

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, December 1, 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)

MEETING MINUTES

- Council:** Ms. Elizabeth Acly, Ms. Elizabeth Burgess, Mr. Paul Butkus, Chairman Thomas Elmore, Dr. Margaret Faber, Dr. Leah Glaser, Ms. Christine Nelson – Vice Chairwoman, Ms. Sara Nelson, Dr. Sarah Sportman, Dr. Walter Woodward
- Absent:** Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Ms. Ellen Zoppo-Sassu
- Staff:** 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. Mary Falvey
Ms. Peggy Alder
Ms. Vincencia Adusei
Ms. Sandra Jones
Mr. Jim Woodworth
Ms. Ocsar Espina-Ruiz
Ms. Marissa Davis
Ms. Jane Montanaro
Mr. Hector Martinez
Rev. Salvatore Mancini

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:38 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 – November 3, 2021 Meeting

On a motion by Ms. C. Nelson, second by Dr. Woodward, the Historic Preservation Council voted to approve the November 1, 2021 minutes as submitted.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-3, Absent-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

* National Register Process Information Session – Jenny Scofield

Ms. Jenny Scofield, SHPO National Register Coordinator and Architectural Survey Coordinator gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the process and procedures of updating existing National Register nominations and why these updates are important to SHPO's work.

1. Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, Town of Clinton, National Register District Nomination, Clinton

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend the award of a Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, funded by the Historic Preservation Fund of the U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service 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-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Town of Clinton

Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Clinton requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to prepare a National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Commerce Street/Leffingwell Road area. Staff recommended the application for funding. Ms. Dunne has been working with Ms. Scofield and Ms. Peggy Adler from the Town of Clinton on this application. The boundaries of the proposed district will be determined during the nomination process and the project budget appears to be sufficient. Ms. Peggy Adler was on the call to answer any questions or concerns.

Ms. S. Nelson commented that she is very supportive of the effort to designate this area. She did request some clarity on the relationship between the existing districts and the boundaries of the proposed district. Ms. Dunne replied it was originally conceived as an expansion to one of the two existing districts, but after evaluating the area with Ms. Scofield, it was determined that this newly proposed district is a distinguishable entity with a separate development history. This neighborhood consists of late 19th through early 20th century housing. The area to the north is the commercial center and the area to the east dates to an earlier period and surrounds the Green.

Ms. Acly asked about the difference between funding a nomination with a Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant versus a Survey and Planning Grant. Are the CLG grants federal funding and/or non-matching? Ms. Dunne replied that the Certified Local Government program (CLG) is a partnership between the National Park Service, SHPO, and, currently, 51 municipalities in Connecticut. The CLG Historic Preservation Enhancement grants are federally funded and non-matching and only CLG communities are eligible to apply for them. They fund similar activities to the Survey and Planning grant, but CLG's are encouraged to take advantage of the federal, non-matching pot of funds as a benefit to participation in the program. This also means more funds are available for non-profits and non-CLG municipalities through the Survey and Planning grants.

Dr. Glaser asked Ms Dunne if additional information could be added to clarify, for the RFP, the distinction between this neighborhood and the adjacent districts. Ms. Scofield mentioned this a single-family neighborhood of late 19th century and 20th century housing with some pattern book houses. It does not appear to be worker housing, but research has not been completed yet on who the residents were. Ms. Scofield added it should be standard that research is done on the history of indigenous people and people of color.

Ms. Adler added that at the lower end of Summer Street, which runs from Route 1 to the waterfront, indigenous people, mainly Mohawk and Iroquois, lived in this area in 1663. Dr. Glaser asked if the area has been recognized? Ms. Adler replied there was a golf course there at one point and that was replaced by housing, which had no architectural significance. Ms. Scofield added that the integrity of that specific area had been lost when the land was leveled for a contemporary housing tract.

2. Survey and Planning Grant, Town of Wethersfield, State Register of Historic Places Nomination for Kycia Barn, Wethersfield

On a motion by Ms. Burgess, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to call this application to the table for discussion.

(Y-9, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Dr. Woodward, the Historic Preservation Council voted to change the dollar amount of the grant from \$5,000.00 to \$5,175.00.

(Y-9, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

On a revised motion, the Historic Preservation Council, voted to recommend the award of 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-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Town of Wethersfield

Amount: \$5,175.00

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Wethersfield requested funding in the amount of \$5,175 to produce a State Register of Historic Places nomination for the Kycia Barn. The Town acquired the barn and applied for funding for repairs, but the barn does not have any historic designation. Producing the State Register nomination will provide more insight into the history and architecture of the building and will also make the building eligible for future SHPO funding, such as pre-development or capital grants. Ms. Wisniewski has reviewed the nomination and determined that the building is eligible for listing. Mr. Jim Woodworth is on the call for any questions or concerns.

Ms. Acly asked, for context purposes, if the building was still part of a farm complex? Ms. Wisniewski replied that SHPO staff looked at the property that contains the barn, which the Town acquired. There is property across the road associated with the farm, but it is more of a mid-20th century family home. The farm was a multi-generational family farm and as the property evolved, the original house was either lost or subdivided off. The only other agricultural structures on the property were some greenhouses and a small shed which collapsed. This barn is really the last vestige of what was once one of many dairy farms within the Wethersfield area.

Ms. Acly asked if the pasture had been developed a swell? Ms. Wisniewski replied she was not sure and asked Mr. Woodworth from the Town of Wethersfield to chime in. Mr. Woodworth replied there are about 30 acres all together on this parcel. He is not sure how large the farm was originally. There are houses that now encroach on the original farm and a football field adjacent to the lot with the barn. There was an older house in the front yard of the barn and a pile of bricks that may have been a chimney. The date of 1913 is not certain. It may be an older barn that was on the same foundation. Mr. Woodworth commented he would love for Mr. Levine to come take a look at the barn. After speaking with family members, Mr. Woodworth found out there are extant movies of the cows being brought from the barn to pasture. There are a lot of invasive species in the area now and the Town's Wetlands Committee is trying to figure out a use for the land. Some of the fields will go to athletic fields but would love to save some for an agriculture enterprise, possibly with a non-profit, which the barn could be the centerpiece of. There are also about 80 acres of farmland nearby.

Mr. Butkus asked for clarity of the date of purchase. One paragraph says 2019 and one says 2020. Mr. Woodworth replied, the referendum was in 2018. It took

a while for the Committee to get started and then COVID hit. Mr. Woodworth did not know the exact closing date.

Dr. Glaser commented that the history of dairy farming and the associated labor history in the area is very important and should be included. A few years ago, one of her students did a cultural landscape report on the Wilkus Farm in Wethersfield, which included photos and documentation of the farm. This may be information that could be useful to the consultant. The Wethersfield Historical Society should have a copy of it. Mr. Woodworth commented that the two farms, Wilkus and the dairy farm in question started at around the same time and had similar trajectories. One was started by a Polish immigrant and the other by an Italian immigrant. The Wilkus Dairy Barn burned in the 1940s and the nieces were sure the historic barn had been taken from West Hartford and moved there. Mr. Levine and I went to investigate, and it was determined that it was not a historic barn but was most likely built around the 1940s.

Mr. Woodworth added that there were laws passed in the 1960s in the dairy industry that required refrigeration, and this is when the dairy operations at the farm ended. The farm then converted to planting vegetables and strawberries. There are articles which spoke about the wonderful strawberries grown there.

Dr. Faber asked for clarity on the budget, the amounts did not match in the application. The amount is listed as \$5,000 in the motion, but the application says \$5,175. She would also encourage the applicant to apply for a Conditions assessment.

3. Survey and Planning Grant, Music Mountain, Condition Assessment for Music Mountain Campus, 225 Mountain Rd., Falls Village, CT

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Mr. Butkus, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend the award of 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-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Music Mountain, Inc.

Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. Music Mountain 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 Music Mountain (1930), located at 225 Music Mountain Rd., Falls Village, CT. This application came in last Spring, during the match waive period. Staff recommended the application for funding. Ms. Dunne has discussed the budget with the applicant. Because this campus consists of several buildings, there was concern that \$20,000 may not be enough. The organization is ready to contribute some

additional funding even though this application does not require a match. The Applicant could also consider doing some add/alts in the RFP that could be included if the budget will allow. The application does prioritize the buildings that the Applicant would like to look at first, and then if funding is adequate, they can move onto to the other buildings. Mr. Oskar Espina Ruiz was on the call from Music Mountain to answer any questions.

Ms. S. Nelson mentioned that in the application, the product is described as an exhaustive, detailed, and comprehensive evaluation of the buildings on the property, but this may not be the best fit for this project budget. This type of assessment would be very time consuming and consultant heavy because you would need to have structural and mechanical engineers, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing evaluations, etc. It seems like this first request should be more about getting a handle on the buildings as part of a more cursory overview of the property to identify key issues.

Ms. Dunne mentioned she agreed and did make the applicant aware that the budget may not produce the type of assessment outlined in the application. Ms. Dunne can work with the applicant to craft an RFP to ensure that the product is useful and more in line with the type of assessment Ms. Nelson was describing. The applicant understands and so they will fashion the RFP to reflect that so that they are not disappointed, but they get something that they feel they can use.

Chairman Elmore asked, based on Ms. S. Nelson's discussion, would it be better to focus more on the prioritized building first in the scope of work versus getting a cursory review of everything? He would hate to have them get something that's not detailed enough to be usable.

Ms. Dunne replied, yes, after the Applicant submitted the application, they followed up with a priority list of what they would like to tackle first, so the RFP could focus on that. They can always come back for additional funding for a more in-depth building by building look if needed. Chairman Elmore asked what exactly was Council voting on this point?

Ms. Burgess mentioned that there are a lot of references to mold throughout the application that needs to be addressed and prioritizing the venue because that's what the public sees, but she is torn between the overall, more cursory, assessment, versus a more detailed focused assessment.

Ms. Acly asked if the buildings were used year-round or seasonal? Ms. Dunne replied the performances are seasonal.

Mr. Espina-Ruiz added it's seasonal, they only use these buildings in the summer, they are not insulated. Regarding a cursory versus detailed inspection, they have already had several cursory inspections done by builders that have led to several repairs throughout the past 4 years or so. After he started with the organization, Mr. Espina-Ruiz understood very quickly that the buildings needed repair and that the inspections that had been done to date, we're not done professionally in his opinion. Since then, they have started to do a lot more

maintenance and repairs, but even after these 4 years of cursory inspections and significant repairs., there is so much to catch up on that they really need a more professional and more comprehensive assessment.

The Applicant is hoping to prioritize and use this funding towards the assessment of the Big House and the Viola House, which are 2 buildings they use to host students and faculty. This would be extremely helpful. These two buildings are in better shape than some of the others, excluding Gordon Hall, which is the main building where concerts are presented. Gordon Hall is one of the better maintained buildings. Viola House has no mold now, as it had a full mold remediation job two summers ago. Mr. Espina-Ruiz is hopeful that with good quality comprehensive assessments of the Big House and Viola House, it would mean they could be very well restored.

Chairman Elmore asked what the sizes of those two buildings are? Mr. Espina-Ruiz replied he did not have exact numbers, but the Big House is a 2-story building with an attic and 7 bedrooms with a kitchen, living room, dining room, it's a large house. The cottages are significantly smaller. They have 5 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms.

Ms Acly asked if the Big House was named the Violin House? Mr. Espina-Ruiz replied yes, they use both names most of the time.

Chairman Elmore asked if there were extant floorplans for the buildings. Mr. Espina-Ruiz commented they would have to be created. They have photos of all the rooms of all the buildings that were taken professionally, but not measurements and a floor plan.

Ms. Dunne added they submitted floor plans for one of the cottages and apparently the smaller buildings are identical in size, so they are in the application, but did not know whether they were measured or if they would be adequate for this report. Mr. Espina-Ruiz added one was produced for the mold remediation for Viola House in 2019.

Ms. S. Nelson added her professional preference is always to try and get as much detailed information as we can to help owners further along the process. Now hearing from Mr. Espina-Ruiz on what the priorities are, it seems that there is a realistic project, which is an in-depth study of two buildings, given the constraints of the budget. Ms. Nelson does worry about buildings that are in worse shape and asked if there's any other funding that can help Music Mountain, like the 1772 Foundation or some other organization, that can continue to help them while this study is ongoing. Ms. S. Nelson felt more comfortable narrowing the scope of this condition assessment to two buildings and then having the applicant come back. She asked Ms. Acly what her thoughts were?

Ms. Acly replied she completely agreed with Ms. S. Nelson. Limiting the scope to those 2 priority buildings is a lot more comfortable for the for the grant amount. The RFP can also be structured with a base price and then with

additional add-on pieces for pricing. There is a little bit of efficiency in doing this once the consultant is on board and on site. She also had the same concern that these are the buildings that are in better shape.

Mr. Espina-Ruiz responded he was hoping for that because the buildings that are in the worst condition were in use up until 2019. They have really deteriorated significantly in the last 2 years, so it would be great to see what else can be done. Even if it's a little bit more cursory assessment for the buildings that are in worse shape, it would at least allow the Applicant to prevent any further deterioration or damage until the organization is ready to take care of them.

Ms. Acly asked if there was an issue with the roof leaking? Mr. Espina-Ruiz replied no, but there is mold in the basements to the point where some of the beams have been damaged. Ms. Acly added the root cause of the mold must be determined.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Dunne to enlighten us on the process of one grant application versus multiple grants running concurrently. Ms. Dunne replied SHPO's general policy is that an organization can only have one of each at a time. You can have one Survey and Planning Grant, one HRF, etc., but generally not two grants from the same program. That's not a rule and it is not in statute, it has just been SHPO's general policy.

Chairman Elmore asked about other potential funding or if it made sense to focus on the buildings that are in worse condition. Mr. Espina-Ruiz replied that he would love to figure out a way to at least do a cursory assessment of the smaller buildings. Music Mountain would be willing to match the grant or to raise additional funding if needed.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Dunne if the RFP could be structured so that the consultants bidding on the assessment of the two priority buildings could also provide a price for the other structures and then Music Mountain can evaluate how they would like to proceed.

Ms. C. Nelson added she like the idea of expanding the Condition Assessment, if possible, to reinforce choices for where to focus and prioritize the actual work, focusing on the education building. Do the guests and educators stay there as well? Mr. Espina-Ruiz replied yes, there are dormitories, a dining hall and class or rehearsal room as well.

Mr. Butkus added that since several of the buildings are identical, you can glean a lot for code upgrades and accessibility, so you can do some budget planning for the other buildings. Then you can limit the scope in the RFP to address the mold in the basements and tackle that critical piece. This would be an alternative to putting a total assessment of the other buildings into the RFP as an add-on.

**4. Survey and Planning Grant, Full Gospel Interdenominational Church Inc.,
Condition Assessment for church building, 745 Main St., Manchester**

On a motion by Ms. C. Nelson, second by Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend the award of 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-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Full Gospel Interdenominational Church Inc.
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Full Gospel Interdenominational Church, Inc. 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 for the Full Gospel Interdenominational Church building (1924), located at 745 Main St., Manchester.

There are exterior issues, the interior is not presenting a lot of issues. The funding will be matched, hoping it will be enough to cover the Condition's assessment. Reverend Sal Mancini is on the call for any questions or concerns.

Ms. Acly offered began with a round of encouragement. She thought it was great to see a masonry building come here for a proper consultant review. Sometimes masonry buildings get repaired without a consultant, and if things like the mortar selection aren't correct, it can really damage a building. She asked if the ornamentation might be precast concrete or terra cotta. Ms. Acly asked if Ms. Dunne knew what some of the materials were. Ms. Dunne replied she would have to check the nomination but could find out.

Mr. Butkus asked what should be done first, a conditions assessment, or should Council be focused on having the Applicant develop construction documents they can go right out to bid with. Th condition is apparent, and Mr. Butkus would like to see them move forward anow and prevent further deterioration of the parapet. Ms. Dunne replied they can certainly do that, but sometimes we do recommend they take that step back because there may be additional issues that need to be addressed. The applicant could come back in January, or the motion could be revised. She would have to consult with the applicant to see what they are ready to do.

Ms. Acly added that she was a bit torn on that issue. There is an important potential safety issue with the parapet, which clearly needs work. However, the condition assessment is also critical to understand what other issues may exist both near the parapet and with the rest of the buildings. The ideal wish list for

this RFP would be a condition assessment with an add/alternate for the stabilization of the parapet. It does appear that there is quite a bit of deferred maintenance on the building so it may be challenging for the applicant to think about a design project without first thinking more about funding. The conditions assessment would help the applicant to prioritize and plan further.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Dunne if the RFP for a Survey and Planning grant could include both the condition assessment and construction documents for a stabilization of the parapet? Ms. Dunne replied yes, the plans and specifications would still be considered pre-development. So, they along with the assessment report would be eligible activities under Survey and Planning. Applicants do occasionally include plans and specifications for a priority need along with a condition assessment. Ms. Acly agreed that the parapet would be a priority need.

Ms. Burgess added she agreed with Ms. Acly and the structure of the RFP that she proposed. The long-range preservation plan that would be included in the conditions assessment will be important for the applicant to know what projects will need to be planned for down the road. Plans and specifications alone would not be able to provide this.

Dr. Faber asked if it came down to it, could the applicant have a condition assessment and an HRF grant going at the same time. Ms. Dunne replied, yes, but this project would be the condition assessment, with plans and specs for a priority need, which wouldn't necessarily be an HRF grant. If they got the plans and specifications within the next few months, they could certainly apply for an HRF before they technically closed out the Survey and Planning grant.

Ms. S. Nelson added, based on a prior project that she worked on, that another option would be to develop plans for a temporary stabilization of the parapet, which would allow the applicant to buy time until a larger rehabilitation project of the building. This would also provide additional flexibility for this future work, depending on the other needs of the building. It is unclear how stable the parapet is in its current condition.

Mr. Butkus added he agrees, but the challenge with non-profits is funding. The concern would be the applicant having to do the work twice, the first as a stopgap measure, the second as a permanent solution.

Chairman Elmore asked if the RFP could be structured such that it includes plans and specifications for the stabilization, but if the applicant finds that they're in dire need of emergency monies, can they come in for that emergency HRF funding? Ms. Dunne replied yes.

Ms. S. Nelson added we are all trying to help them get the best value for their money.

Chairman Elmore asked if this was a matching grant, and if so, is \$40,000 enough to do a comprehensive exterior (building envelope) condition assessment and include an adequate evaluation of the parapet.

Ms. Acly agreed with Mr. Butkus' initial concern that if there is no obvious path to this potentially dangerous condition of the parapet being addressed urgently, then it might not be addressed.

MS. Dunne stated that the initial award is just the start of the process. SHPO will work with the applicant to help them with the RFP and to help them focus based on this conversation to ensure that they are on the right path.

Chairman Elmore confirmed that Council would vote on the application as submitted, with the understanding that the applicant would come back for additional funds if an emergency were identified during the assessment.

5. Survey and Planning Grant, Miracle Temple Church of New London, Condition Assessment for Church, New London

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council votes to recommend the award of 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-8, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-3, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Miracle Temple Church of New London
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Miracle Temple Church of New London 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 Miracle Temple Church building (1868), located at 45 Broad Street, New London. Staff recommended the application for funding. This application came in last spring during the no-match period. This is a large building. The applicant is asking for a condition assessment for the whole building, but the steeple and the stained-glass windows are presenting an obvious need for examination. Even though there's not a match required, the church is prepared to provide matching funds for a conditions assessment. The windows themselves are in good shape, they just need to be tightened up and the wood surrounds needs to be restored. Ms. Marissa Davis was on the call to answer any questions.

Ms. Acly commented that this type of granite church in New London is not uncommon, and she has worked on several of them. Granite tends to really hold moisture and she doesn't always recommend this, but with granite, it is important to get an aerial lift to closely inspect the materials on top of the tower. A drone survey can be done for many buildings, but it is important to tap on the masonry

to see how much is delaminated and to detect any hidden conditions. This can automatically add another five to six thousand dollars to the assessment.

Chairman Elmore asked if that would include the steeple as well. Ms. Acly replied yes. Granite is such a durable material, but it tends to hide potential problems in the middle of the walls. Ms. Acly understands the church is willing to chip in additional funds, which is good, as \$20,000 is going to be a low budget for the assessment of this building.

Mr. Butkus agreed. He has worked on many churches over the years and has seen a general lack of annual maintenance, so while the lift is on site, it would be good to inspect the slate roof to prioritize any immediate repairs that can be made.

Chairman Elmore mentioned @11:14 a.m. – Ms. Sara Nelson left the meeting.

Ms. Acly added that the RFP could be structured in a way that initially focuses on the steeple conditions and the windows as item A. Item B could be an assessment of the remainder of the building envelope, and item C could be the interior, for the purposes of getting pricing for additional work. Dunne agreed that it often makes sense, with smaller budget projects, to do more focused assessments.

Mr. Butkus added it made perfect sense to list the assessment priorities and to move forward as Ms. Acly described.

6. Stewardship Relief Grant, Middlesex County Historical Society, Joseph K. F. Mansfield House, Middletown

On a motion by Ms. Burgess, Second by Mr. Butkus, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Stewardship Relief 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-7, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-4, Recused-0) (Roll call vote) *

Applicant: Middlesex County Historical Society
Amount: \$1,000.00

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Middlesex County Historical Society requested funding in the amount of \$1,000. Staff recommended the application for funding. Due to the COVID shutdown, the Historic Preservation Council voted to create the Stewardship Relief grant program. The purpose of the funding is to support the continued safeguarding of historic resources at a time when many organizations are experiencing economic distress because of the COVID-19 pandemic. These are reimbursable grants and only 501(c)3 non-profits are eligible. Eligible reimbursable expenses are those related to the basic utilities and regular maintenance costs associated with the upkeep of a designated historic

resource. The grants were capped at \$1,000 and applicants must show proof of expenditure. The program will be discontinued in January 2022.

Ms. Butkus pointed out a correction, the dollar amount should be changed from one million to one thousand.

Dr. Faber mentioned that the application check list was not complete. Ms. Dunne replied that it should have been checked, but everything was included so the application is considered complete.

Ms. C. Nelson thought this was a great program and she wished more organizations had applied, including several she had worked with. Hopefully there won't be similar global circumstances that make it necessary, but in the future with economic downturns or other economic circumstances, she hopes it could be reconsidered in the future. The program was a real gift and a boost to some organizations, and she thanked Ms. Dunne for organizing it.

Ms. Dunne replied that she hoped it had an impact and there's nothing that would prevent the Council from bringing the program back if needed.

***Dr. Glaser left the meeting at 11:21 a.m.**

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

1. State Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Walter B. and Anna Spencer House, 252 Wakelee Avenue, Ansonia

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Dr. Sportman, the Historic Preservation Council voted to list the Walter B. and Anna Spencer House, located at 252 Wakelee Avenue, Ansonia, to the State Register of Historic Places.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-4, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Wisniewski presented this application. Staff recommended approval of the listing. The Anna and Walter B. Spencer House, located at 252 Wakelee Avenue in Ansonia, is eligible for listing under Criterion 1, at the local level, as a part of the suburban development of Ansonia, as well under Criterion 2 at the local level as an intact example of a foursquare plan single family home. Alterations to the property have been minimal, the most noticeable being the replacement of most of their original windows.

The property retains its integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association with the area as it developed into a middle-

class neighborhood located along a transportation route. Mr. Hector Martinez, the property owner, was on the line for any questions or concerns.

Ms. Burgess mentioned that Dr. Glaser left comments in the chat. Ms. Wisniewski added that she did see Dr. Glaser's comments and anticipated the discussion based on Ms. Scofield's earlier presentation. It is not a hard and fast rule that you can't mention anything before the period of significance or date of significance in the nomination. Ms. Wisniewski finds that weaving in a little bit of background information, whether it be just a quick paragraph, helps to introduce the reader into the context of the property. You don't want to go on for four pages about background history and then only talk about the period of significance for one page.

Ms. Scofield added that you can weave essential background information into the narrative. What she was getting at in her talk was you don't lead with a whole statement on general background that's unrelated.

Ms. C. Nelson commented sometimes when she is reading, she so often says to herself, so what, what's the point of that? She believes you can weave anything in as long as you make it relevant, no matter when it happened.

Ms. Wisniewski added this nomination does a very good job discussing the development of the foursquare form. The applicant included some national trends that were going on at the same time, while also bringing it home to a very local level.

Chairman Elmore commented that he wished the nomination would just start off with a brief introduction (this house dated such and such, and such a style, and the parcel is X number of square feet in size) because he badly wants to know that right from the beginning before he gets into it. He only found the 0.24-acre size, several paragraphs down. Ms. Wisniewski replied we can add an executive kind of summary paragraph right at the outset. It may be a little repetitive, but it's good if you're looking for an overall summary so she will add that as a comment.

Ms. C. Nelson added she feels the same way about the agenda and looking for the address for each application. Mr. Kinney commented that it would not be a problem at all to add addresses to the agenda. Chairman Elmore added sometimes, not all the time, he'll sit there and Google the property to find out where they are.

II. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

IX. Threatened Properties - CEPA Updates – Todd Levine

1. Norwalk, 10 Old Kings Highway

Mr. Levine reported that the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) is not confident that they are going to bring suit on this matter. One of the problems is that the property is adjacent to wetlands and a floodplain which prevents the owner, Andy Glaser, from building outside of the current footprint and the existing home is already out of compliance because of the setbacks. SHPO, OAG, the town, and the owner are trying to negotiate a solution where at least some of the exterior walls as well as the older portion of the building, which you may recall included the chimney, would be retained. The municipality said that they are not going to allow the owner to build on the existing foundation.

Even if OAG does move forward with a suit and is successful, the municipality could still not approve the plan, which would simply mean a waste of time and resources for everyone involved. SHPO is currently trying to get a clear answer from the municipality on exactly what they will accept and not accept. SHPO hopes to have this information by the end of the month because the demolition delay runs out December 30th, 2021. Unfortunately, this may end up being a loss.

2. Bridgewater Grange, 11 Main Street South

This matter is still with the OAG, where they are trying to work out a deal with the municipality as they are disinclined to file suit in this situation. The municipality agreed to list the property for sale in Preservation News for two months. SHPO was hoping for 6 months and did not sign on to this deal. It was Mr. Levine's understanding from residents that someone may be putting in an offer for the asking price, but the municipality has the right to refuse any offers that are submitted. The municipality is also in for a STEAP (Small Town Economic Assistance Program), which SHPO is reviewing and will result in an adverse effect to historic properties. Unfortunately, this may also end up being a loss.

3. University of Connecticut, Storrs Campus, 4 Gilbert Road

Ms. Labadia thanked Mr. Levine and commented that she wanted to share some information about a potential new threat to Faculty Row or the remaining 'Brown Houses' at UCONN, which she thought would be important for the HPC to be aware of.

SHPO and HPC were previously engaged with the project back in 2016-2017 when UCONN proposed to demolish all nine of the "Brown Houses." Recently, just before Thanksgiving, Ms. Laura Cruickshank, Senior Architect for the University of Connecticut, contacted our office requesting an opportunity to meet with us regarding the existing agreement document that was signed back in 2017. Since that time, Ms. Labadia was reviewing the Environmental Monitor, and the University of Connecticut is looking to construct a large new dormitory on the exact location of one of the two remaining Brown Houses, which UCONN committed to preserving and rehabilitating in the 2017 agreement document. Ms. Labadia is putting two and two together and assumes that this may be what Ms. Cruickshank's meeting request may potentially be about. She doesn't know for sure. There was a lot of discussion last

time and she just wanted to make everyone aware that UCONN has requested this meeting. Ms. Labadia is happy to provide updates and answer any questions that she can as this moves forward.

Dr. Faber stated that she was really involved with the whole UConn saga the first time around and that there was an MOU with the Connecticut Trust and SHPO. In that document, UCONN committed to retaining the 2 houses, which they haven't been maintaining, obviously. She asked what would happen if UCONN decided to move forward with the dormitory? Ms. Labadia replied she did not know; this is uncharted territory. She doesn't know what SHPO/Council can hold them to, based on the agreement document. UCONN has also requested a meeting with Preservation CT. Ms. Labadia is not sure how this is going to play out and knows Dr. Faber has a lot of interest in it. Ms. Labadia is more than happy to have another discussion offline.

Dr. Woodward added, the agreement UCONN arrived at after Dr. Faber went to war with them is that the buildings were to be saved. Preservation has not happened and now they want to renege on the agreement. He asked Ms. Labadia if SHPO/Council has any recourse? Ms. Labadia responded she doesn't know at this point. SHPO allowed the prior demolitions to take place with the understanding they were going to retain the two remaining houses. Ms. Labadia added she would like to go over the agreement in detail. It has been made known where our office stands on this matter. This is very frustrating and SHPO does not know where this will fall legally yet.

X. Preservation Restrictions

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney reported on the SHPO's plan to respond to the federal infrastructure bill and the anticipated increase in regulatory reviews resulting from it. In addition to the primarily state-funded financial incentive programs that come before Council each month, SHPO plays a critical role in the federal regulatory processes as well. Consultation with SHPO is a mandatory component of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), which applies to all projects under the direct control of the federal government, as well as the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires that SHPO performs a compliance review of any federally funded, licensed, or permitted project.

The purpose of these historic preservation review processes is to ensure that federal or federally assisted project proponents take into consideration the potential impacts of their projects on significant historic resources. The goal of SHPO consultation is to identify cultural resources within the project area, identify potential impacts to resources, and to find ways to avoid harm to historic properties. If impacts cannot be avoided, then SHPO works with the project proponent to minimize or mitigate the adverse effects.

With the recent passage of the federal infrastructure bill, States can anticipate substantial increases in federal project funding in the coming months and years, which will translate to hundreds if not thousands of additional regulatory review requests. Just based on formula funding along, CT looks like it will be receiving over 34% more funding for highway and bridge projects on an annual basis over the next five years. The States will also be able to apply for additional competitive grant funding as part of the larger infrastructure initiative. The legislation also includes billions of additional federal dollars for roadway safety projects, resiliency measures, climate change mitigation, public transportation improvements, airport facilities, and passenger and freight rail.

As a majority of these federally funded projects will be coming through SHPO as part of the above-mentioned review processes, staff is going to be very busy in the coming months and years. SHPO is evaluating its staffing needs and is in the process of requesting additional positions to augment its review capabilities. This will ensure that the office can continue to maintain the high level of service we provide through both our state and federal programs, that we meet our federally mandated regulatory requirements, and that we are well-positioned to handle the anticipated long-term workload increases associated with this new legislation.

Mr. Kinney also briefly reported on new appointments to the HPC. This is still an ongoing process. SHPO received the names of several potential candidates recently and we hope to be moving forward with new appointments shortly. Thank you to Christine Nelson for making several recommendations.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

Ms. Shapiro started with a quick update that is not specifically related to the museums, but to the CT Cultural Fund Operating Support grant that CT Humanities is administering with state funds. As a reminder, this program offers unmatched grants of at least \$5000 to history, arts, and cultural non-profits with a total grant pool of \$16 M. The application period has closed and there are over 700 applicants. The grant team is currently working to review eligibility, and to create the data forms that will be a requirement for applicants to complete prior to receiving their awards.

The staff has been working to fill the open position of Museum Curator that became open when Mr. Mike McBride retired in August. There has been an interesting twist, in that a Mandatory Reemployment / SEBAC Candidate was interested in the job and has decided to accept the position. While Ms. Shapiro can't name the person yet, she has worked at the museums in the past 15 years, she is well qualified for the position. Ms. Shapiro is waiting on confirmation from the Attorney General's office, the confirmation comes in the form of a stipulated agreement which Ms. Shapiro believes she will have this week. The candidate will start the first week of January.

Substantial completion at the Prudence Crandall Museum was supposed to be November 12th. The project team met on November 14th for a walk through, and unfortunately there are still issues pending, including parts needed to make the brand-new HVAC system

function. The team is working on a new substantial complete date now, perhaps by the end of December. In good news we've had approval from the state fire marshal on the collection's storage plan that consultant Kathy Craughwell-Varda prepared for us, and museum staff is planning to empty out the storage pods starting in January. Once the building is under staff's control again, they will be doing some final work to pull out cabinets and replace flooring and paint in what was the staff workroom.

Ms. Shapiro received final season reports from the Eric Sloane Museum and Old New-Gate. A few choice tidbits from Sloane include a total visitation of 2700, admissions sales of \$8,831 and gift shop sales of nearly \$12,000! Old New-Gate saw 8216 visitors with admission sales of \$33,891, and gift shop sales of \$17,731.75.

Staff is tracking quite a bit of data for all the museums, but this is the first year that staff have been asked to provide a very detailed season end report. The information comes from the point of sales system as well as staff who are now using Air Table to track their expenses for the site. Ms. Michelle Parrish is working on her report for Henry Whitfield, and we will have a report for Prudence Crandall, although it will look substantially different because the museum has been closed.

The reports also include highlights of the season, notable accomplishments, and goals for the next museum season. Ms. Shapiro uploaded them into Dropbox this morning in case anyone is interested in looking at them. She will share with others.

XIII. Old Business

XIV. New Business

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies – Mary Falvey, CT Preservation Action

There is not much to report on at the moment, as the legislature is not back in session yet. Ms. Falvey made everyone aware this will be her last meeting with presenting to the HPC as she is stepping down as President of CPA in January 2022 to focus on finishing her Master's in Public History. She will continue to serve on the board of CPA and will be happy to assist in any way possible to see that SHPO has adequate funding for staffing. Ms. Falvey thanked Ms. Shapiro for organizing monthly legislative check-in meetings between SHPO, PCT, and CPA to make sure that the lines of communication are open regarding preservation related legislation.

XVI. Public Forum

XVII. Adjournment

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the meeting was adjourned at 12:06 p.m.

***Next regularly scheduled Council meeting:
Wednesday January 5, 2021 – Meeting format to be determined***