

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, February 2, 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)

MINUTES

Council: Ms. Elizabeth Acly, Ms. Elizabeth Burgess, Mr. Paul Butkus, Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Chairman Thomas Elmore, Dr. Margaret Faber, Dr. Leah Glaser, Ms. Christine Nelson - Vice Chairwoman, Ms. Sara Nelson, Dr. Sarah Sportman, Dr. Walter Woodward

Staff: Ms. Julie Carmelich, Ms. Mary Dunne, Ms. Erin Fink, Mr. Jonathan Kinney, Ms. Cathy Labadia, Mr. Todd Levine, Ms. Jenny Scofield, Ms. Liz Shapiro, and Ms. Marena Wiesnewski

Guest:

- Ms. Alexia Belperron
- Mr. Hermann Cartes-Barrios
- Mr. William Diaz
- Ms. Donna Douglas
- Ms. Elsbeth Dowd
- Mr. Andrew Droney
- Ms. Mary Falvey
- Mr. Ric Fattibene
- Ms. Jane Montanaro
- Ms. Elizabeth Normen
- Ms. Laurie Paulos
- Ms. Carol Solheim
- Ms. Jordan Sorenson
- Ms. Angela Thomas
- Ms. Renee Tribert

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. Both Ms. Burgess and Mr. Woodward indicated that they would be recusing themselves from agenda item V.B.1. based on prior involvement with the project.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes and Transcripts

a. Minutes – December 1, 2021 Meeting

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to approve the December 1, 2021 meeting minutes with minor corrections.

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

b. Minutes – January 5, 2022 Meeting

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to approve the January 5, 2022 meeting minutes with minor corrections.

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

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

A. Unfinished Action Items

1. Historic Restoration Fund, Union Baptist Church, Hartford. Item V.B.1 tabled from the 7/7/2021 meeting. Funding request raised to \$200,000 for roof repairs.

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

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

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Ms. S. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to revise the original motion to reflect the increased grant amount of \$200,000.

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

On a roll call vote, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend the award of a Historic Restoration Fund 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.

Applicant: Union Baptist Church

Amount: \$200,000

Ms. Fink presented this application. Union Baptist Church requested funding in the amount of \$200,000 to replace the building's slate roof, flashing, and gutters, repoint masonry, rebuild the coping stones, install new thru-wall flashing, and replace and/or restore woodwork at the eaves. Staff recommended the application for funding.

There was discussion about the language in the motion, specifically regarding the scope of work. Ms. Fink stated that the most recent version of the motion reflected a reduction in the project's scope, specifically the removal of the proposed work in the building's basement. Chairman Elmore stated that the version of the motion he had still contained a reference to the basement work. Ms. Fink read the latest version of the motion into the record for clarification.

This item was originally tabled at the July 2021 HPC meeting and was subsequently tabled again at the August 2021 meeting. This was done so that the Applicant could apply for a survey and planning grant to inspect the roof and to develop bid level plans and specifications for this current round of HRF funding. Bruce Darling Roofing Consultant conducted the assessment and Crosskey Architects prepared the bid documents and drawings. The additional information gained from the Survey and Planning Grant resulted in an increase in the requested grant amount from \$100,00 to \$200,000.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. S. Nelson to lead the discussion since she was part of the original subgroup that reviewed the original application. Ms. Nelson stated that she was heartened by the level of investigation that has been done on the roof and the owner is now much better prepared to undertake the work. Ms. Nelson asked Ms. Fink to help clarify the scope of work and whether the phasing of the work was proposed to be done by geographic location on the roof or by trade-based work. Ms. Fink stated that she believed it was phased geographically.

Ms. Acly commented that slate roofing tiles do have a finite life span. If the current plan is to reuse as much original slate as possible with new slates replacing those that are too deteriorated for reuse, the existing slates should be carefully inspected. Ms. Acly stated that she would hate to see the Applicant go through all this work only to find out that much of the extant slate only has a few years of life left.

Chairman Elmore asked if the approach of removing the slate and then reusing them in conjunction with new slate would lead to a piecemeal appearance. Ms. Acly replied that it would partially depend on if the replacement slate was weathering or not. If so, it could be carefully arranged to minimize the visual impact. Ms. S. Nelson also mentioned that the new slates could be strategically located in less visible areas.

Mr. Butkus stated that the existing roof consists of colored bands of slate on the ridge and eaves. Mr. Butkus hopes that every effort will be made to match the slates in-kind to maintain the current appearance.

Chairman Elmore stated that this is another great example of how Council has helped the applicant by asking for additional information, even though it caused a delay. Ms. Thomas agreed.

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

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

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

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to table this item until the March 2, 2022 meeting, for the Applicant to obtain additional information.

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

Ms. Fink presented this application. The item was tabled at the January 5, 2022 meeting so that the Applicant could obtain additional information regarding the proposed replacement lay light system that will be installed above the gallery space. At the January meeting, Council requested historic and current photographs of the gallery space under various lighting conditions if possible.

Chairman Elmore asked if all Council members were aware that additional information was uploaded to the Dropbox for review on Monday and Tuesday prior to the meeting. Dr. Faber stated that she was unable to view it. Ms. Fink stated that the additional uploaded documents contained information on five other brands of materials that the Applicant investigated.

Ms. Fink stated that unfortunately the company Kalwall would not produce a sample panel for the Applicant as requested by Council in January. The Applicant also investigated the use of five other potential products, but the Kalwall product is the only product that provides the necessary R value for climate control and conservation of the art. Council also expressed concerns about the structural load from the heavier weight of the proposed Kalwall panels, but an architect and engineer have been engaged and were able to submit a cross section that shows the assembly. Based on the limited options for products available to the Applicant, the material conservation needs, and the involvement of the architect and engineer in the project, SHPO recommended the application for funding.

Ms. Fink shared a set of photographs and drawings supplied by the Applicant.

Mr. Butkus mentioned Ms. S. Nelson's recommendation at the January meeting that the Applicant investigate a hybrid system that used the proposed Kalwall system, but with fabric stretched across the lower surface of the Kalwall panels. This hybrid approach would more closely replicate the original fabric material that existed and would minimize the visual impact from the further division of the panels resulting from the Kalwall product's internal grid system.

Ms. S. Nelson asked if the Applicant had looked at a hybrid system.

Ms. Paulos responded that the presence of the tie rods and cables above the lay lights would potentially complicate the installation of a system of this kind. Mr. Butkus responded that panels would be small enough to work around the grid structure so working around the vertical supports would be possible.

Mr. Butkus also mentioned Ms. Acly's question at the January meeting regarding the weight of the proposed system. Ms. Paulos stated that an engineer recently visited the site and determined that the design of the supporting structure is sufficient to support the weight of the Kalwall product.

Mr. Butkus asked Ms. Fink if SHPO had determined whether the Kalwall material meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Ms. Fink stated that she looked for information but was unable to find any. Ms. Fink can discuss further with SHPO staff if needed.

Chairman Elmore asked Mr. Butkus and Ms. S. Nelson to talk more about the fabric treatment. Mr. Butkus stated that it would most likely be a framed piece of fabric, almost like a painting canvas, that would be dropped into the structural gridwork.

Ms. Burgess stated that the Kalwall system meets the needs of the Applicant, so Council is really talking about aesthetics at this point and the preservation of the building and the environment for the collections trumps aesthetics in this situation for her. Mr. Butkus responded that the hybrid system incorporating the fabric will theoretically address both the environmental and aesthetic concerns, which are important here because the lay light is such a character defining feature of the gallery space.

Dr. Faber asked if a photograph or example of the proposed hybrid system was available. Mr. Butkus recommended the Renzo Piano Pavilion at the Kimbell Art Museum in Fort Worth. Ms. Fink brought up photographs of the building for Council to review. Dr. Faber followed up with a question about the price of the hybrid system. The Applicant's architect was not on the call to respond.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Paulos if they would be willing to get back together with the architect to investigate the hybrid system further.

Mr. Butkus stated that the other materials that were rejected were rejected primarily due to aesthetics. Ms. Paulos stated that they were rejected due to low r values that did not meet their needs.

Ms. S. Nelson stated that she hoped Ms. Paulos understood that Council was trying to reach a solution that would meet their needs for thermal performance and aesthetics.

Ms. Paulos stated that she appreciates Council's expertise and the examples that were provided.

B. New Action Items

1. Partners In Preservation Grant, Connecticut Explored, Inc., historic preservation education and outreach and *CT Explored Sites Lines* publication, Statewide

Ms. Burgess and Dr. Woodward recused themselves from this item and left the meeting.

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

Applicant: CT Explored, Inc.
Amount: \$40,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. CT Explored, Inc. requested funding in the amount of \$40,000 for historic preservation education and outreach and CT Explored Site Lines publication. Staff recommended the application for funding. SHPO awarded a small grant to CT Explored last year to continue publishing a historic preservation themed issue and to continue the Site Lines publication, which features preservation related material. Also included in that grant, was a planning component requesting that the Applicant convene a committee of educators to explore ways to broaden our outreach, particularly with elementary level curriculum. The Applicant did convene a broad committee with the recommendation that the focus be on grades K-2. The result was the application before Council, which continues to provide for the preservation themed issue and Site Lines, but also for another year of continued planning in concert with the State Department of Education and a panel of experts. The second year of the grant will focus on implementation. Elizabeth Normen, Publisher of CT Explored, was on the call to answer any questions.

Mr. Butkus asked about the distribution mechanism for the curriculum. How will it be shared with school districts, and will it be available for a set amount of time? Ms. Dunne responded that this will be part of the work done in the second year of the grant, when the Applicant is working on implementation with the Department of Education. The intent is to first do a pilot program to explore feasibility.

Ms. Normen added that it will be available on a free and open website, www.wherelivect.org. There is no set time limit for distribution of the curriculum, and it is intended to be worked on and improved over time. The Applicant is going to have to work hard on the front end along with their education specialists to build relationships in order to share it more broadly. Mr. Butkus mentioned that reaching out to local historical societies and preservation organizations will be helpful since they will have the resources available to tie it into the local history of the community. Ms. Normen agreed.

Dr. Glaser stated that she was not clear on how this tied into historic preservation for K-2 students or is it focused more on local history. Ms. Normen responded that the focus at that age is understanding yourself and your place in your family, community, neighborhood, and the larger world. The key connection is getting students to better understand the built environment around them and their experiences.

Chairman Elmore asked how any different curricula for different age groups will be developed? Ms. Normen responded that the curriculum for grades 3-4 is already in place and is being used. There is also one in place for the 5-8 grade level. Mr. Elmore followed up by asking if the grant amount of \$40,000 is enough. Ms. Normen responded that she believes it is and they will be building on work that is already done.

Ms. Acly asked if other states are doing something similar or is this unique to Connecticut? Ms. Normen responded that she is not sure, but she would be surprised if this was unique. Dr. Glaser responded that New Jersey has something similar.

Ms. Burgess and Dr. Woodward returned to the meeting.

2. Survey and Planning Grant, Amity and Woodbridge Historical Society, updated National Register nomination form for Darling House, 1907 Litchfield Turnpike, Woodbridge

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Ms. C. Nelson, 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-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Amity and Woodbridge Historical Society
Amount: \$14,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Amity and Woodbridge Historical Society requested funding in the amount of \$14,000 to obtain the consulting services of a 36-CFR qualified architectural historian to prepare an updated National Register of Historic Places nomination form for the Darling House. Staff recommended the application for funding. SHPO has awarded several pre-development grants to the Applicant to address preservation issues with the outbuildings on the property. The outbuildings are noted in the nomination, but SHPO encouraged the Applicant to complete this update to explore the outbuildings more fully and to also explore a broader diversity of occupants or persons associated with the property. National Register Coordinator Jenny Scofield has been working with Ms. Dunne and the budget appears to be appropriate. Alexia Belperron was on the call to answer any questions.

Dr. Glaser stated that it is great this nomination is being updated, but she was concerned that there was not enough emphasis on the enslaved people associated with the property. Ms. Belperron responded that they would be very interested in including this information and the organization already has related documentation that could be used. Dr. Glaser offered to share links to additional information if that would help.

Ms. Dunne commented that SHPO will be involved throughout the process and always makes sure that when an applicant comes to the office proposing an update that this broader research is done. While the outbuildings may have been the impetus for the update, the update would not go forward without that additional research.

Ms. Belperron also mentioned that they are exploring changing the name of the property from the Thomas Darling Farm to something more inclusive.

Chairman Elmore stated that once additional information has been included about the outbuildings, it should be an easy transition to include additional information about the landscape. Ms. Scofield responded that consideration of landscape, setting, outbuildings, and additional themes of significance are routinely considered as part of a nomination update.

Ms. Acly asked about the protocol for when changes are required to the listing criteria and how SHPO manages that. Ms. Scofield responded that the updates often involve the addition of information, such as an area of significance or additional justification for arguments that were made in the past. It is not often a complete rewrite of text originally included in the document. In this case, there is a reasonably thorough architectural description of the property in the nomination, but it wasn't common at the time to recognize the landscapes or outbuildings as much as is the practice now.

Dr. Glaser asked if the property could also be listed under Criterion A if that was pursued during the update. Ms. Scofield responded that it could. A nomination represents the documentation of a resource at a particular moment in time. There is nothing preventing it from being revised or added on to. It was common, with earlier nominations, to only list them for their architectural significance because that was the most expedient way to get them on the Register.

Chairman Elmore asked if the Council would see the updated nomination. Ms. Scofield clarified that the HPC reviews nominations to the State Register, while National Register nominations are reviewed by the State Review Board.

3. Survey and Planning Grant, Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc., National Register nomination for the former Waterbury Manufacturing Chase Brass Mill, 526 and 720 North Main St and 40 East Farm St, Waterbury

On a motion by Mr. Butkus, second by Ms. S. Nelson, 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-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc.
Amount: \$10,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc. requested funding in the amount of \$10,000 to obtain the consulting services of a 36-CFR qualified architectural historian to prepare a National Register of Historic Places nomination form for the former Waterbury Manufacturing Chase Brass Mill. Ms. Scofield was consulted on this effort regarding the property's eligibility for National Register listing and the appropriateness of the budget. The property does appear to meet the National Register Criteria and the budget appears to be sufficient. The Applicant will match the grant amount with \$10,000 of their funds.

Mr. Butkus asked if this nomination was for the entire mill complex. Ms. Scofield responded that this is one of three distinct Chase Brass sites. There is an office complex that is already listed as part of a separate historic district. There are also two rolling mill sites. One rolling mill site was partially destroyed in the flood of 1955. The property being nominated, as part of this effort, is the other rolling mill site and is a complex of multiple buildings. Mr. Butkus confirmed that the listing would provide potential economic incentives for all the buildings on the site. Ms. Dunne confirmed that to be the case.

4. **Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, Town of Westport, town-wide Preservation Plan, Westport**

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. Burgess, 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-10, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

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

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Westport requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to obtain the consulting services of a 36-CFR qualified historic preservation professional to prepare a town wide preservation plan. Staff recommended this application for funding. Westport is a certified local government community, and the preservation plan is an essential tool that they should have in place. SHPO did fund a plan a little over a decade ago, but it focused more on the town center. This plan would focus on identifying historic resources throughout the municipality and preservation issues that might need attention. These plans can also lead to local legislation and can be incorporated into the municipal plan of conservation and development. Donna Douglas was on the call to answer any questions.

Mr. Butkus asked about potential districts that would be identified in the plan and if local districts are recommended are they automatically listed on the State Register so that there are “carrots” or economic incentives available in addition to the “stick” of local regulation? Ms. Dunne responded that local districts were listed on the State Register up to 2019, when SHPO decided to make it a two-step process, but the submission of a simultaneous State Register nomination is encouraged. Mr. Butkus reiterated that this is important to combat some of the common concerns expressed about local regulation of historic properties. Ms. Dunne commented that in Connecticut, the local designation process does require a 2/3 vote in favor of designation and public meetings. Since the proposed project is a town wide plan, Ms. Dunne will make sure that the RFP involves a public discussion component.

Ms. S. Nelson asked if the Certified Local Government grants were non-matching. Ms. Dunne confirmed that they are non-matching.

Ms. C. Nelson asked if the RFP could include language about connecting the local town plan to the larger statewide historic preservation plan. Ms. Dunne

confirmed that this will be considered. Ms. C. Nelson also made the point that local and State or National Register districts in the same area do not have to have identical boundaries.

Ms. Scofield stated that separating the processes was also a way to prevent applications for local designations being submitted simply to get something on the State Register by a different method, and sometimes against staff recommendation.

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

1. Nomination to State Register of Historic Places, 525 Main Street, Hartford

On a motion by Dr. Glaser, second, by Ms. Burgess, the Historic Preservation Council voted to add Criterion 1 to the State Register of Historic Places nomination form.

(Y-8, N-1, Abstaining-2, Absent-0, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, second by Mr. Butkus, the Historic Preservation Council voted to list the Donahue Building, located at 525 Main Street, Hartford, to the State Register of Historic Places.

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

Ms. Wisniewski presented this application. Staff recommended listing of the Donahue Building under Criterion 2, at the local level, as the last remaining commercial building associated with the prominent 20th century Donahue family, which, at the time was the second largest commercial land holder in Hartford. The building is notable as the only known design in Hartford by New Haven architect Roy W. Foote that is not associated with the Southern New England Telephone Company. Alterations were made following conversion into offices by the City of Hartford in 1977, which included window and storefront replacements. However, these alterations do not detract from the integrity of the remaining materials, design, feeling, setting, and association of an early 20th century commercial building. Renee Tribert, the author of the nomination, was on the call.

Dr. Glaser indicated that the property is being nominated under Criterion 2 for architecture, but there are several large paragraphs history of the family, so could the property also be listed under Criterion 1? Ms. Wisniewski responded that there were discussions about listing the property under both Criteria. However,

the property owner was concerned about timing as they are preparing for a rehabilitation, and since only one Criterion is required for listing, the decision was made to move forward with just Criterion 2. If Council recommends the addition of Criterion 1 to the nomination, that can certainly be taken into consideration.

Ms. Acly noted that the building materials are listed as masonry and steel. This is the time period when there is a transition in construction methods, and it may be interesting to look into. Ms. Wisniewski agreed.

Mr. Butkus stated that the building was constructed by the H. Wales Lines Company out of Meriden, CT, a prominent firm. This association would be worth exploring in a bit more detail. Mr. Butkus will send information to Ms. Wisniewski.

Ms. Carnell commented that the nomination is excellent and sets the standard for quality and thoroughness. She understands that timing is a concern, and that research is often not as thorough as we would like, but the authors here did a great job.

Dr. Glaser made a motion to add Criterion 1 to the nomination. Ms. Burgess seconded the motion. Dr. Glaser commented that she would like to see the history separated out into its own section so that it is more prominent within the document.

Ms. Carnell asked if Dr. Glaser was looking for additional research to be done? Dr. Glaser responded that she was not. Ms. Wisniewski agreed that additional research was not required. This will be more of a reorganization of the information.

There was discussion amongst Council as to the procedural steps for revising the original motion and how Dr. Glaser's motion would impact the property owner's timeline.

2. Nomination to State Register of Historic Places, 87 Church Street, East Hartford

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. Carnell, the Historic Preservation Council voted to list the Taylor Atkins Co. Factory, located at 87 Church Street, East Hartford, to the State Register of Historic Places.

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

Ms. Wisniewski presented this application. Staff recommended listing of the Taylor Atkins Co. Factory under Criterion 1, at the local level, in the area of industry, as an example of a 19th century and early 20th century manufacturing

facility, specifically as a manufacturer of paper products. There have been many alterations to the property, although these were completed to meet the needs of an evolving facility and the manufacturing process. The alterations do not detract from the property's overall integrity and the contributing resources include those constructed during the period of significance. Jordan Sorenson and Renee Tribert, the authors of the nomination, were on the call. The property owner, Ric Fattibene, was also on the call.

Dr. Glaser stated that the nomination was very thorough and a pleasure to read. She noted that there was a mention of worker housing in the document and asked if there was any additional information about the employees themselves. Dr. Glaser also asked if they had turned up any information about the environmental impacts of the paper production. Ms. Tribert responded that they tried to find as much information as they could to the workers, but there was not much available. There are a few employees identified in the historical narrative. There are also a few remaining workers houses located across the river from the property. Ms. Tribert stated that there was also information about the environmental impact, but was primarily associated with the last occupant of the property, the Burnside Company, which was producing asbestos papers. This postdates the period of significance.

D. Glaser stated that it may be useful to look at broader contextual documents on the environmental impacts of the paper industry. Dr. Woodward commented that there may be information in a book entitled "Water for Hartford", but there is a lot of documentation on pollution and the paper industry along the Connecticut River.

Ms. Wisniewski stated that since this would all fall under Criterion 1, it would be easy to add some additional language to the document. Even if the environmental impacts occurred outside of the resource's period of significance, information could be added for historical context.

Chairman Elmore asked why the site is not listed as a contributing feature. Ms. Tribert explained that the history of the site is documented, and the site features are enumerated in the nomination, including the dam, head race, tail race, and reservoir (outside of property boundary). Ms. Wisniewski added that when these properties are described in the nomination, the focus is on the cultural, the features altered by the human hand that has modified them. If Council would like to see additional information about how the property was chosen because it was attractive for this type of industry, that could be added.

Chairman Elmore asked again why the site cannot be listed as a contributing feature on the nomination form. Ms. Wisniewski responded that the property is being listed as a historic district, which is made up of a collection of different types of resources. Chairman Elmore stated that the buildings are identified as contributing resources on the form. Ms. Scofield recommended that the group

may want to have a larger discussion before deciding that every industrial complex should have a counted site. Chairman Elmore asked why the number of contributing sites listed on the beginning of the form could not just be changed to 1 to account for the landscape. Ms. Scofield responded that this process follows National Park Service guidance for the National Register and there are sites that are specifically counted because they have archaeological potential. There are also landscapes that are called out and described. However, when you nominate something, you pay very close attention to the boundary of the property, and it is commonly accepted that the landscape and setting within the boundary are part of that property. The site doesn't need to be called out separately to recognize the landscape.

Chairman Elmore asked about the size of the property. Ms. Wisniewski responded that it is 6 acres. Chairman Elmore asked that the size be added to the Acreage of Property field on page 4.

Mr. Butkus stated that the dam and associated waterpower are why the complex is located where it is, but the dam is not included in the district. Does the dam have separate recognition somewhere or should it be incorporated? Ms. Wisniewski stated that ideally it would be part of the district. It is under separate ownership and can be described in the nomination but cannot be included if the owner is not receptive.

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

IX. Threatened Properties - CEPA Updates – Todd Levine

UCONN – 4 Gilbert Road

Mr. Levine reported that there is no update at this time. SHPO has sent a letter to UCONN requesting additional information about the proposal, but there has been no response to date.

Glastonbury 2283-2289 and 2289R Main Street

Mr. Levine reported that the developer has agreed to withdraw the demolition permit application and resubmit it to restart the clock and allow for another three months for the parties involved to work towards a solution. The demo delay now expires on April 19th. The municipality has informed Mr. Levine they are working on a deal with the developer that will result in the retention of the buildings in situ. If no agreement is in place by the end of March, Mr. Levine will begin to move forward with bringing the matter before HPC in April.

X. Preservation Restrictions

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney began by thanking Ms. Fink for all her work on the latest round of Historic Restoration Fund grants. With guidance from Council and assistance from SHPO staff, Erin reworked almost the entire grant program in a few short months. She put in a ton of work to design and build the new digital submission and review program, worked with her applicants as they learned the system, developed new guidance language and procedures for the SHPO website, and designed training material on the new system for both applicants and reviewers. This is in addition to all the work that went into preparing for the meeting itself.

2022 is looking like it will be an exciting year for SHPO, full of both challenges and opportunities. The shifting sands of the pandemic continue to create uncertainty in many aspects of the office's work. The latest guidance from the State means that SHPO staff will continue to primarily work remotely, with trips to the office as needed and Mr. Kinney anticipates that meetings of the HPC will remain virtual until further notice.

But, as Mr. Kinney said, with these challenges also come opportunities. SHPO staff is very excited that its new GIS system is scheduled to be rolled out later this year, which will be a game changer for both SHPO staff and the larger preservation community in CT. As Mr. Kinney reported last month, SHPO is also in the process of creating three new positions in response to the anticipated workload increase associated with federal infrastructure legislation. SHPO will also begin the process of laying the groundwork for Connecticut's next statewide historic preservation plan, which will cover the period from 2024-2029.

In addition, SHPO will be focusing on a renewed effort to make sure that all HPC appointments are up to date and rolling out a series of training presentations to HPC, similar to the presentation Jenny Scofield did for HPC at last month's meeting. Mr. Kinney envisions topics that include Connecticut Environmental Protection Act and the various programs that SHPO administers, but he would also like to hear from Council members about topics they are interested in, and feel would improve their ability to fulfill their duties.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

Ms. Shapiro reported that new staff member Jodi Polsgrove started her position and has jumped into work as part of the museum team. She is assisting all four museums to develop their school and home-school programs.

At the last staff retreat in January, staff reviewed the pilot exhibit script draft 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. Everyone is excited to finally be open!

That said, museum staff are still waiting on the substantial completion date at Prudence Crandall. It had been scheduled to be decided at a walk-through on site on January 28, but unfortunately that was cancelled as the heating system (brand new) is not functioning properly.

Ms. Shapiro was also pleased to share that Morgan Bengel, curator at Old New-Gate, and her husband Devin, welcomed their son, Eli, who was born on January 26th. Everyone is so happy for her, and mom and baby are doing well. While Morgan is on maternity leave (through the middle of April) Andrew Rowand will be checking on the site.

The museums have been approved to hire up to eight seasonal employees. The position listing should be live in the next week or so. The plan is to reopen on the weekend of May 1. This year, the Prudence Crandall Museum will have year-round hours.

XIII. Old Business

XIV. New Business

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies

Ms. Jane Montanaro – Preservation CT

Ms. Montanaro reported that Preservation Connecticut is accepting nominations for this year's preservation awards. The awards ceremony will be held (hopefully in person) on Wednesday May 4th at the New Haven Country Club. There is a portal on the organization's website where nominations can be submitted.

XVI. Public Forum

Chairman Elmore stated that before the meeting is adjourned, he was interested in hearing feedback from Council on how everything is going, not just how he is running the meetings, but anything else that Council is running into on a monthly basis.

Ms. S. Nelson responded and said that Chairman Elmore was doing an awesome job. Ms. Nelson suggested several tweaks in the way staff shares information with Council, specifically with regard to items being added to the Dropbox a day or two before the meeting. Ms. Nelson reviews most of the application materials the weekend before the meeting and she does not routinely go back into the system to check whether anything else has been added. Ms. Nelson stated that there used to be a cutoff date, approximately a week before the meeting, when nothing new would be added. That is one suggestion. Ms. Nelson's second observation was regarding a motion that had been changed, but it was not clear what specific language within the motion had been changed. When a situation like this arises, would it be possible to highlight the changes to make it easier for Council to recognize?

Dr. Faber agreed with Ms. S. Nelson. She does all of her review the weekend prior to the meeting and did not see any new material.

Ms. Acly stated that a mechanism for communication, perhaps beyond email, that would allow for messaging between staff and Council, could be very helpful if new material needs to be made available for review. Chairman Elmore stated that one thing they need to be aware of is not having a quorum of Council members discussing applications outside of the meetings.

Ms. Carnell stated that Chairman Elmore is doing a fantastic job and thanked him for his leadership, particularly while meetings are being held virtually. Ms. Carnell stated that she looks forward to the time when meetings can be held in person again. She also stated that she understands that there are sometimes last-minute additions to the applications, but she does not go back in and check Dropbox, so if Council could be notified about new additions, it would be very helpful.

Ms. C. Nelson stated that she does not know how or why, but she does receive updates when Dropbox is updated.

Mr. Kinney thanked Council for their input and stated that he could certainly chat with staff about ways to make the use of Dropbox more effective and to increase communications between staff and Council when new material is added.

Ms. Carnell asked, specifically with regard to the Historic Restoration Fund grant applications, if SHPO staff are vetting the applications and the materials that are being brought before Council. Chairman Elmore added that SHPO does not have an architect on staff, and that is why he has relied so heavily on Ms. Acly, Ms. S. Nelson, and Mr. Butkus because of their expertise. It has benefitted applicants when Council has delayed projects for additional information and a lot of those delays are based on pieces of information the experts on Council are looking for. Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Shapiro and Mr. Kinney if there was any way Council could help with that staffing issue.

Ms. Shapiro responded that anyone who watches State government will know about the leaning of State positions. Even for two of the three positions that SHPO is currently trying to create, there is no guarantee they will be funded, as there is currently no funding for them in DECD's budget. That will solely be based on the Governor's ability to provide additional funds for them. It is correct that SHPO does not have an architect on staff, but staff does incredibly intense reviews of the applications that are submitted. For every application Council is seeing, there are 5-6 hours of just conversation with the Applicant, not including the review of documents. The only reason we can hire for the first position right away is that SHPO had a small amount of money set aside. Overall, funding for staff is very tough right now.

XVII. Adjournment

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the meeting was adjourned at 12:21 p.m.

***Next regularly scheduled Council meeting:
Wednesday March 2, 2022 – Meeting format to be determined***