

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, April 6, 2022 @ 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)

MEETING

- Council:** Ms. Elizabeth Acly, Ms. Elizabeth Burgess, Mr. Paul Butkus, Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Chairman Thomas Elmore, Dr. Margaret Faber, Dr. Leah Glaser, Ms. Vice Chairwoman Christine Nelson, Ms. Sara Nelson, Dr. Sarah Sportman, Dr. Walter Woodward
- 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:** Ms. Wendy Bellmore
Ms. Karen Cardi
Ms. Mary Falvey
Ms. Jennifer Johnston-Marius
Mr. Steve Lewis
Ms. Jane Montanaro
Ms. Laurie Pavlos
Mr. Jeffrey Shay
Mr. Steve Vastola

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 Review of Public Comment 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. Ms. Carnell indicated that she would be recusing herself from agenda items V.B.3 and V.B.5.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes and Transcripts

- a. Minutes – March 2, 2022 Meeting

On a motion by Ms. M. Carnell, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Council voted to approve the March 2,2022 meeting minutes.

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

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

A. Unfinished Action Items

- 1. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, Lyme Art Association, Old Lyme. Item V.B.4. tabled from the 1/5/2022 meeting, item V.A.2. tabled from the 2/5/2022 meeting, and item V.A.1. tabled from 3/2/2022 meeting. Funding request \$200,000 for replacement of gallery skylights and lay lights and the addition of attic insulation.**

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Mr. P. Butkus, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recall this item to the table for additional discussion.

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

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, Second by Mr. C. Nelson, the Council voted to table this application for discussion until the July 6, 2022 meeting so that the Applicant may pursue a Technical Assistance grant from Preservation Connecticut.

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

Chairman Elmore stated that the Applicant has not submitted the additional information requested at the last meeting, but they have been working closely with staff and have decided to pursue a Technical Assistance Grant from Preservation Connecticut to investigate additional conditions and laylight options. Staff requested that the application be tabled for another 3 months while this effort is underway.

Ms. Fink reported on the status of the application. SHPO, The Lyme Art Association, and Preservation Connecticut have had several productive meetings to discuss a path forward for the installation of the gallery lay lights and building skylights. After the initial investigation by the Lyme Art Association, they determined that the hybrid Kalwall and muslin laylight installation discussed at previous meetings will not let enough light into the gallery space, so Preservation Connecticut has generously offered to fund a Technical Assistant grant, which will allow The Lyme Art Association to hire a structural engineer, architect, and HVAC specialist to investigate alternative installation techniques that will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards (Standards). SHPO staff had several internal discussions about this project and the Standards. They determined that although the Kalwall system is reversible, that the internal gridlines will detract from the original visual intent of the public space.

Chairman Elmore asked if he was remembering correctly that some of the discussion in previous meetings dealt with the structural capacity of the existing framing system. His recollection was that it had been assessed and that he was a

little surprised but pleased that it was being discussed today. Also, he asked what additional information they expected to identify with this additional assessment.

Ms. Laurie Pavlos, Executive Director of The Lyme Arts Association was on the call and thanked the Council for bringing this application back to the table again. The Applicant did conduct a structural analysis to see whether the laylight frames would support the weight of the Kalwall, which was their originally proposed solution, but the insulated glass, which had been suggested to as a potential alternative that could meet the Standards, would be heavier and may require additional support. Ms. Pavlos stated that they have already looked into the insulated glass, which has a negligible insulation property (R value of 1.5). They've looked at a few of the suggested alternatives to the Kalwall system and they are concluding that their goal of having insulation in the attic is not going to be in keeping with the goals of the Council and they are getting very discouraged. So, before they take this generous offer of a grant to do more investigation, Ms. Pavlos asked if they really want to investigate something that isn't going to provide insulation more than a R value of 2 or 3?

Chairman Elmore responded that he appreciated Ms. Pavlos' input. He only asked the question because that was his recollection of previous conversations.

Dr. Faber had a question on #3 of the staff recommendations, the Phillips Academy Gallery and the over cladding. Would that provide any additional R value? Ms. Pavlos responded that it would, but it would also raise the building's roofline significantly and that project, in 2009, cost \$22,000,000. Ms. Faber responded that it is a much larger space. Ms. Pavlos added that she understood, but that would be an extraordinary approach to the problem they are looking to resolve.

Ms. Fink added that it does significantly increase the R value, in much the same way as a storm window might. Staff provided this example just as a way of showing that there were creative solutions. They weren't suggesting that this was necessarily the best solution for the Applicant.

Ms. Pavlos added that kind of approach would require us to seal up the attic again, eliminating the passive ventilation of the attic space. The Applicant does feel that they have the most conservative and appropriate solution that respects our historical structure and provides our historical organization with a reasonable environment to operate in.

Ms. Pavlos stated that the grant is encouraging for the organization, but they have done a thorough investigation and the materials that are currently available that are translucent and can provide daylighting to the galleries are limited. The product they chose is way more insulating than any of the other options and that's why it was chosen. The use of the Kalwall system would not change any of the structure that exists in the in the building and if a better option came around in the future, they could easily remove the Kalwall panels and replace them with a better option.

Mr. Butkus commented that this conversation about maximizing energy efficiency often comes up when talking about replacement windows. If Council approved the Kalwall system simply on that basis alone, how would they defend any other decision where the most energy efficient solution, such as replacement windows, is not compatible with the historic character of the structure. Ms. Pavlos asked if it changes the situation if they are talking about insulating their attic as opposed to a window. Mr. Butkus responded that the ceilings in the galleries are an important feature of the building, and the original design intent was not to have a 10x10 grid across the entire ceiling. The entire attic space between the laylights and the skylights is available to install the insulating system, but the visible surface within the galleries should respect the historic appearance.

Ms. S. Nelson stated that she understands Ms. Pavlos' frustration. Her background is as an architect and sometimes when they hit a wall on a project, they will frequently bring in another outside expert or consultant for a fresh look at the problem. Ms. Nelson asked if they have looked into bringing in a specialized consultant for historic skylights and thermal performance to add to the team.

Ms. Pavlos responded that they would welcome a suggestion. They have looked around but have not found anyone that fits that exact bill. Ms. Nelson suggested that may be something that Council could assist with. If Council could provide the Applicant with additional resources to help expand the conversation, would they be willing to do the additional investigation?

Ms. Pavlos replied yes, but they cannot delay the project for much longer. The skylights are leaking and the alternatives they have looked into for the laylights just do not meet their needs.

Mr. Butkus stated that the laylight issue is completely different than the leaking skylights, which seems like a critical need that should be addressed as quickly as possible. Ms. Pavlos responded that they are pursuing replacement of the skylights as part of this project, it is part of their application. Mr. Butkus commented that the timelines should be independent of the insulation portion of the project.

MS. Pavlos explained that they are connected because the organization received a Survey and Planning grant to develop plans and specifications for both the skylights and laylights.

Ms. S. Nelson added her understanding was the threading together of the laylight in the skylight into a single HRF project, which has been tabled a number of times, and so the only possible alternate path forward, which Mr. Butkus was alluding to, would be to amend the grant application to focus on the skylights, flashing, and roof work that needs to be done to address the water infiltration would be a possible avenue.

Ms. Pavlos added that if they adjusted the grant to focus only on the skylights, they would be severely constrained in their ability to treat the laylights, which would be a problem.

Ms. Carnell asked about the possibility of engaging more than one consultant as there are multiple levels to this problem, including the insulation, aesthetics, and lighting, particularly in the gallery. Ms. Carnell could not remember if the Applicant had a lighting consultant on board.

Chairman Elmore added that this was what Mr. Butkus was referring to during a previous meeting. He asked Ms. Pavlos if she was still open to applying for the Technical Assistance grant and coming back in 3 months so they can proceed as originally planned, or is there any hesitation?

Ms. Pavlos replied, if they can get an expert and get the Technical Assistance grant to help them understand if there is a good reason to move forward, they will be willing to do that. They haven't found an answer that is satisfactory, other than the project that was originally proposed. Maybe they just haven't been asking the right person. If they can find that right person, they would be very happy to explore another approach, but they ones they have looked at simply don't meet their budget, even with a generous grant, or they don't meet their goals for energy efficiency.

Mr. Butkus added that when there are instances when things do not meet the standards, the only recourse is the building owner can go ahead with that project, but it's something that SHPO/HPC could not fund. Ms. Pavlos replied they fully understand that.

Mr. Butkus replied SHPO/HPC wants to see this project succeed and be able to support it. However, Council must be conscious of not setting a precedent for other projects to come in and say, "Well, you approved something that doesn't meet the standards on somebody else is project"? "Why don't you approve it for ours"? It's a balancing act all around.

Chairman Elmore commented to Ms. Fink that it sounded, based on the questions and discussions, that Council is in favor of tabling this application for 3 months and giving them the opportunity to pursue the Technical Assistance grant. Before moving to a vote, Chairman Elmore asked the architects and the engineers on the Council to get their heads together to come up with a list of professionals that may be able to help the Applicant.

2. Historic Restoration Fund Grant Increase, North Congregational Church of Woodbury, Inc., Woodbury. Replacement of metal roof on sanctuary building. Increase amount \$24,812.18.

On a motion by Dr. M. Faber, second by Mr. P. Butkus, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recall this application to the table for discussion and approval.

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

Ms. Fink presented this funding increase request. North Congregational Church of Woodbury, Inc. requested additional funding in the amount of \$24,812.18. The Applicant was approved for a Historic Restoration Fund Grant in July 2021. Due to limited contractor availability, they were not able to move forward with the project until late Fall 2021. This is when they found out the proposed roofing materials were no longer being produced. The Church evaluated three products in consultation with SHPO and they were able to fall back on their second choice, which is significantly more expensive. They are requesting the additional funding to cover the difference. The applicant hopes to begin work as soon as possible to avoid any additional material costs. Mr. Steve Lewis was on the call to answer any questions or concerns.

Mr. Lewis stated that construction has been very difficult the past two years due to the pandemic. Ms. Fink has been a great help throughout the process. When they went through the predevelopment grant, historic architect Mr. Hugh Sullivan wrote the specifications that were sent out to six contractors and only two responded. One had done previously done restoration work on the Church's belltower 7 or 8 years ago and one construction firm out of Massachusetts that was twice the price and way out of their budget. The company that produced the roofing material SHPO approved went out of business due to not being able to get materials from China. Mr. Lewis held up materials intended for use to the Council. Thankfully, no advance was paid, and the company left 10 other clients in the lurch. A company in Tennessee did have the material but at an increased cost.

Dr. Faber mentioned that the newly proposed shingles do not appear to be an exact match with the originals, how does staff feel about the new product? Ms. Fink responded that staff reviewed 3 different options. SHPO's first choice was a product that cost four times as much as the original proposal, which was not feasible for the Applicant. Staff and the Applicant compromised and agreed upon another new product option, which is now the proposed material.

Chairman Elmore asked if this was the same question we had with Lyme Arts Museum's application, cost versus material? Ms. Fink replied in Lyme Arts case the product and material detracted from the character of the historic gallery space and did not meet the Standards. In this case, Ms. Fink believes it is comparable and will not detract from the original design intent. SHPO is comfortable it meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards, and it will be installed correctly.

Mr. Butkus added that the new product is actually closer in appearance to the original design than the originally approved replacement. The Applicant has done a good job of finding a replacement material that closely replicates the historic appearance.

Ms. S. Nelson commented in response to Chairman Elmore's question that she appreciated the rigor of comparing the one application to the other and added that one thing to consider when talking about materials is how close you are to them when you are experiencing the building. Are you 35 or 40 feet away? What can

the eye pick up at that distance? The difference between the prior application and this application is the just the immediacy of the material system in the Lyme Arts galleries.

Ms. Acly asked a quick question about the materials. When you see a price and then a doubling of price or quadrupling of cost there are usually fundamental differences between them. It could be things like different types of material, gauge thickness, etc.

Mr. Lewis replied that the difference in the gauge thickness is negligible but did speak to several differences in the materials, such as one including zinc in the material that has to be finished on both sides prior to installation and one that did not come with any of the ancillary pieces required for installation such as the drip edge, the eaves, the peak, the ridge, all of which would need to be custom made, while the product they have selected comes as a complete system and with a 50 year warranty.

Chairman Elmore made a request, if Council does approve the application, that a half a dozen of the existing roof panels be stored in the attic with a note left between them for future reference for 100 years from now. There will be no cost added to the project, but an example of the original roofing materials will be saved. Ms. Burgess commented that it is called institutional history.

Mr. Lewis replied they would be happy to do that and mentioned that someone also suggested they make a record of what if anything is underneath the existing roofing material, which they are happy to do.

3. Survey and Planning Grant, Congregational Church of Plainville, UCC, Increase to June 2, 2021 grant award, 130 West Main Street, Plainville. Increase amount \$11,000.

On a motion by Ms. M. Carnell, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Council voted to call this application to the table for discussion and approval.

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

Ms. Dunne presented this funding increase request. This application was originally funded in June 2021. The Church did start the bidding process and at the pre-bid meeting it became apparent that it might not just be the steeple that needed an assessment, but attendant damage to the church that was evident. They did receive proposals that ranged from \$20,000 to \$30,000, some of which included the creation of construction documents. The grant cap is \$20,000 and the Applicant has already received \$9,000, so they are looking for an additional \$11,000. What is proposed is to extend the assessment beyond the steeple. It's not going to be a full assessment of the entire building, but to investigate what kind of additional damage might be happening because of the steeple failure. Mr. Steve Vastola is on the call to answer any questions or concerns.

Chairman Elmore asked, considering that this additional request came from a pre-bid meeting with educated eyes looking at the cracked plaster, are you expecting some intrusive holes to be created so people can look at the structure? Ms. Dunne replied she would think so. There is evidence of plaster damage, which is probably as a result, but there are still some unknowns.

Chairman Elmore added the reason he asks that question is so often Council is looking at non-intrusive assessments. But it seems that there could potentially be major structural damage and the only way you're going to see it is to be opening walls. He just wanted Mr. Vastola and others to be prepared for that.

Ms. Acly added opening walls is to be expected and obviously finding the root cause of what's going on is of utmost importance. The building has some deferred maintenance so whether it's water intrusion issue or something more structural certainly warrants additional investigation.

Chairman Elmore stated that one of the pictures of the basement window showed dirt up over the sill. He is hoping that part of the assessment will be a run around the building to look at conditions and assess those with the idea of lowering grade and redirecting water away from the building.

Mr. Steve Vastola stated the Church had an assessment of the building done a decade ago and there was a good plan for repairs to the building in place, which they started following. With Historic Restoration Fund money, they installed five tie rods across the ceiling of the sanctuary because there were scissor trusses that were splitting, and he does believe it caused some of the cracks in the plaster, which hopefully has been remedied now.

Next, the Church went on to the second item on their list, which was the roof, and they installed a new roof, once again with Historic Restoration Fund money. So hopefully, the water penetration has stopped, and all of the older issues have been remedied that caused the cracks. They were going to move on to restoring the Church's windows and adding interior storms when they realized that the steeple was falling apart. They went back to the plan that the architect had created for and realized that the steeple had been completely overlooked and has moved to the head of the line of projects. Mr. Vastola understands they may have to cut into some plaster.

Mr. Butkus added that if other work has already been done, that's great news. Hopefully there's documentation of what the conditions were at that time, and they can be compared with the current conditions to evaluate any change. Crack monitors can be installed on plaster so that any movement in the building can be recorded. Hopefully, there is a pile of documentation that can be referenced by whoever is going to do this next bit of work to help inform whether everything has been fully addressed by the remedial actions that have taken place so far, or if it's being still impacted by the condition of the tower.

Mr. Vastola stated that someone at the pre-bid meeting suggested that they install crack monitors and we neglected to do that, but it would be good to do. We have quite a few pictures from the old assessment and shared those with the people at the pre-bid meeting so they can go ahead and compare the old to the new once they get going on the work.

Mr. Butkus added that some of those patterns in the cracking or indicative of certain types of movement. Whenever we see those, it's can be a big red flag about the way the building is moving around and hopefully that will all be factored in.

Ms. Acly commented that cracking patterns are a very good clue of what might be going on within the walls and the Applicant should make sure the consultants understand that to help identify what's really going on.

B. New Action Items

1. Survey and Planning Grant, Christ and The Epiphany Church, Condition Assessment for Leverett Bradley House, 47 Park Place, East Haven

On a motion by Ms. C. Nelson, 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. 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-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this application. Christ and the Epiphany Church requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to obtain the consulting services of a CFR-qualified architect to prepare a condition assessment for the Leverett Bradley House (1791), located at 47 Park Place, East Haven. Staff recommended the application for funding. The house is owned by Christ and the Epiphany Church, but they're in a long-term lease to the East Haven Historical Society, which currently uses the building. The house is used for revolving exhibits and has a curator that's in-residence year-round. There are no known issues with the building right now and they don't have any plans to change the use of the building, but this general condition assessment will provide them with information about any but major concerns that they may need to incorporate into a long-term preservation plan or cyclical maintenance plan. Ms. Wendy Bellmore was on the call representing the church if you have any questions or concerns.

Chairman Elmore welcomed Ms. Bellmore to the meeting. He apologized to the last applicant after realizing that this was actually the building with had soil above the basement windowsill. So, part of the assessment should be a look around the

building, focusing on the landscape and the idea of lowering the grade and redirecting water further away from the building.

Ms. Burgess commented that the photographs indicate there is some deferred maintenance on the building and that the organization should be mindful of the maintenance needs moving forward.

Ms. Acly recommended that when the RFP is prepared, the language in the scope and pertaining to the types of consultants the Applicant is looking for be specific. It sounds like the applicants are looking for a historical architect with a structural engineer to inspect as well. It very much helps the teams that are responding to the RFP to put the right people on if the scope is very clear and Ms. Dunne can certainly help with that.

Ms. Carnell asked if drawings were part of the scope? There was no mention of drawings at all, which raised the question of whether there are existing drawings or if they will need to be developed.

Ms. Dunne replied that she would need to check with the Applicant.

Ms. Bellmore replied that there are no existing drawings.

2. Survey and Planning Grant, Monroe Historical Society, Condition Assessment for The Eliot Beardsley House, 31 Great Ring Rd., Monroe

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Ms. Carnell, 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. 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-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Monroe Historical Society requested funding in the amount of \$15,000 to prepare a condition assessment for the Eliot Beardsley House (c.1780), located at 31 Great Ring Road, Monroe. Staff recommended the application for funding. This building needs a structural assessment. The motion specifies a condition assessment, but there is a known structural deficiency, and it has gotten to the point where the property is not being used. They originally closed due to the COVID pandemic, but now they are concerned about the safety to the public. This assessment would focus on the structural issues. Depending on what the assessment reveals and what the appropriate next steps are, the Applicant can come back for additional funding. Ms. Karen Cardi from Monroe Historical Society was on the call to answer any questions.

Mr. Butkus commented that this is an example of a situation where there is a clearly defined issue, and the RFP should be focused on the structural engineering component as opposed to a general overall assessment. This should be an engineer led effort as opposed to the typical architect led effort where they are trying to assess things like accessibility issues or potential changes of use. This effort will really focus on putting the money where it needs to go at this point.

Ms. Dunne agreed that's the recommendation as opposed to a general comprehensive condition assessment. There is a known critical need, and that's what the applicant wants to address first, then they can move forward with additional grant funding for next steps.

3. Survey and Planning Grants, Town of Simsbury, architectural plans for restoration of several tobacco barns on Firetown Road, Simsbury

Ms. Carnell recused herself from the meeting at 10:50 a.m.

On a motion by Ms. Burgess, 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. 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-9, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-0, Recused-1) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Simsbury requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to prepare architectural plans for restoration of several tobacco barns on Firetown and Hoskins Road in Simsbury. Staff recommended the application for funding. DECD is very invested in this project and gave the Town of Simsbury a Good to Great grant for the acquisition of several of these barns. Concurrent with that, SHPO applied for an African American Civil Rights grant from the National Park Service to document resources related specifically to southern college students who traveled to Connecticut during the summers to work in the tobacco fields. The most prominent of the students was Martin Luther King, Jr. We have encouraged the town to keep these barns standing because of their significance. There aren't any plans for actual active use, but there are plans for an interpretive exhibit outside of the buildings themselves. The buildings are just not safe to enter and what the town would like to do in conjunction with the interpretive exhibit is to improve the barns condition so that the public would be allowed to go in and look at them from the inside. They're asking for funding to do an assessment for stabilization and then they do plan to come for a HRF Grant after that to do any work that's required. Mr. Jeff Shea, former Town Engineer, now consulting with the Town, was on the call. Mr. Todd Levine of the SHPO staff was available for questions as well.

Ms. Burgess asked Ms. Dunne to clarify the difference between the two Simsbury applications on the agenda just for the record. Ms. Dunne stated that Simsbury is a

Certified Local Government and, because of that designation, they are eligible for non-matching federal grants. It does put the town in a position to be able to apply for both Survey and Planning and Certified Local Government to match. These two grants are for the same project.

Ms. S. Nelson commented that the Town of Simsbury should be very specific about the scope level and the level of drawings they are looking for (schematic, design development, etc.) which will enable responding teams to be able to understand that the budget impact of what we're talking about.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Dunne to also clarify the number of barns. Perhaps the consultant can do a run through and say these four are in initial need and then we will assess the others if there's money left over. The Application only references the term "several" barns and that cannot be used to develop a budget.

Ms. Dunne responded she did make the Town aware of that. The funding that they will receive may not be enough, so they are going to have to be more specific in the scope. She appreciated the two comments and will work with the Town on that.

Ms. Acly commented that it would also be useful to identify if the structure of all the barns is the same. This would help the structural engineer. The engineer would be documenting the condition of each building, but if the beam sizes are the same for all of the buildings there is some economy of scale.

Mr. Butkus stated that there was a mention of potential future use as a visitor center in the application. The Town should be careful about including that kind of wording because that's going to make a huge difference in the way potential bidders interpret what is being asked for, i.e. simply stabilizing the barns versus a future adaptive reuse of the structures.

Ms. Dunne replied that she understood the term visitor center in this context, did not mean inside any of the barns, but the interpretive experience outside. She will clarify this with the Town.

Mr. Butkus responded, it's more of an open-air museum rather than a visitor center. Terms like visitor center can have loaded meanings, such as introducing bathrooms, offices, or a gift shop. It should be clear that the extent of the scope is stabilization to make the barns accessible to the public for guided tours.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Dunne if aerial photos can be shown in the next application for Simsbury so that the barns can be seen in their larger context.

Ms. Acly added there is one in the structural application, but it's not zoomed out. It shows the number one through number four barns and then it looks like one had collapsed in the middle. Chairman Elmore added he just wanted to show the aerial image for documentation purposes.

Dr. Glaser mentioned she noticed the barns are not listed on the State or National Registers. Ms. Dunne replied they are not, but the intention of the African

American Civil Right Grant is to list the barn so that effort is moving forward concurrently to this one.

Ms. Carnell returned to the meeting at 11:02 a.m.

4. Certified Local Government, Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, Town of Vernon, project plan and specifications for restoration of entry stairs, Rockville Public Library, 52 Union St., Rockville

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, funded by the Historic Preservation Fund of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All federal and state grant guidelines and 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-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Vernon requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to develop project plans and specifications for the restoration of the entry stairs at the Rockville Public Library, located at 52 Union Street, Rockville. Staff recommended the application for funding. The town has identified a critical need and want to move forward with getting an architect in to assess the extent of the damage and what will be required to move forward with a Historic Restoration Fund Grant. Ms. Jennifer Johnston Marius was on the call from the Town to answer any questions.

Ms. Acly asked if the top run of the stairs is accessible from below? Often there's a sort of underground basement area below the stairs. Ms. Johnston-Marius replied that she had been told that at some point there may have been, but currently there is no accessibility that way.

Ms. Acly responded that oftentimes when we're seeing some movement in historic stairs like this, there's a material issue below the stairs. Maybe others can help further a comment on this, but there may need to be some investigation under the stairs to really get a handle on the full scope of work moving forward. Certainly, in the past on projects like this, they have had to rebuild the stair supports underneath.

Chairman Elmore commented, in addition to that, this is a large set of stairs. It's not two or three risers.

Dr. Glaser added that she was assuming there's another way in for ADA accessibility and knows that when people are working on stairs, they usually need to think about that. Ms. Johnston-Marius replied yes, there was an addition put on the back of the building in 2014, which enables ADA compliant access.

Ms. Carnell mentioned she that hadn't been in this building in about 20 or 25 years, but she wanted to mention that if granite material patching was proposed, it

is important to match those materials as closely as possible. This is an extremely important Charles Platt building so just wanted to raise the possibility of engaging an architectural materials conservator as a possible member of the team.

Ms. S. Nelson commented she may have missed this in the application, but buildings of this age and vintage usually had very thorough detailed drawings that conveyed a wealth of information. Perhaps it is in the Town's vault. This goes to the forensic analysis that Ms. Acly was talking about and the importance of understanding how it was constructed as a big part of knowing how to fix it.

Ms. Johnston-Marius commented they have been looking and were told that there are some drawings, so we've been working with the Town Clerk. They've been sifting through a lot of old records.

Ms. S. Nelson asked if there are other archives that are known for Platt's drawings?

Ms. Dunne replied that it had been a while since she had done research, but there probably are.

Mr. Butkus commented this is a real case study for conditions of materials needing maintenance over time. The use of things like a lot of snow melt salts on the steps can lead to deteriorating mortar and things can start to shift. Water is going to get into these joints and that's one of the reasons why we try to stay away from a lot of mortared brick applications in the northeast. If we can avoid it, because the joints are always going to open it up. Keeping up with regular maintenance whenever those mortar joints do open up, is really an ongoing item that should be on everybody's list to keep up so that things don't start shifting. On other projects, like Ms. Acly was alluding to, a lot of times these stairs were set up on brick piers and the brick will deteriorate underneath and the only solution is to lift all of the stones off, put it in a new concrete foundation, and then put it back.

Chairman Elmore asked a question for the architects, engineers, and staff. It's his understanding that this is such a large set of stairs that additional handrails are going to be needed. How do you address that aesthetically and historically? Stairs that are wider than 6 feet need at least 2 handrails, and based on what he saw there was just a single handrail running up the center.

Ms. Dunne replied that SHPO does grapple with that. She would just like to continue working closely with the Town to see what transpires. She was not sure if this project will include a recommendation for additional handrails. If so, then they would review that and see how closely those additions meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards and be prepared to make alternative suggestions if necessary.

Chairman Elmore added, based on what he saw, the stairs are being dismantled 100% and rebuilt, which means you've got to deal with the handrail issue.

Ms. Dunne replied, correct, it would be required for what would be considered new construction. It is possible to meet safety requirements, ADA requirements, and still be compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. It just requires back and forth communication during the process.

Ms. Acly added it looks like the existing handrail is already a replacement, so part of the study would be identifying what the original was and to Ms. Dunne's point, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards allows for modification.

Mr. Butkus stated that the Applicant should also factor in whether this is the primary means of egress. Usually, the handrails must be along the primary path of travel. Even though it's a monumental stair, there may be some leeway with that definition.

5. Certified Local Government Grant, Town of Simsbury, architectural plans for the restoration of several tobacco barns on Firetown Road, Simsbury

Ms. Carnell recused herself from the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

On a motion by Ms. Burgess, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, funded by the Historic Preservation Fund of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All federal and state grant guidelines and 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-9, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-0, Recused-1) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented the second Simsbury tobacco barn application. The Town of Simsbury requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to prepare architectural plans for the restoration of several tobacco barns on Firetown Road, Simsbury. Staff recommended the application for funding. She thanked the Council for approving the Survey and Planning Grant for the same project earlier in the meeting. This whole project is getting a lot of positive press and SHPO is very pleased to be part of it.

Mr. Kinney posted aerial images of the tobacco barns on screen. He and Ms. Dunne gave a brief description of the imagery and the overall area.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Dunne, as part of the RFP, to have the consultants pull up the historic aerial photographs for these properties and document how many tobacco barns were on the property back in 1932 and 1958 and 1972 and just document when the numbers changed between those aerial photographs.

Mr. Butkus asked if this will be similar to the first application where the RFP will request an initial assessment and then plans and specifications will be prepared for the work to be done.

Ms. Dunne replied that the two applications cover the same exact project. The total project cost of \$40,000, which as we discussed earlier may or may not be adequate. So, the RFP is going to have to be very specific and maybe even include additional alternatives to make sure that they get as much as they can at least in this first round.

Mr. Butkus mentioned that one barn on Firetown Road had apparently collapsed so what is the strategy of identifying which buildings are in imminent risk of collapse and knowing that all funds are finite, is there a particular set that should be the primary focus? Is there a certain group of barns that are documented to be associated with Dr. King or some other way to prioritize?

Ms. Dunne stated that the grant that SHPO has from the National Park Service is going to help direct that because it is for documentation of the significance of the barns and the landscape as a whole. Dr. King is the most well-known student to work here, but there were many others and the context will address the bigger picture.

Mr. Levine added we've already done, ore the Town has already done emergency stabilization last fall to get through the winter and we will probably look to prioritize the barns on Firetown Road, closest to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s dormitory and those originally were five on that side, now we're down to three. Those are the three that are going to be prioritized not only for state funding, but also private funding is going to those three. If there is funding left over, we will be looking at the other ones.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Dunne if the dual funding sources will be available again for a second round so that the additional barns can be assessed and saved because we're losing a lot of tobacco barns in Connecticut.

Ms. Dunne responded that the dual funding would be available for a separate project or even a second phase if additional barns needed assessment or plans to move forward with an HRF grant. The town could take advantage of both CLG and Survey and Planning grants.

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

IX. Threatened Properties - CEPA Updates – Todd Levine

Mr. Levine reported that there will be a Connecticut Environmental Protection Act matter in Suffield presented to Council in May. There's also the possibility of one in June and then another one this summer. Mr. Levine is working hard to resolve these conflicts before they come to you. If they cannot be resolved, they will be brought to Council and Mr. Levine will keep the group informed.

X. Preservation Restrictions

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney apologized for the CEPA training for HPC that was cancelled a few weeks ago. He will continue to work to find a date that works for the group so that the training can occur before the CEPA items Mr. Levine mentioned are brought to Council.

Mr. Kinney also reported back on previous discussions regarding a return to in-person meetings or a hybrid meeting setup. The State Review Board meeting for March was supposed to be held in a hybrid format, but it did not happen for a number of reasons, including that the building is not set up yet technologically for hybrid meetings. The necessary equipment has been ordered but the delivery date is not yet known. Mr. Kinney will keep the group updated.

Finally, Mr. Kinney reported that because there will be both a CEPA item and a full slate of HRF applications in May he has spoken with SHPO staff and Chairman Elmore and the plan is to hold the regular meeting on May 4th and hear only the CEPA item. A special meeting will be scheduled for Wednesday, May 18th, where Council will review all of the HRF applications.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

Ms. Shapiro reported that Morgan Bengel and Andrew Rowand are leading the hiring of the museum seasonal positions. A huge thank you to Deborah Gaston for being a key member of the interview panel. With luck, the museums will have eight seasonal employees in play by May 1.

Museum season opens between April 30 (at Sloane) and May 7 at New-Gate, and June 11 (Museum Open House Day) for Prudence Crandall.

Ms. Shapiro is working with staff member Jodi Polsgrove to develop and test new school programs for all of the sites, but particularly emphasizing new programs at Prudence Crandall and at Henry Whitfield State Museum. At Crandall, they are testing a program for third graders that explores what it means to be a hero, and at Whitfield, they are looking at putting the Henry Whitfield House into the context of the colonial revival as a reaction to the mass waves of immigration to the US from the mid-19th century to the 1930s.

Ms. Shapiro was happy to announce that the never-ending restoration project at PCM is finally at substantial completion. Final issues are being finishing up, including a regrading of the parking lot to be ADA compliant between the parking spaces and the ramp.

Additional work is being done to remove old cabinets in what used to be the workroom, as well as painting, adding new lighting, etc. Thanks to Marena Wisniewski for working so closely with Joanie on that project.

In the meantime, the full archaeological collection is being inventoried and cataloged (from all the archaeological work that was done over time at the site). Thank you to Sarah Sportman for helping to guide that process, and to Cathy Labadia for her expertise in helping to make some decisions about what to keep in that collection.

The next step at PCM, for later this month, is moving the collections into the building and emptying the storage containers.

At the staff retreat in January, museum staff reviewed the draft pilot exhibit script for the Prudence Crandall Museum. Curator Joan DiMartino is working on script revisions and moving into the design phase. As a reminder, the new interpretation will be in test phase for this season so the exhibit will mostly be in the form of retractable panels that are relatively inexpensive to create and can be moved as needed. The new visitor experience will be a guided experience, that is dialogic in nature.

Starting June 11, when the museum opens to the public, the visitor experience will look different. Guided tours during certain time slots will be available, and the museum will be open year-round for the first time. Overall, between siting the peace garden, developing and scheduling our first school tours, talks for various groups, and participating in CT Humanities programs with the International Sites of Conscience, things are very busy and it's just great.

At New-Gate, site administrator Morgan Bengel has returned from her maternity leave. She has jumped right back into the fray, is confirming a schedule for events at the Museum this year and working closely with the Re-entry Hall of Change and the Prison Arts Program as we continue to partner with the re-entry population to ensure the voices of justice impacted citizens are reflected in our interpretation of the site. A new exhibit will open in the guard house, of work from the Prison Arts collection. The site will also offer programs with the Judy Dworin Dance group, the Rock and Mineral Show, and Bat Day.

Ten school groups are already scheduled to visit this spring – which is back to the normal numbers!

Right now, Morgan is working to complete plans for Halloween at Old New-Gate, which will be evolving from an event that emphasized the history of the site in a more light-hearted way, to an event that is fully Halloween based, and only uses the site as a backdrop for a more traditional family-friendly Halloween.

Morgan is also moving the RFP for services to begin the grant project funded by Save America's Treasures to stabilize and interpret the four-story prison block.

Thanks to Andrew Rowand who so capably handled the site management during Morgan's maternity leave.

At Henry Whitfield, the museum has a new exhibit in the visitor's center looking at the work of the architect William E. Weld called, "Weld-Built: The Guilford Architecture of William E. Weld" and it's on loan from the Guilford Keeping Society.

Michelle has been working to prepare a grant application to the NPS America 250 grant program and thanks to Cathy Labadia for helping to answer questions. This involves pulling together cost escalations from a report that was completed in 2018 and more.

After staff held an onsite meeting at HWSM in March, they made a group decision to reconfigure the use of the barn/shed to be used for school groups. This will include the removal of some of the current exhibits in the space, and the addition of a portable exhibit in the space that will refocus the story of the house to the two "colonial revival" restorations. We'll be looking closely at nativism, immigration, reaction to immigration, and how the house fits into that story. We'll also look at the Reverend Henry Whitfield as an immigrant.

The Sloane Museum will be a cosponsor of the 2022 Dublin Seminar presented by Historic Deerfield and The Early American Industry Association. In addition to using a Sloane image in their advertising (with permission from the estate!) Andrew Rowand will be presenting a workshop on Sloane and the new museum interpretation.

Plans there are underway for the traditional July 4th bell ringing and community event.

Andrew is also working with the Kent Chamber of Commerce, working long-term to move the Kent Farmer's Market to the museum property. While those discussions are happening, Sloane will be hosting the Floral Market for the Daffodil Festival in Kent on April 23.

XIII. Old Business

XIV. New Business

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies

Jan Montanaro – CT Preservation Action

Ms. Montanaro reported, on behalf of Connecticut Preservation Action, that the Community Investment Act Collation met this week and is working on a letter going out to all the legislators. The letter will be a thank you for supporting the CIA.

On behalf of Preservation Connecticut, Ms. Montanaro reported that they are announcing their preservation award recipients this week. The Harlan Griswold Award, presented jointly with SHPO, is being given to Nancy Savin for her life-time commitment to historic preservation. The award ceremony will be on May 4th, 2022.

XVI. Public Forum

XVII. Adjournment

On a motion by Ms. Faber, second by Ms. S. Nelson, the meeting was adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

***Next regularly scheduled Council meeting:
Wednesday May 4, 2022 – Meeting format to be determined***