuant to Section 110(b) of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, record those historic properties to be demolished or substantially altered as a result of agency action or assisted action (referred to as mitigation projects). Fourth, individuals and organizations prepare documentation to HABS/HAER standards and donate that documentation to the HABS/HAER collections. For each of these programs, different Documentation Levels will be set.

The Standards describe the fundamental principles of HABS/HAER documentation. They are supplemented by other material describing more specific guidelines, such as line weights for drawings, preferred techniques for architectural photography, and formats for written data. This technical information is found in the HABS/HAER Procedures Manual.

These Guidelines include important information about developing documentation for State or local archives. The State Historic Preservation Officer or the State library should be consulted regarding archival requirements if the documentation will become part of their collections. In establishing archives, the important questions of durability and reproducibility should be considered in relation to the purposes of the collection.

Documentation prepared for the purpose of inclusion in the HABS/HAER collections must meet the requirements below. The HABS/HAER office of the National Park Service retains the right to refuse to accept documentation for inclusion in the HABS/HAER collections when that documentation does not meet HABS/HAER requirements, as specified below.

Standard I: Content
1. Requirement: Documentation shall adequately explicate and illustrate what is significant or valuable about the historic building, site, structure or object being documented.
2. Criteria: Documentation shall meet one of the following documentation levels to be considered adequate for inclusion in the HABS/HAER collections.
a. Documentation Level I;
   1. Drawings: a full set of measured drawings depicting existing or historic
      conditions.
   2. Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior
      views; photocopies with large format negatives of select existing drawings or
      historic views where available.
   3. Written data: history and description.

b. Documentation Level II;
   1. Drawings: select existing drawings, where available, should be photographed
      with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.
   2. Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior
      views, or historic views, where available.
   3. Written data: history and description.

c. Documentation Level III;
   1. Drawings: sketch plan.
   2. Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior
      views.
   3. Written data: architectural data form.

d. Documentation Level IV: HABS/HAER inventory card.

3. Test: Inspection of the documentation by HABS/HAER staff.

4. Commentary: The HABS/HAER office retains the right to refuse to accept any documentation
   on buildings, sites, structures or objects lacking historical significance. Generally, buildings,
   sites, structures or objects must be listed in, or eligible for listing in the National Register of
   Historic Places to be considered for inclusion in the HABS/HAER collections.

   The kind and amount of documentation should be appropriate to the nature and significance of
   the buildings, site, structure or object being documented. For example, Documentation Level I
   would be inappropriate for a building that is a minor element of a historic district, notable only for
   streetscape context and scale. A full set of measured drawings for such a minor building would
   be expensive and would add little, if any, information to the HABS/HAER collections. Large
   format photography (Documentation Level III) would usually be adequate to record the
   significance of this type of building.

   Similarly, the aspect of the property that is being documented should reflect the nature and
   significance of the building, site, structure or object being documented. For example, measured
   drawings of Dankmar Adler and Louis Sullivan’s Auditorium Building in Chicago should indicate
   not only facades, floor plans and sections, but also the innovative structural and mechanical
   systems that were incorporated in that building. Large-format photography of Gunston Hall in
   Fairfax County, Virginia, to take another example, should clearly show William Buckland’s hand-
   carved moldings in the Palladian Room, as well as other views.

   HABS/HAER documentation is usually in the form of measured drawings, photographs, and
   written data. While the criteria in this section have addressed only these media, documentation
   need not be limited to them. Other media, such as films of industrial processes, can and have
   been used to document historic buildings, sites, structures or objects. If other media are to be
   used, the HABS/HAER office should be contacted before recording.

   The actual selection of the appropriate documentation level will vary, as discussed above. For
   mitigation documentation projects, this level will be selected by the National Park Service
   Regional Office and communicated to the agency responsible for completing the
documentation. Generally, Level I documentation is required for nationally significant buildings and structures, defined as National Historic Landmarks and the primary historic units of the National Park Service.

On occasion, factors other than significance will dictate the selection of another level of documentation. For example, if a rehabilitation of a property is planned, the owner may wish to have a full set of as-built drawings, even though the significance may indicate Level II documentation.

HABS Level I measured drawings usually depict existing conditions through the use of a site plan, floor plans, elevations, sections and construction details. HAER Level I measured drawings will frequently depict original conditions where adequate historical material exists, so as to illustrate manufacturing or engineering processes.

Level II documentation differs from Level I by substituting copies of existing drawings, either original or alteration drawings, for recently executed measured drawings. If this is done, the drawings must meet HABS/HAER requirements outlined below. While existing drawings are rarely as suitable as as-built drawings, they are adequate in many cases for documentation purposes. Only when the desirability of having as-built drawings is clear are Level I measured drawings required in addition to existing drawings. If existing drawings are housed in an accessible collection and cared for archivally, their reproduction for HABS/HAER may not be necessary. In other cases, Level I measured drawings are required in the absence of existing drawings.

Level III documentation requires a sketch plan if it helps to explain the structure. The architectural data form should supplement the photographs by explaining what is not readily visible.

Level IV documentation consists of completed HABS/HAER inventory cards. This level of documentation, unlike the other three levels, is rarely considered adequate documentation for the HABS/HAER collections but is undertaken to identify historic resources in a given area prior to additional, more comprehensive documentation.

**Standard II: Quality**

1. Requirement: HABS and HAER documentation shall be prepared accurately from reliable sources with limitations clearly stated to permit independent verification of information.

2. Criteria: For all levels of documentation, the following quality standards shall be met:
   a. Measured drawings: Measured drawings shall be produced from recorded, accurate measurements. Portions of the building that were not accessible for measurement should not be drawn on the measured drawings, but clearly labeled as not accessible or drawn from available construction drawings and other sources and so identified. No part of the measured drawings shall be produced from hypothesis or non-measurement related activities. Documentation Level I measured drawings shall be accompanied by a set of field notebooks in which the measurements were first recorded. Other drawings, prepared for Documentation Levels II and III, shall include a statement describing where the original drawings are located.
b. Large format photographs: Large format photographs shall clearly depict the appearance of the property and areas of significance of the recorded building, site, structure or object. Each view shall be perspective-corrected and fully captioned.

c. Written history: Written history and description for Documentation Levels I and II shall be based on primary sources to the greatest extent possible. For Levels III and IV, secondary sources may provide adequate information; if not primary research will be necessary. A frank assessment of the reliability and limitations of sources shall be included. Within the written history, statements shall be footnoted as to their sources, where appropriate. The written data shall include a methodology section specifying name of researcher, date of research, sources searched, and limitations of the project.

3. Test: Inspection of the documentation by HABS/HAER staff.

4. Commentary: The reliability of the HABS/HAER collections depends on documentation of high quality. Quality is not something that can be easily prescribed or quantified, but it derives from a process in which thoroughness and accuracy play a large part. The principle of independent verification of HABS/HAER documentation is critical to the HABS/HAER collections.

**Standard III: Materials**

1. Requirement: HABS and HAER documentation shall be prepared on materials that are readily reproducible for ease of access; durable for long storage; and in standard sizes for ease of handling.

2. Criteria: For all levels of documentation, the following material standards shall be met:

   a. Measured Drawings:
      - Readily Reproducible: Ink on translucent material
      - Durable: Ink on archivally stable materials.
      - Standard Sizes: Two sizes: 19 x 24” or 24 x 36”

   b. Large Format Photographs:
      - Readily Reproducible: Prints shall accompany all negatives.
      - Durable: Photography must be archivally processed and stored
      - Negatives are required on safety film only. Resin-coated paper is not accepted. Color photography is not acceptable.
      - Standard Sizes: Three sizes: 4 x 5", 5 x 7", 8 x 10".

   c. Written History and Description:
      - Readily Reproducible: Clean copy for xeroxing.
      - Durable: Archival bond required.
      - Standard Sizes: 8 1/2 x 11"

   d. Field Records:
      - Readily Reproducible: Field notebooks may be xeroxed. Photo identification sheet will accompany 35mm negatives and contact sheets.
      - Durable: No requirement.
      - Standard Sizes: Only requirement is that they can be made to fit into a 9 1/2 x 12” archival folding file.

3. Test: Inspection of the documentation by HABS/HAER staff.

4. Commentary: All HABS/HAER records are intended for reproduction; some 20,000 HABS/HAER records are reproduced each year by the Library on Congress. Although field records are not intended for quality reproduction, it is intended that they be used to supplement the formal documentation. The basic durability performance standard for HABS/HAER records is 500 years. Ink on Mylar is believed to meet this standard, while color photography, for
example, does not. Field records do not meet this archival standard, but are maintained in the HABS/HAER collections as a courtesy to the collection user.

Standard IV: Presentation
1. Requirement: HABS and HAER documentation shall be clearly and concisely produced.
2. Criteria: For levels of documentation as indicated below, the following standards for presentation will be used:
   a. Measured Drawings: Level I measured drawings will be lettered mechanically (i.e., Leroy or similar) or in a handprinted equivalent style. Adequate dimensions shall be included on all sheets. Level III sketch plans should be neat and orderly.
   b. Large format photographs: Level I photographs shall include duplicate photographs that include a scale. Level II and III photographs shall include, at a minimum, at least one photograph with a scale, usually of the principal facade.
   c. Written history and description: Data shall be typewritten on bond, following accepted rules of grammar.
4. Test: Inspection of the documentation by HABS/HAER staff.

Architectural and Engineering Documentation Prepared for Other Purposes
Where a preservation planning process is in use, architectural and engineering documentation, like other treatment activities, are undertaken to achieve the goals identified by the preservation planning process. Documentation is deliberately selected as a treatment for properties evaluated as significant, and the development of the documentation program for a property follows from the planning objectives. Documentation efforts focus on the significant characteristics of the property, as defined in the previously completed evaluation. The selection of a level of documentation and the documentation techniques (measured drawings, photography, etc.) is based on the significance of the property and the management needs for which the documentation is being performed. For example, the kind and level of documentation required to record a historic property for easement purposes may be less detailed than that required as mitigation prior to destruction of the property. In the former case, essential documentation might be limited to the portions of the property controlled by the easement, for example, exterior facades; while in the latter case, significant interior architectural features and nonvisible structural details would also be documented.

The principles and content of the HABS/HAER criteria may be used for guidance in creating documentation requirements for other archives. Levels of documentation and the durability and sizes of documentation may vary depending on the intended use and the repository. Accuracy of documentation should be controlled by assessing the reliability of all sources and making that assessment available in the archival record; by describing the limitations of the information available from research and physical examination of the property, and by retaining the primary data (field measurements and notebooks) from which the archival record was produced. Usefulness of the documentation products depends on preparing the documentation on durable materials that are able to withstand handling and reproduction, and in sizes that can be stored and reproduced without damage.

Recommended Sources of Technical Information


**HABS/HAER Production Notes**
- Field Records
- Large-format photographs
- Measured drawings


APPENDIX B

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR THE
NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

NEW MEXICO STATE REGISTER OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES

HERITAGE CONSERVATION PLACES
Determining National Register Eligibility

Properties Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places


Of the four criteria, three are relevant to understanding the significance of buildings on the NMSU campus:

- Criterion A (Historical Events). Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;
- Criterion B (People). Properties associated with the lives of persons significant in the past;
- Criterion C (Design/Construction). Properties that embody the 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.

Under normal circumstances, properties are not considered for National Register eligibility until they reach 50 years of age. It is at this point that the National Register believes enough time has elapsed to develop a historical perspective needed to evaluate significance. If a property is thought to achieved significance within the past 50 years, it can be considered under Criteria Consideration G which considers properties that “achieves significance within the past fifty years is eligible if it is of exceptional importance.”

In addition to the requirement that a property meet a significance criterion, it must also retain integrity. There are seven aspects of integrity:

1. Location: place where a property was constructed or where the historic events occurred.
2. Design: combination of elements that create the form, plan, and style of a property.
3. Setting: physical environment (topography, vegetation, relationship to other buildings or open space) of the historic property.
4. Materials: the physical elements combined at a specific period in time in a specific configuration to form a historic property.
5. Workmanship: physical evidence of the craft or technology of a particular culture or group who built the historic property during a given period.
7. Association: direct link between an important event and the historic property.
If a historic property meets these requirements (done in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer) it can be determined eligible for inclusion on the National Register and may go through the formal nomination process, which is ultimately accepted by the Keeper of the National Register.

Properties Eligible for the State Register of Cultural Properties

A “cultural property” is a structure, place, site, or object having historic, archaeological, scientific, architectural or other cultural significance. The State Register generally follows the same significance criteria and aspects of integrity as the National Register; however, importantly, it does not consider the age of a property.

Heritage Conservation Places

In addition to the National and State Register eligible properties that meet the rigorous criteria for inclusion into those lists of significant historic buildings, structures, and objects, there are other properties on campus that contribute to overall heritage of the university and thus should be considered by campus planners for preservation. Although not meeting the rigorous historical or architectural standards required of National or State Register properties, these other properties, what we have called for the purposes of this preservation plan “Heritage Conservation Places,” offer tangible symbols of NMSU’s history and are visible reminders of that history.

The word “heritage” is a common catchphrase in the preservation community, which is not often defined and is frequently substituted for the word “history.” As used in this plan, however, heritage is used to convey those aspects of history that are embraced and consciously affirmed by a culture, community, or group (in this case the students, faculty, staff, and alumni of NMSU), but do not necessarily encompass all the ancillary, and often problematic, issues that are attached to the comprehensive history of a culture or community. There is a certain mythological quality to term heritage that suggests that the complete historical picture is not being presented, but rather a generally positive, self-conceptualized vision of one’s history that acts as a form of cultural re-definition. Heritage Conservation Places (HCPs) reinforce this self-interpretation and enrich the group’s identity and feelings of place attachment.

The HCPs identified in this plan all share several commonalities:

1. They may or may not meet National or State Register criteria for defining historic properties under the National Historic Preservation Act or the New Mexico Cultural Properties Act;

2. There are four types of HCPs:
   a. Individual objects;
   b. Buildings and structures (or parts thereof);
   c. Landscapes settings or viewsheds; and
   d. Zones which represent a combination of buildings and designed open space.

3. They all have attributes which characterize the place and integrate it into the heritage of NMSU. These attributes include:
   a. Community Identity. HCPs are recognizable by most of the campus community.

---

b. They all have spatially defined boundaries. Their forms are not transient or ephemeral.
c. They do not necessarily have integrity with regard to location, that is, they are not tied to a specific place on campus, nor do they have to be necessarily historically authentic, that is tied directly to a historical event. Instead they symbolize NMSU’s history as a heritage-affirming object.
d. When arranged in a Heritage Conservation Zone, HCPs can link historic properties (i.e., National Register eligible buildings, structures, and landscapes) that may be physically separated in space.

These Heritage Conservation Places (or zones) can often be identified by asking the question: Would this “thing” (building, object or setting) be missed by the greater university community if it was suddenly taken away from the campus landscape? If most people answer “yes” then it is probably an HCP because of its contribution to NMSU’s historical identity and campus sense of place.
APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF THE NMSU ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY
The NMSU Architectural Survey identified four historic districts, an additional four individual buildings, and one individual landscape feature were recommended eligible for listing in the National Register. In addition, eleven buildings and one associated landscape that were seen as not eligible for the National Register because they are less than 50 years old were recommended eligible for listing on the State Register of Cultural Properties. Another three buildings and three objects were recommended for further study to determine their National and State register status and whether they contribute to the proposed Academic Historic District, respectively.

National Register eligible buildings and districts are associated with specific dates referred to as their Period of Significance. According to National Register Bulletin 16A, this period is the “length of time when a property was associated with important events, activities, or persons, or attained the characteristics which qualify it for National Register listing (p. 42).” The NMSU architectural survey has recommended a general period of significance for the entire campus as 1890 to 1959. Specific periods for each historic district are given below.

- **NMSU Agricultural Historic District:** This discontinuous district consists of 1) the Small Animal Area: a rectangular block bounded by Knox Street, Frenger Street, Espina Street, and two buildings on the south side of Stewart Street; and 2) the West Side: an area including The Pike (College Drive between Espina Street and Union Avenue) and the area bounded by University Avenue, Union Avenue, and I-10. The Small Animal Area includes seven contributing buildings, four non-contributing buildings, and the associated contributing landscape. The West Side includes four contributing buildings, three contributing landscape features, and the surrounding fields. Two of those buildings, the Cotton Ginning Research Lab and the Seed Lab, are individually eligible for listing in the National Register. In addition, the West Side includes a number of non-contributing outbuildings. The period of significance for this district is 1890 to 1959.

- **Fabian Garcia Horticultural Farm Historic District:** This district, which lies west of I-10, includes four contributing buildings, one non-contributing building, and a large contributing landscape of agricultural fields. In addition, the district includes a number of non-contributing outbuildings. The period of significance for this district is 1904 to 1959.

- **NMSU Academic Historic District:** This district, which encompasses the heart of the original campus, includes fourteen contributing buildings, one contributing outbuilding, two contributing landscapes, five contributing objects, one contributing site, two non-contributing buildings, two non-contributing objects, and three objects that warrant further study to determine eligibility. Four of the contributing buildings are already individually listed in the National Register, and the contributing outbuilding and a landscape are historically associated with one of those buildings and should have been included in the original nomination. The period of significance for this district is 1907 to 1959.

- **NMSU Residential Historic District:** This district includes two nodes, 1) Sutherland Village, with two hundred identical houses and a park, and 2) Tom Fort Village, with one hundred identical houses. This district possesses a very high level of integrity and may be eligible for listing at the state or national level of significance. The period of significance for this district is 1958 to 1959.

The individually eligible resources outside the historic districts are:

- Rhodes-Garrett-Hamiel Hall (listed in the State Register of Cultural Properties)
- OFS Custodial Building
- Garcia Memorial Hall (Garcia Annex)
- Rentfrow Gym
- the “A” on Tortugas Mountain

Buildings recommended potentially eligible for the State Register of Cultural Properties are:
- Branson Library
- EPPWS Shop
- Garcia Hall
- Gerald Thomas Hall
- Guthrie Hall
- Jacobs Hall
- Milton Hall
- Monagle Hall
- Pan American Center
- Regents Row
- Walden Hall

Buildings that warrant further study to determine their eligibility for the National and State registers are:
- Horse Farm Office
- Horse Farm Paddock
- PSL Anderson Hall

Heritage Conservation Areas: Memorial Tower (now part of the Health and Social Services Building) and five “heritage landscapes” that lie outside historic districts and warrant consideration in developing the NMSU Master Plan:
- Duck Pond and Regents’ Grove
- Frenger Mall
- International Mall
- McFie Circle

Buildings without historical significance: Of the 98 buildings and structures surveyed, 42 buildings, three structures, and two objects were determined not eligible for listing in the National or State registers, due to a lack of integrity, insufficient significance, or age. One complex of buildings, the Alumni Residence Center, was demolished while the survey was underway. Of those 42 buildings, seven are within eligible historic districts but do not contribute to those districts, nor do the post-1958 outbuildings within those districts.

Differences Between NMSU Survey and Preservation Plan

Naming of the Historic Districts: VCHP has renamed some of the historic districts to better reflect their relationship to the campus and the university’s history. As noted in National Register Bulletin 16A (1991, p. 8), the name should indicate the property’s historic importance or the name that was commonly used for the property during its period of significance.

Agricultural Historic District: VCHP has split this district into two separate entities – the West Side Farm Historic District and the Animal Sciences Historic District. It is believed that the two areas have different management and planning issues, which are best addressed by the creation of two distinct districts.
District Boundaries: Boundaries for The Academic Historic District vary slightly from the NMSU survey by excluding the Air Mechanics Laboratory, the Astronomy Building, and the Miller Gates. These properties are, however, considered individually eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

Contributing Versus Individually Eligible Buildings: VCHP differs from the NMSU survey in that it found Kent Hall, Dove Hall, Gardiner Hall, and the Chemistry Building to be not only contributing properties to The Academic Historic District, but also individually eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

President’s Yard: NMSU’s survey identified this area (located on the corner of University Avenue and Espina Street) as listed on the National Register as a part of the President’s House property. However, after researching the National Register nomination form, it was discovered that this area was not included in the designation and further research failed reveal any formal university policy or plan that set aside this landscaped area specifically for the president’s use. Although it was never officially designated as the president’s yard, historic photographs appear to show that this “green” space has probably served as a de facto extension of the president’s yard in the past. However, there is no university documentation to indicate that this was meant to be a permanent landscape design. VCHP has concluded that this area has been primarily a “land bank” awaiting future development and in the meantime has undergone several manifestations of landscape designs. As such the landscape features found on the property today are not contributing to The Academic Historic District and needs no further consideration in this plan.

President’s Garage: VCHP does not believe that this structure is historically or architecturally significant, and although it was built during the district’s period of significance, it is not a contributing property to The Academic Historic District as recommended by the NMSU survey.

Commemorative Objects and Artwork: While VCHP agrees with the NMSU survey that under National Register criteria guidelines the Fountain, Fish Pond, Greek Bulletin Board, and McFie Cornerstone are contributing properties to The Academic Historic District, and that the Miller Gates are individually eligible for inclusion in the National Register. There are other objects, such as the Civil War cannon, the Burrall Stone, the Pioneer Class Memorial, WPA sidewalk stamps, the Learning Statue, and the Goddard experimental radio pad that are better classified as Heritage Conservation Places rather than National Register properties as recommend by the NMSU survey.

Seed House (Nematology Building): VCHP believes that this building is National Register eligible under both Criteria A and C, rather than only A as recommended by the NMSU survey.

Cotton Ginning Building: While VCHP agrees that this building is National Register eligible (under Criterion A), the property is owned by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, not NMSU, therefore will not be considered further in this plan.

Las Cruces Lateral: Also referred to as “the acequia” by the NMSU survey, this historic ditch is listed as a contributing property to the Elephant Butte Irrigation District; however, the ditch itself is not owned or controlled by NMSU. As such, it will not be considered further in this plan; however, its status as a National Register property should be noted by university planners when considering this area of the campus.
Proposed Convention Center Site: The City of Las Cruces has signed a 99-year lease with NMSU to build a new convention center on 8.8 acres of land situated within the West Side Farm Historic District. The city has assumed responsibility for complying with applicable historic preservation laws and regulations for this piece of property.

Story Tree: Although the tree, located in the West Side Farm Historic District (NMSU’s Agricultural Historic District), is certainly a well-recognized heritage property on the campus, VCHP does not believe that there is enough supporting historical documentation to raise it to the level of contributing property to the National Register district. It is treated as a Heritage Conservation Place in the preservation plan.

“A” Mountain Viewshed: VCHP has created a new multiple-property Heritage Conservation Place comprised of the Pike, The Horseshoe, the International Mall, and the whitewashed “A” on Tortugas Mountain all of which are independently identified by the NMSU survey. VCHP believes this viewshed better reflects the interrelationship among these places as it reflects the historical east-west axis of the campus.

Rentfrow Gymnasium: VCHP does not believe that this building meets the level of architectural or historical significance to warrant a determination of individual National Register eligibility as recommended by the NMSU survey. VCHP has included this building in Appendix E as a property of interest on campus and thus should be given some consideration during the planning process.

Sutherland Park: This is the name used by the NMSU survey for the contributing property to the Sutherland-Tom Fort Historic District (their Residential Historic District); however, this landscape is also called Preciadio Park in the Master Plan and by the university’s planning staff. This plan will refer to the park as Preciadio Park.
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HISTORIC CAMPUS MAPS
1913 Sanborn Map
1931 Map from Student Bulletin