

QUESTIONS

1. Why does the Landmarks board recommendation to the CCA + City Staff to **modify the Framework to address the NPS recommendation** against new construction and moving historic building go COMPLETELY **unheeded**? The latest iteration of the Framework VERSION 6!!! STILL COMPLETELY OMITTS all these recommendations.
2. Not only does the NPS recommend against new construction and moving historic buildings within an NHL but SHPO's latest recommendation from Steve Turner on April 11, 2012 says:

I am writing to reiterate the opinions expressed by the three of us at that onsite meeting. We strongly feel that the needed functions of ADA restrooms and a visitor's center could easily fit into the existing historic campus as separate functions within small ancillary structures that do not detract from the surrounding landscape and spatial relationships. As mentioned, one possible idea is to excavate under the raised, non-historic patio at the north side of the auditorium; the National Historic Landmark (NHL) nomination states that this patio was constructed in 1987 and is clearly not historic. However, the insertion of one large building within the historic district, which would hold all functions including the desired additional meeting space, would be highly disruptive and appears to not be possible without compromising the historic character of the entire landscape.

How can we be ASSURED that this is included in the Framework discussion?

3. Why does the Feb 28 study session say

- 3.1. *The draft Chautauqua Collaborative Stewardship Framework, (CCSF) which includes the analysis of data collected over one year at Chautauqua, a proposed decision-making approach for any future change at Chautauqua, and a set of tools to support the successful stewardship of Chautauqua;*
- 3.2. *The CCSF sets forth a collaborative decision-making and coordinating process between the Colorado Chautauqua Association (CCA) and the city departments of Community Planning & Sustainability, Public Works, Parks and Recreation, and Open Space and Mountain Parks.*

If this really is the purpose of the framework why is CCA using it instead to itemize a list of new building locations that it wants? Is this "Framework" a wish list or a decision making tool?

4. In light of the blatant absence of NPS and state recommendations against new buildings in EVERY document ever written by CCA, should there not be objective preservation oversight by an objective 3rd party BUILT INTO THE FRAMEWORK discussion.
5. At what point in the framework approval process are the **building needs questioned**, the data substantiated, cause and effect verified. The graphs are faulty and the conclusions don't follow from the data they have supplied. Can we request that SOMEONE do a detailed analysis of the graphs, whether they are statistically significant, and whether they provide ANY value, that is point to ANY conclusion whatsoever?
6. Section 1.1 claims that "Balance peak and off-peak activity is a central theme in this Framework" How does building a *new* event center redistribute congestion; it just adds more congestion. Is the "balance" coming from a future where the number of events in the winter will match the congestion in the summer, or are they actually planning to force summer events into the should season?

7. Why do they mention returning Primrose back to its historic capacity as a rental lodge when the graphs they provide show that cottage rentals are still UNDER CAPACITY EVERY month of the year? Why wouldn't we continue to use Primrose in its current function as an office, to avoid building new buildings (per the SHPL and NPS recommendations)
8. How is the CCA commitment to use "management vs Construction solutions" and to "maximize use of existing buildings" compatible with a framework that has a whole section *detailing* new building locations. Can we ask CCA to consider their "Principles and Criteria". Either change the "Principles and Criteria", or check that the Framework actually meets these principles and criteria.
9. Susan Connelly has promised both verbally and in writing that the new event center will not be used during peak season. Is that promise anywhere in the Framework? If they ARE allowed to identify specific buildings locations, shouldn't this self prescribed restriction ALSO be part of the "Framework"?
10. If the goal of the new event center is to generate income to support needed infrastructure changes, can a 3rd party be hired to do a proper business analysis: specifically addressing the financial wisdom of going into millions of dollars of debt for several years, thus delaying any opportunity to have funds available to bury the electrical lines and update the sewer system.
11. The graph of the community house usage shows that they are at about 50% capacity in May, June and August. If the graphs show that usage of the Community House is already under capacity during choice times AND during the off season, why do they need a new event center, which was promised ONLY to be used in the off season. Per the NPS letter, and the CCA's OWN criteria, should they not OPTIMIZE USE OF EXISTING STRUCTURES BEFORE LOOKING TOWARD NEW CONSTRUCTION?
12. If the CCA is such a steward of the "historic gem of Chautauqua", what was the reasoning behind Susan Connelly sending a letter dated Nov 5 2010 to the SHF requesting that their covenant with SHPO be revised to include only select buildings on which the SHPO had worked, instead of the whole NHL. Why were they trying to reduce the SHPO role at that time? What their objective is for reducing the covenant on an organization that gave them so much money for restoration projects?
13. How did the idea of a new building in Chautauqua evolve? Why isn't fundraising, updating dining hall appearance and more demographic and needs oriented service formats, upscaling cottages, and analysis of lodging marketing, included in the plan for more year round income.
14. Why, after the National Park Service recommended that there be no new buildings in a National Historic District (April 8 2011 memo that you reference in your post), and the latest memo from SHPO (dated April 11, 2101 to Susan Connelly) is the CCA (who proclaims that a good part of their mission is to maintain the historic fabric of chautauqua in every document they generate) still trying to push through a "Framework" that still suggests that new construction is the way to make Chautauqua the year-round income generator they want (although the issue is ill defined and the ACTUAL graphs in the Framework don't conclusively support this direction).

15. Why does the City Staff continue to recommend this action to all the Boards before which they have appeared? Despite the fact that
- 15.1. version 6 of the Framework has NOT been modified to incorporate the recommendation of the NPS, SHPO and Landmarks board.. VERSION 6!!!!
 - 15.2. there has never been an objective needs analysis on the new building, the graphs looked at for relevance, and other income generative options considered and
 - 15.3. the "Framework" is supposed to be simply a tool to help the 3 governing bodies make decisions in the future.
16. The City Staff appears to be advocating for the CCA, parroting such unexamined claims as "the buildings are at or near capacity in the summer and under-capacity in the shoulder and off season". How can such a biased process be driving such an important issue; How can we avoid such a poor decision making process in the future, where the neighbors concerns are omitted, historic experts are omitted, and false claims go unquestioned. Interestingly, the consultants, financed by the taxpayers, are helping CCA construct version after version of the "framework" that continues to promote CCA's quest for new construction and obscure the truth.
17. Why this entire run-away train is still going down a track that runs clearly counter to REAL stewardship of an NHL?

CONCLUSIONS

Considering all the questions above, I recommend that:

- the City Council reject the current framework until these issues are addressed
- an *objective* independent preservation expert to oversee how CCA's wish list impacts the NHL, as their one-sided Framework proves them to be poor stewards of historic preservation.
- All mention of new buildings be removed from the Framework. Only subjects that relate to decision making and organizational framework should be included.
- A separate analysis be done that objectively and comprehensively looks at the myriad of funding and income generating options available to fund Chautauqua programs, maintenance (both preventative and on-going), and existing building improvements, in the future.