

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, October 6, 2021 @ 9:30 am**

**ONLINE TEAMS Meeting (see code for meeting in your email or contact
Mary.Dunne@ct.gov or Jonathan.Kinney@ct.gov for the code)**

MINUTES

- Council:** Ms. Elizabeth Acly, Ms. Elizabeth Burgess, Mr. Paul Butkus, Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Chairman Thomas Elmore, Dr. Margaret Faber, Dr. Leah Glaser (9:45 a.m.), Ms. Christine Nelson (10:27 a.m.), Ms. Sara Nelson, Dr. Sarah Sportman, Dr. Walter Woodward, and Ms. Ellen Zoppo-Sassu
- Staff:** Ms. Julie Carmelich, Ms. Mary Dunne, Ms. Erin Fink, Ms. Deborah Gaston, Mr. Jonathan Kinney, Ms. Cathy Labadia, Mr. Todd Levine, Ms. Jenny Scofield, Ms. Liz Shapiro, and Ms. Marena Wiesnewski
- Guest:** Mr. Dan O'Brien
Ms. Mary Falvey
Mr. Phil Esser
Ms. Susan Godshall
Ms. Rona Johnston
Mr. Glen Trunkfield
Ms. Elizabeth Holt
Ms. Elsbeth Dowd
Ms. Laurie Paulos
Mr. Andy and Dr. Daryn Loc
Mr. Paul Sellier
State Representative John Piscopo
Mr. John Crawford
Ms. Diane Boston
Mr. Donald Lowe
Ms. Jordan Sorenson
Ms. Jane Montanaro

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Chairman Elmore read aloud the Public Comments Procedures.

III. Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest

Chairman Elmore read aloud the Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest and asked if there were any conflicts of interest. There were none.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes and Transcripts

a. Minutes – September 1, 2021 Meeting

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Dr. Faber, the Council voted to approve the September 1, 2021 minutes with corrections.

(Y-8, N-0, Abstaining-3, Absent-1, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

A. Unfinished Action Items

1. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, Thomaston Opera House, Replacement of Condenser Units, Thomaston (Item V.B.8 on 7/7/21 Agenda, Item V.A.3 on 8/4/21 Agenda, and Item V.A.2 on 9/1/21 Agenda)

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. Carnell, the Council voted to recall this application to the table for discussion.

(Y-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-1, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Fink presented this application. This item was tabled at the July, August, and September meetings as the applicant gathered more information requested by the Council. Ms. Fink stated that the Town's maintenance coordinator was not present on the call, due to a condenser system failure in the Opera House that arose this morning. State Representative. The need for the work has become urgent. John Piscopo was on the call to voice his support for the project. Chairman Elmore asked Ms. S. Nelson to lead the discussion for Council. Ms. S. Nelson thanked the town and the staff for submitting the additional information so that the bidding process can be more efficient.

Ms. S. Nelson asked for clarification on the statement in the application about replacement of the rubber roof and whether that is part of this project as well. Ms. Fink confirmed that this is a separate project that the Town will fund on their own. Ms. S. Nelson also mentioned that there are many levels of efficiency for condensers called SEER ratings and she did not see specific information in the application documents or specifications about what level they were looking for. Ms. Fink replied that she will suggest that the applicant add this information to the RFP. Chairman Elmore added that a unit with a higher SEER rating will cost more up front, but cheaper in the long run to maintain.

Dr. Glaser and Chairman Elmore stated that they were fine with recommending approval of the funding for this application.

On a roll call vote to approve the motion:

(Y-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-1, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

B. New Action Items

1. Institutional Support for Capacity Building Grant, Hartford Preservation Alliance, Hartford

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Ms. Burgess, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award an Institutional Support for Capacity Building Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown below. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-1, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Hartford Preservation Alliance
Amount: \$83,640.00

Ms. Dunne presented this application and reminded Council that this is the same funding program as the one she summarized at the September meeting, when New London Landmarks was awarded a grant. Hartford Preservation Alliance requested funding in the amount of \$83,640 for two years of support. Staff recommended the application for funding. There are two more similar applications on the agenda for approval. Hartford Preservation Alliance (HPA) has been a grant recipient for the past ten years. HPA has been very supportive of SHPO as their local preservation partner. The ISCB grant provides reimbursement for basic operating support and capacity building to support HPA's advocacy and daily operations. Ms. Mary Falvey of HPA was on the call to answer any questions.

There were no questions from Council.

Ms. S. Nelson commended HPA for submitting an excellent application.

Ms. Falvey thanked the Council and SHPO.

2. Institutional Support for Capacity Building Grant, New Haven Preservation Trust, New Haven

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Dr. Glaser, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award an Institutional Support for Capacity Building Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown below. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-1, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: New Haven Preservation Trust
Amount: \$100,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. New Haven Preservation Trust (NHPT) requested funding in the amount of \$100,000 for two years of support. Staff recommended the application for funding. NHPT has also been a long-time recipient (15 years) of this funding from SHPO and an important partner for SHPO, providing invaluable boots on the ground and field support for our preservation efforts. Mr. Glenn Trunkfield, Ms. Susan Godshall, Ms. Rona Johnston, and Ms. Elizabeth Holt are on the call for any questions or concerns.

There were no questions from Council.

3. Survey and Planning Grant, Mather Homestead Foundation, Condition Assessment for Mather Homestead, Darien

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Ms. S. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown below. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-1, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Mather Homestead Foundation
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Mather Homestead Foundation requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to obtain the consulting services of a CFR-qualified architect and appropriate team to prepare a condition assessment of the Mather Homestead (1778), located at 219 Stephen Mather Road in Darien, Connecticut. Staff recommended the application for funding. This is a significant property (National Historic Landmark) that is important to the Town. The applicant is in the middle of developing a strategic plan that will guide future plans for the Homestead. They would like to maintain it as a house museum that is open for tours although the strategic plan and condition assessment will explore other possible uses. The newly built Education Center is where most of the applicant's programs are held. There is a large landscape which will be explored later in a separate report. There is an old set of drawings for the house from the early 20th century, from when a porch was added, that was included with the application. Ms. Diane Boston is on the call for any questions or concerns.

Ms. Burgess requested clarification clarity on the drawings listed in the "project derivable" section and will \$20,000 be sufficient for to also have drawings completed?

Ms. Dunne replied the extant drawings are about 100 years old, so an updated set is certainly needed. She did inform the applicant that this report may require

measured drawings and the overall cost may exceed \$20,000.00. This application came in during the period that the match requirement was waived.

Ms. Acly stated that the aerial photo that was provided shows the visitor center, but she was curious if there are other historic buildings on the property and if so, are they part of the condition assessment? Ms. Dunne replied that there is a cottage that is occupied by a resident caretaker. The barn is a newer structure, but Ms. Dunne will check the nomination for its significance and age. The cottage will definitely be included in the assessment.

Mr. Butkus mentioned that the RFP should clearly state that amount of funding available. This will allow respondents to submit more realistic and achievable proposals/scopes of work that may not include everything on the applicant's wish list. Ms. Dunne replied if it looks like the applicant's scope may exceed the amount stated, we may include add/alts in the RFP so that the applicant can be sure they are comparing apples to apples when bids are received.

Ms. Boston added they are a new organization and are still trying to figure out what their need are. They are aware that the assessments they need to have completed (landscape, maintenance, building preservation, future use, etc.) may exceed the scope of this grant. Right now, they are hoping to get guidance on how best to preserve the buildings and meet their future goals. Additional funding may be available to the organization in 2022 and they will evaluate what can be contributed towards future grant funded work.

Ms. Burgess stated that the application was very well written. For future applications, the applicant may wish to add more information about women and/or diverse populations and their role in the history of the resource. Ms. Dunne responded that was an excellent point and it would be good to have that broader perspective.

Ms. Boston commented that the daughter of Mr. Steven Mather was a very important historic figure in the community.

Chairman Elmore commented that on Page 3 of 6, Item 1, the description says "condition assessment to investigate structural, mechanical, and architectural elements and on Page 5 "project deliverable" there is a different description of what will be produced. There is a significant disconnect between these two sections of the application and the applicant should make sure that the scope of work is clear in the RFP. If they try to do too much for a limited amount of funding, the product will be watered down and will not be helpful. Ms. Dunne agreed. The budget and scope need to be narrowed down. The applicant can always come back for additional funding in the future.

4. Survey and Planning Grant, Town of Sherman, Plans and Specifications for Scout House, Sherman

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, second by Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown below. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-1, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Town of Sherman
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Sherman requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to obtain the consulting services of a CFR-qualified architect and appropriate team to prepare plans and specifications to support the restoration of the Scout House (c.1827), located at 9 Route 39 North, Sherman, Connecticut. Staff recommended the application for funding.

The applicant is looking to have plans and specifications completed, based on a 2016 report, which estimate the costs at approximately \$30,000, not including electrical and fire safety. Based on recent cost escalations, MS. Dunne asked the applicant if they were ready to make up the difference in predevelopment costs and they are prepared to do so. This is a non-matching grant, and they are prepared to make up the difference. It is a simple building. There are no existing drawings, except for what is in the capital needs assessment. There are no plans to change the programming, so this should be a straightforward plans and specs project. Mr. Don Lowe is on the call for any comments and concerns.

Mr. Butkus reiterated the importance of the applicant being very specific with what they are looking to accomplish in the RFP. This will result in better responses from consultants and a more accurate budget so as to not exhaust funds. Ms. Dunne agreed this is the key for a more effective bidding process.

Ms. Burgess added that the long-term preservation plan on this property is almost nonexistent. This is a town owned property, and more information should be provided. Perhaps they could take additional information from the 2016 report. Dunne replied this was 5 years ago and the town is aware of this, and it will be addressed.

Chairman Elmore asked Mr. Lowe when would they are planning to go out to bid? He replied that they would like to go out to bid over the winter so that the work can start in the Spring.

Ms. Acly asked whether the water mentioned in the application was referring to drainage off the building or site drainage? Mr. Lowe replied the water was

coming off the building. There are no drainage issues on the ground. Ms. Acly suggested an architect and a structural engineer should be mentioned in the RFP.

Mr. Butkus added it would be a good idea to have a civil engineer deal with the septic. Mr. Lowe replied there is no bathroom in that building. Mr. Butkus mentioned there were letters of support for one due to the Girl Scouts using the building. Mr. Lowe replied there is there are facilities on campus and in the theater across the road which is all on the same property. We wanted to keep the building as is.

5. Survey and Planning Grant, Lyme Art Association, Plans and Specifications for Lyme Art Association Building, Old Lyme

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Mr. Butkus, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown below. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-1, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Lyme Art Association
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Lyme Arts Association requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to obtain the consulting services of a CFR-qualified architect to prepare plans and specifications for energy efficiency measures for the organization's 1921 building, located at 90 Lyme Street in Old Lyme, Connecticut. Staff recommended the application for funding.

SHPO recently funded an energy efficiency feasibility study which was posted to Dropbox prior to the meeting. The architect for that project was competitively selected, so if the grant is awarded, the applicant will be moving forward to start the plans and specifications. The feasibility study covered several energy efficiency issues. This particular plan is focusing on the skylights, of which most are original, and the laylights, which are not original.

SHPO has been in ongoing talks with Lyme Art Association regarding the feasibility study and making sure the plans that are developed comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards or the project will not be reimbursed. They have a budget of \$31,000. Even though this is a non-matching grant, the applicant does plan on making up the difference if they go over the grant amount. Ms. Elsbeth Dowd and Ms. Laurie Paulos were on the call for any questions or concerns.

Mr. Butkus asked what the cost of the feasibility study was and were drawings made up from scratch? Ms. Dunne replied about \$17,000. This grant is for a

portion of the feasibility study that is specifically addressing the current issues with the skylights.

Ms. Christine Nelson joined the meeting at 10:27 a.m.

Ms. S. Nelson mentioned that other firms have been involved with the property and that there is a repository of some elevations, plans, and drawings from around 2013 when a conditions assessment was completed.

Ms. Paulos confirmed this. Lyme Art is trying to do everything they can to secure the future of this 100-year-old building.

Ms. Burgess asked Ms. Paulos which option out of the several mentioned in the application they planned on going with? Ms. Paulos replied they were going with the suggestion in the back of the 2018 feasibility study.

Ms. Acly suggested to make sure when changing the insulation in the building no moisture is being trapped so no harm is done to the framing. This should be added to the RFP and fully evaluated as a work item.

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

1. Nomination to the State Register of Historic Places, 515 Stillson Road, Fairfield

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to list the property at 515 Stillson Road in Fairfield, CT to the State Register of Historic Places.

(Y-11, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Wiesnewski presented this nomination and gave a brief description of the Caroline and Walker Sherwood House, located at 515 Stillson Road. The house is eligible under Criteria 1 and 2 and alterations have been minimal. There were 7 letters sent in support of the nomination's approval. One was received late and not added to Dropbox. Ms. Wiesnewski read it aloud to the Council for their consideration. Dr. Daryn Loc and Mr. Andy Loc were on the call for any questions or concerns.

Mr. Butkus asked if floor plans could be added to the final nomination. Ms. Wiesnewski agreed.

Chairman Elmore, as a historical landscape architect, would like to see more information on the extant historical landscape features. Dr. Loc replied that there are two sugar maple trees that have been damaged in recent storms and are being

inspected by an arborist. Chairman Elmore suggested they be taken down to prevent any further architectural damage. Dr. Loc replied that they are working with neighbors to get trees assessed and would like to maintain the streetscape and replant trees that are able to deal with the salt spray coming off the road.

Dr. Glaser added that greater historical context for the property under Criterion 1 would be beneficial.

Ms. Acly asked if the home was originally a front or a side gable entry? Dr. Loc replied she was not sure. Ms. Acly stated that it does not look like a lot of 18th century material remains. Dr. Loc responded that upstairs and the attic are all intact. On the first floor there have been more changes, including the stairs.

2. Nomination to the State Register of Historic Places, 1001 Ocean Avenue, New London

On a motion by Mr. Butkus, second by Ms. Zoppo-Sassu, the Historic Preservation Council voted to list the Henry E. Russell House, located at 1001 Ocean Avenue in New London, CT, to the State Register of Historic Places.

(Y-11, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Wiesnewski presented this nomination and gave a brief description of the Henry E. Russell House, located at 1001 Ocean Avenue in New London, CT. Staff recommended the listing of the house under Criterion 1 as a local example of a large estate commissioned by a prominent industrialist and designed by a well-known architect aiding in the development of the area. There have been some alterations to the property, but it retains sufficient integrity to convey its significance. The house suffered fire damage in 2021 and the owner would like to move forward with repairs using funds from the Historic Restoration Fund grant program. The house needs to be designated before they can apply for that program. This nomination is a bit unusual because research revealed that the history of the house needed to be rewritten. Ms. Jordan Sorenson (who assisted in rewriting the nomination), Ms. Elizabeth Holt, and Ms. Elsbeth Dowd are on the call to answer and question or concerns.

Ms. Burgess asked what the difference was between the original nomination and the rewritten version before Council. Ms. Wisniewski explained that there appears to have been a previous structure on the property, built by a New York doctor and his wife. In 1901, after the death of the doctor, the parcel was sold to Mr. Henry E. Russell, a prominent Industrialist.

Mr. Russell primarily lived in New Britain and had vacationed in the New London area. After he retired, he purchased the parcel in question and contracted Mr. James Sweeny to have an estate built at the crest of the hill. Ms. Sorenson was able to newspaper articles documenting this as well as photo of the current house soon after it was completed.

Ms. S. Nelson requested that the nomination be revised to include a discussion of the relationship of the house to the land around it. Ms. Wisniewski replied that can certainly be done and agreed with Chairman Elmore's earlier comment that more information could be added about the landscape as well.

Chairman Elmore asked if the nomination is approved with a description of the landscape and the recommended boundaries, does that prevent future sub-division of the property? Ms. Wisniewski replied no. The listing is primarily honorary, and the property is being listed under Criterion 1, for association with a historical event.

Dr. Glaser asked if there was any original hardware left in the house? If so, can that connection be made? Ms. Wisniewski replied she did not believe there were, but the owner can double check. She mentioned she had an iconic doorknob in her home that she does not use.

Dr. Woodward asked if Henry Russell was married at the time the house was built. Ms. Wisniewski replied yes, he was married, his wife died, and he married his housekeeper. He passed away in the house at the age of 82.

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

A. Local Historic Property Study Report –90 Poplar Road, Ridgefield

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. Carnell, the Historic Preservation Council, pursuant to CGS §7-147 q (c), voted to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance and boundary for 90 Poplar Road, Ridgefield, Connecticut as presented in the study report transmitted by the Ridgefield Historic District Commission on September 20, 2021.

(Y-11, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Notes: The study report was received on September 20, 2021 and is technically complete. Staff recommends a positive recommendation from the Historic Preservation Council.

Ms. Dunne presented the application and explained the process of municipal designation for resources of local architectural and historical significance to the new Council members. Mr. Dan O'Brien, Chair of the Ridgefield Commission, was on the call for any questions or concerns.

Mr. Butkus asked Ms. Dunne for clarity on the process after local designation. Does the owner need to come back to SHPO for a separate listing on the State Register? Ms. Dunne confirmed that was the case.

Ms. Acly asked is there any kind of encouragement for the study reports to be structured in a way that allow them to be more easily changed into a State

Register nomination? Ms. Dunne replied that it was not an easy change because the statutes require a specific type of report. This is a statutory process.

Ms. S. Nelson reiterated that the local designation process is really its own animal and separate from the NR/SR processes.

Ms. C. Nelson asked if there are any notifications that are made as part of the process to make building officials aware of the designation or documenting it on land records for future property owners to be aware of? Ms. Dunne replied that was a great question. There is nothing in the enabling legislation that provides for that process. That is an ongoing concern because the property will be listed in a local ordinance, but it does not mean it will end up on the land records. Many municipalities maintain separate lists of their designated properties. Ms. C. Nelson mentioned that her municipality ensures that there is a note on all land records for significant local properties so real estate agents would know and property owners would not make errors. They also had the Assessor notes to all of the field cards for those properties.

Chairman Elmore replied to Ms. C. Nelson that was a good idea This the first thing asked in the CEPA applications, “did you know the property was listed?” Mr. O’Brien added they have 3 other properties designated as local historic properties under the purview of the Historic Commission. Once approved by all parties, the Town Clerk put the information on the land records to be properly recorded. The Building Department is also notified along with the Planning and Zoning Enforcement Officer; everyone is on board.

Chairman Elmore asked what is meant by “technically complete”? Ms. Dunne replied that is to assure Council the information required by the statute is included.

Ms. Carnell added this was an interesting report and property. She encouraged the Town to pursue listing this property on the State Register, including aspects of the landscape and the family history before it leaves the family’s hands.

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

IX. Threatened Properties - CEPA Updates – Todd Levine

Bridgewater

Mr. Levine reported that SHPO first heard about the threatened building in 2016. Council referred it to the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) 2018 and SHPO, OAG, and the Town have been working since then to reach a compromise. The OAG and First Selectman, Curtis Reed, agreed earlier this week to list the building with Preservation Connecticut’s Historic Preservation Exchange (where they list threatened properties) for 2 months. If a deal is not made with a buyer within that time, then demolition can move forward. This is not a good deal as Mr. Levine was hoping for 6 months but SHPO has worked very hard to save this building and the OAG does not think that going to court would be a success. Mr. Dave Goslin of Crosskey Architects was working with the owner

to keep and rehabilitate the building. That deal fell through, COVID hit, and then it was decided the building would be demolished. A potential deal that would have allowed a non-profit organization to rehabilitate the building was shot down by a Town referendum. The building can still be saved by a potential offer.

Norwalk

Mr. Levine mentioned last month that the owner intends to demolish the building. He is presently working with the OAG to determine whether or not they will bring suit. One solution is a variance, which will allow them to keep the A and B side intact while building new construction behind it. The Town has expressed concerns that the building may fall. The owner does not want a variance. The OAG is in discussion with SHPO and the municipality regarding alternatives.

X. Preservation Restrictions

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney reported that the legislatively created Working Group Regarding the Protection and Preservation of Historic Properties has been meeting regularly every two weeks to develop a plan to support and facilitate preservation activities by municipalities and non-profits.

To that end, Mr. Kinney asked members of Council to provide any information they would like the Working Group to consider such as examples of interesting, effective, or creative tools or programs that they have seen, that may benefit local communities or organizations. In Addition, Mr. Kinney would also like to receive information on resources that may be lacking in Connecticut, such as specific funding gaps or programs that could be changed or improved.

Mr. Kinney also reported that based on feedback from Council, and with assistance of other members of the SHPO staff, Ms. Fink has been working incredibly hard over the past several months on some exciting changes to the Historic Restoration Fund grant program, which SHPO hopes will streamline the application and review process. Ms. Fink will present the details later in the meeting.

The SHPO Grant Map (FY 2018- FY2021), prepared by Jack Dougherty at Trinity College, is now live on the SHPO website. Mr. Kinney provided the link to the map so that members of Council could take a look.

Finally, Mr. Kinney reported that SHPO staff continues to telework primarily, coming into the office as needed, with several staff members now splitting their time between remote and in-office work. It is expected that this will be the case at least until the end of the calendar year. The entire SHPO staff continues to do exemplary work across all our programs, and Mr. Kinney took the opportunity to acknowledge their accomplishments and to thank them.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

Ms. Shapiro reported that members of the museum staff traveled to Little Rock, AR, in mid-September to attend and to present a session at the conference entitled, “Reinterpreting Reinterpretation: Challenging Traditional Reinterpretation Processes while rewriting an inclusive narrative.” Although only 300 people attended the in-person conference (there will be a fully virtual conference next week). About 35 people attended the session – and by comments that were received after the session, and throughout the rest of the conference, people seemed to think it provided information they could use. The session will be presented again (slightly changed) during this November’s virtual NEMA conference.

SHPO is in the final steps of posting the curatorial position that opened when Mr. Mike McBride retired from the Henry Whitfield Museum. Ms. Shapiro will share a link to the posting when it goes live (it is currently being reviewed by EEO) and hopes that everyone will share it. SHPO is looking for a curator who has extensive experience with developing school programs, essentially a curator of education.

The ongoing restoration project at the Prudence Crandall Museum now has a substantial completion date set in mid-November. There has been an ongoing issue with the painting subcontractor. In the meantime, curator Ms. Joan DiMartino will meet with colleague Kathy Craughwell-Varda next week to develop a plan to rehouse the collections, most of which will not be on display when the museum reopens next year. Many items will be deaccessioned as they have little to do with the house itself, and a very small percentage is related to Prudence Crandall.

Mr. Andrew Rowand, site administrator at the Eric Sloane Museum, has had several interesting irons in the fire. The museum will receive a donation of several signed Eric Sloane books from a donor in Indianapolis, one of which is neat because it is signed “Everard Hinrichs” and crossed out and signed “Eric Sloane.” Everard Hinrichs was Sloane’s real name. In addition to that excitement, there are large new fans in the museum which seem to be preventing repeated mold outbreaks. Mr. Rowand also presented a session on the Sloane Museum for the (virtual) Ohio Local History Alliance. He was told by the conference presenters that there were 40 people in the session and thus it was one of the biggest individual session turnouts of the conference. Mr. Rowand has been particularly challenged since mid-month as we said farewell to seasonal staff member Mr. Brandon Lisi, who has been with the museum for three seasons. Brandon accepted a position at the Sharon Historical Society as curator. SHPO was proud to have launched him into his museum career.

Ms. Shapiro also gave a special thanks to Ms. Michelle Parrish for her work at the Henry Whitfield Museum.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Shapiro if she knew where the mold was coming from at the Eric Sloane Museum. Ms. Shapiro replied the barn was not meant to be a storage space. Ventilation was added, but the fans were noisy and cannot be on when visitors are present. New fans were purchased, and all the artifacts were recently cleaned.

XIII. Old Business

XIV. New Business

A. Historic Restoration Fund – Program Updates – Erin Fink

Ms. Fink gave updated Council on the recent updates that SHPO has made to the Historic Restoration Fund grant program. The grant limit was raised from \$100,000 to \$200,000 to reflect the rise in construction costs and building materials. Applications will now be accepted on a quarterly basis. The next application deadline will be November 5, 2021. A template for a long-term preservation plan was developed as well as lists of eligible and ineligible projects and clarification on which project types will require plans and specifications. This will all be provided to applicants. The biggest change is the transition to an online application process using Survey Monkey Apply and Ms. Fink is very pleased with it so far. Ms. Fink shared her screen to give the Council and staff a view of what the platform looks like. She will send instructions to the Council and staff on how to access and review application documents. The Council agreed to email Ms. Fink with any questions or concerns, and they will be addressed later.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Fink how she would like to handle Council feedback. Ms. Fink asked that Council members send her an email with any comments and then a subcommittee meeting will be set up to review.

Ms. Acly and Dr. Glaser stated that they were very happy with what they saw and that it would be helpful to provide applicants with a PDF of the entire application so that they can have it in front of them while completing it online.

Mr. Butkus added that the ability to jump around between questions and to save and come back to the application would help it to be more user friendly.

Ms. Shapiro mentioned that the Office of the Arts adopted Survey Monkey Apply in 2019 with success.

Dr. Woodward asked if you could upload photos. Ms. Fink replied yes.

Ms. Nelson complimented Ms. Fink and wanted to have a conversation on some aspects of the process.

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies

Ms. Jane Montanaro – Preservation CT

Preservation Connecticut posted a Field Archaeologist position that will function as part of the Circuit Rider program. Applications are due on October 22, 2021 and then interviews will be held. Ms. Montanaro asked that everyone spread the word to those that might be interested in applying.

Ms. Mary Falvey - CT Preservation Action

Ms. Falvey stated that there was not much to report at the moment. Connecticut Preservation Action is gearing up for the legislative session. Anyone with concerns can send Ms. Falvey an email.

XVI. Public Forum

XVII. Adjournment

On a motion by Ms. Burgess, second by Ms. Carnell, the meeting was adjourned at 11:48 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Deborah D. Gaston

*Next regularly scheduled Council meeting:
Wednesday November 3, 2021 – Meeting format to be determined*