

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING:
HISTORIC RESTORATION FUND
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, May 18, 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, and Dr. Sarah Sportman

Absent: Dr. Walter Woodward

Staff: Ms. Julie Carmelich, Ms. Mary Dunne, Ms. Erin Fink, Mr. Jonathan Kinney, Mr. Todd Levine, and Ms. Marena Wiesnewski

Guest: Ms. Sharon Esdaile
Ms. Lois Fiftal
Ms. Dawn Leger
Mr. Joseph Magani
Mr. Jeffrey Mainville
Ms. Jane Montanaro
Mr. David Oakes
Mr. Randy Pulling
Ms. Elizabeth Reza
Mr. Chris Russell
Mr. David Sageman
Mr. John Stevenson
Ms. Stacey Vairo

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:34 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 for any members of Council or staff.

Ms. Acly recused herself from agenda item V.B.6.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes and Transcripts

a. Minutes – April 6, 2022 Meeting

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Mr. Butkus, the Historic Preservation Council voted to approve the April 6, 2022, meeting minutes with minor corrections.

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

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

1. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, City of Bristol, exterior wood trim repairs and painting, 51 High St., Bristol, CT

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. Carnell, 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.

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

Applicant: City of Bristol
Amount: \$75,000

Ms. Fink presented this application. The City of Bristol requested funding in the amount of \$75,000 to complete the restoration of their Parks and Recreation building at 51 High Street. The scope of work includes the complete repair/restoration of exterior window trim work and any other areas of wood rot deterioration, complete lead-based paint remediation of the exterior per EPA RRP protocols and procedures, complete full exterior painting of all wood surfaces (color to match existing), and minor repairs of select wooden windows.

Since 2003, the city has spent about \$1.5 million to restore the building, including a new shingled roof, window replacement and restoration, a new EPDM flat roof, restoration of the vestibules, a boiler replacement, replacement attic insulation and the addition of a sub pump in the basement.

These trim repairs will be the final project until the warranty on the shingle roof expires in 2029. There are three areas of restoration needed. The repairs on the back corner of the building, rot repair and replacement around the windows and restoration of the wood porch features. In addition to the restoration, the trim and

porch need to be painted. Lead paint has been identified and the city is prepared to hire a certified contractor to follow EPA protocols. The city has just successfully completed another HRF grant for the abatement and restoration of plaster in the library.

Ms. Fink indicated that several Council members submitted questions ahead of the meeting, through the online review system Survey Monkey Apply. These questions and the responses from the Applicant were then added to a presentation slide and shown to those in attendance at the meeting (**see appended presentation for a complete list of the questions that were submitted ahead of time for each agenda item**).

Chairman Elmore mentioned that the motion states that there will be a complete lead-based paint remediation of the exterior. However, based on the information Ms. Fink presented, it appeared that the intent was to do limited spot scraping and abatement. Ms. Fink replied that the motion may need to be revised to address this.

Mr. David Oakes commented that they would be doing abatement work in advance wherever the existing lead-based paint will be disturbed, or the paint is loose, flaking, or chipping. The intent was not to go from top to bottom on every painted surface.

Chairman Elmore asked if the sanding will be done with equipment to capture all the dust, so it doesn't become airborne?

Mr. Oakes responded yes, it will be done in conformance with the EPA, RRP protocols and they have experience on several projects like this. There are means and methods to capture the dust and sometimes on a windy day you must even shut the project down because you don't want airborne dissemination of the products. In doing these types of projects in the past, you must have coordination with the local health department, which they do. They will be in close consultation and, also, to be clear, the property is used by Parks and Recreation so there are young children and other members of the community that use the building, so they know they must take the utmost care in doing the project and why they employ the EPA methods and their standards and requirements.

Chairman Elmore thanked Mr. Oakes for the explanation.

Chairman Elmore also asked about there only being one quote submitted with the application. Mr. Oakes responded and briefly explained the CCROG/EZIQC process, which they have used successfully on other projects. It's a convenient way for municipalities to obtain contractor services when they must do work and sometimes a quick manner. They can get a bid in this format, and it meets the purchasing department guidelines and avoids having to go through and wrangle five different contractors that provide bids that may vary based on how they interpret the work. Mr. Oakes met with the firm that provided the quote and it was very clear what the City was trying to accomplish and the contractor understood.

Ms. Fink clarified for the Council that bids are not required to be submitted for Historic Restoration Fund grants. SHPO asks for very informal quotes, and one is technically fine. The applicants just need to submit some form of budget justification.

Mr. Butkus agreed with Chairman Elmore that the motion should be revised to read something more like limited lead-based paint remediation because it currently does imply that the entire building is going to be abated, which is very different than the proposed scope of work. Also, in terms of the materials, there are some molding pieces that have been saved that are falling off that will be replaced. Typically, those elements are a different dimension of lumber than a typical modern one-by material, so the concern is that whatever is being replaced should be replaced in-kind.

Chairman Elmore wanted to add the boiler to the motion as well. Ms. Fink added, the boilers have already been replaced. It was just mentioned as part of the preservation plan.

Ms. S. Nelson had two questions. One was related to the comments that Mr. Butkus was making about materials, because in the submitted questions, there are a couple of different attempts to try and understand what the materials are that will be used. The EZIQC process sounds like it is a process instead of a materials articulation and in another case, it talks about cedar, but cedar comes in a variety of different grades. And as Mr. Butkus alluded to, it comes in a variety of different dimensions. She strongly encouraged the applicant to work with their design team to develop very specific specifications for the materials.

The other question was does the EZIQC process allow for identification of prior experience? It sounds like it's something that is designed to get the lowest bidder, but how do you deal with bidder qualifications when you're dealing with a historic structure?

Ms. Fink replied that in their past application for the library, the Applicant was able to include several lines about qualifications and working on historic structures. She provided them with language about the contractor knowing or having experienced with the Secretary of the Interior standards. They needed to list historic buildings that they had worked on previously, those two lines can be added when they go out to bid formally.

Ms. S. Nelson added, it would be important and give the owner the ability to call references as part of their bid evaluation and to be the sole determiner of who is qualified. Chairman Elmore added the low bid does not make you qualified. Ms. S. Nelson added that the bidder's opinion of their qualifications also does not make them qualified either.

Chairman Elmore added he saw two coats of topcoat of paint. Are you planning on using a primer and will that be water based or oil based? Ms. Fink replied they are planning to use a primer and she would have to get specifics from Roger. Ms. Fink will make a note of that.

On a motion by Mr. Butkus, second by Ms. Carnell, the Historic Preservation Council voted to revise the original motion to replace the word complete with limited in the motion with regard to the language dealing with lead-based paint remediation.

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

The Council then voted to approve the revised motion.

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

Mr. Oakes thanked Ms. Fink and Ms. Dunne for their help. He also wanted to thank the Council on past help with the library plaster work. It came out beautifully and there's been a lot of good comments from it.

2. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, Dixwell Avenue Congregational Church, roof replacement, 217 Dixwell Ave., New Haven, CT

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second Ms. C. Nelson, 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.

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

Applicant: Dixwell Avenue Congregational Church
Amount: \$200,000

Ms. Fink presented this application. Dixwell Avenue Congregational Church requested funding in the amount of \$200,000 for scaffolding, replacement of the roof, replacement of masonry piers, parapet and pier caps, replacement of aluminum skylight, replacement of wood clerestory windows, and exterior painting of wood roof fascia after new metal roof drip edge is installed. SHPO recommends approval of the application. The project will cost approximately \$600,000, but SHPO can contribute up to \$200,000. Emergency repairs were made to get the building through the past winter season, but this work must be done as soon as possible to prevent further damage. The property is listed individually on the National Register. The church is adjacent to the Winchester Repeating Arms National Register Historic District, but not within it. SHPO recommends this project for funding and will work closely with architect Joseph Magani, who was on the call as well.

Ms. Fink read through the questions that Council members submitted online ahead of the meeting and the Applicant's responses. These questions and the responses were shown to those in attendance at the meeting on a presentation slide (**see appended presentation for a complete list of the questions that were submitted ahead of time for each agenda item**).

Ms. Acly asked for the architect to speak about the sealant. Mr. Joseph Migani, architect of record, stated that his firm does a lot of restoration work, and for years they've been called in to do repair work on existing masonry. They currently have a project at a historic church in Ansonia. It's a Greek Orthodox Church with similar exterior stone installation. They are also working on one at Eastern Connecticut State University with similar exterior masonry stairs, and what they found is that mortar absorbs water after it cures. In this climate they have freeze thaw cycles, which over a decade or more, will cause slight expansion and contraction, which ultimately leads to the mortars failing, leading to more, progressive water penetration, which then loosens the stone or brick. At Three Saints Church in Ansonia, they had used this industrial sealant and this the first time Mr. Migani has seen a sealant hold up and do its job. Ten years in and it is still in perfect condition. Based on that performance that we've witnessed in place, this is the product that we specified for the application at The Dixwell Church.

Ms. Acly asked if there is a flashing underneath the coping stones?

Mr. Migani replied, yes. When looking at a building like this and the advanced amount of failure because of water penetration, it becomes a forensic assignment where you must ponder and reach out and talk to a lot of industry representatives who address these types of issues all over the country. The issue is where do you stop the water? The existing copings have failed, and water has penetrated the walls, which has caused spot deterioration, dislocation, discoloration, and breaking of the masonry joints in the support peers. By removing the caps and putting a new flashing under the cap and then sealing it, it will stop the source of the water so that it will not go down into the wall. Following the path of the water, the Applicant adopted a strategy to intercept it in the best place, which is basically at the top of the wall, and then doing spot masonry repairs, tuck pointing where necessary.

Ms. Acly commented, having worked on many challenging situations where there are sky facing surfaces and sky facing joints, that stopping water from getting in is an important piece and it sounds like the Applicant has isolated the capstones as a place where that's happening, and they are taking strategies to prevent that. Ms. Acly wanted to caution that different vintages of masonry behave differently depending on whether it's a has a veneer and a cavity or not. Whatever the concrete or masonry, if water does get in, it is important that the area be allowed to breathe through the joints. There are also some other strategies that you can use, with lead caps just on the Sky facing joints and things like that.

Mr. Migani added, everything under the cap, the horizontal line of the wall cap would be a mortar joint, so the parapet should still breathe. The big concern with this project is that there's still supporting beams, but basically a wooden frame structure for the roof. The issue is it was designed to pond, by which he meant, it was originally designed in the 70s so that water would create a lake effect on the roof, and that was normal practice at that time.

Technology and practice have moved away from that overtime for obvious reasons. One issue was what level of insulation is dictated by the regulatory officials consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Applicant went to the building department with the drawings, and they indicated that they would not require compliance with current code in recognition of the historic significance of the building. They needed us to at least put back what was there. That has the effect of allowing them to minimize the height of the drip edge at the roof edge, which is critical because if you taper the roof to meet the existing code, that would make the building look disfigured. The local building department was accommodating, and the important thing was that the Applicant wanted to make sure that what they proposed in the grant was doable and would be allowed. The second concern was the leaking over time, despite the efforts of the congregation to do spot patching.

A key part of the project will be to have a structural engineer on board when things are opened to visually and physically inspect the condition of the wood framing. There will be a rigorous inspection of the existing structure so that any existing issues can be addressed.

Mr. Migani stated that it's an interesting building. When he started working on it, he didn't like it. By the time he finished working on it, he loved it. It's just fascinating and has a lot of character. The congregation is a very significant cultural entity in the country and is a very impressive group of people.

Mr. Butkus asked about the pinning of the capstones through the flashing and whether the Applicant intended to use thimbles over the pins. Mr. Butkus has seen instances in the past where those penetrations through the flashing allowed for water to get into the masonry wall structure. Mr. Migani replied that there is a continuous membrane underneath the wall cap and that it will have a weather tight seal to the wall assembly beneath. Mr. Butkus added that the pins are going to go through the membrane, so wherever you're penetrating the membrane it's an entry point for water cause we've seen it where? The consultant that Mr. Butkus worked with was always recommending that the flashing have a thimble that's welded to the flashing over the pin so there's no way for water to get in. Mr. Migani agreed with Mr. Butkus and he will confirm that with the drawings and make sure that is included in their specification and scope of work. He thanked Mr. Butkus for pointing this out.

3. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, Town of Woodbury, repairs to roof, porches, windows, doors and exterior wood trim, painting, 7 Mountain Road, Woodbury, CT

On a motion by Ms. C. Nelson, second by Ms. Carnell, 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.

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

Applicant: Town of Woodbury
Amount: \$90,965

Ms. Fink presented this application. The Town of Woodbury requested funding in the amount of \$90,965 for a replacement of the building's roof in-kind with architectural shingles, reconstruction of the east porch (Mountain Road side) including steps, floor, balustrade, columns and related architectural elements, reconstruction of the west porch (Main Street side) including decking, railings, roof and all architectural elements (note the porches are listed as east and west, but it wraps around the south side of the building as well), painting of all exterior elements, reglazing and repairing windows where needed, minor carpentry repairs such as caulking, repair of architectural details, etc., full replacement of gutters and downspouts, and repointing of foundation with an appropriate mortar. Staff recommended the application for funding.

Ms. Fink read through the questions that Council members submitted online ahead of the meeting and the Applicant's responses. These questions and the responses were shown to those in attendance at the meeting on a presentation slide (**see appended presentation for a complete list of the questions that were submitted ahead of time for each agenda item**).

Ms. S. Nelson wanted to reiterate the previous comments about the railings and code requirements. She encouraged the Applicant to ensure that the building official be brought in on the project. Sometimes the architect specifications do not address code requirements. Since this is a public building, this will be very important to do. Early communication is critical because there are a lot of details that can't be replicated under the current code. Ms. Fink agreed to bring the building officials in.

Mr. Butkus added, following on with Ms. S. Nelson's comments, this railing and porch is quite elaborate. The concern is that someone will look at it and say that things need to be changed to bring it up to code. There are no drawings to go along with what the scope is. Are we putting helical piles, for example, underneath the posts going down, so we can get to adequate structural support? Obviously, this thing has fallen over over time and there's really no definition as to what those footings are going to be for those posts and even the posts that are being replicated. Home Depot does sell some turned posts that are in the flavor but are not exactly like what's there. It just makes you feel very uncomfortable not knowing if it's going to match what is being replaced. As Ms. S. Nelson mentioned, if we must put in a 42-inch-high railing, that's a huge alteration from what was there. It's understandable if there's no set of documents that they're bidding against that it's hard for them to quote the defined scope of work. He can imagine somebody getting in there and saying "hey, this entire porch is a goner. We're going to tear it off, and we're going to put a new one on with pressure

treated 2 by 2s at 42 inches height with the two by four on the top. It meets code, so you're all set.”

Ms. Fink asked Ms. Vairo if she would you be able to talk to this, since she worked with the carpenters and may be able to add some clarity.

Ms. Vairo added that she is a resident of Woodbury and lives 5 minutes from the site, so getting this right is very important to her. She understands the need to have more specific specifications for this project. The sense she got from the contractors who she reviewed the project with, were that they understood that they were all doing this within the bounds of the local historic district and that they would have to replicate the features that are there now to the best of their ability. She doesn't think that close enough will cut it in any way, shape, or form when it comes to replicating the front columns. They will have a complete match of that feature. That goes for all the other character defining features on the porches. The railing is a little bit trickier and as Ms. S. Nelson suggested, we will work with the building official to make sure that we try to get the exceptions if possible. If not, will replicate something that will work to make the proportions match as closely as possible.

Ms. Acly added that if the building inspector is not open to allowing the existing rail height to remain, one thing that helps keep the historic integrity is to keep the rail as it is and add a supplemental rail behind it that fades into the background. Just something to keep in mind.

Ms. Lois Fiftal, Woodbury Historic District Commission thanked the Commission. The building means a lot them.

4. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, The Salvation Army, new elevator, 74 Central Avenue, Waterbury, CT

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Mr. Butkus, 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.

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

Applicant: The Salvation Army
Amount: \$171,289.50

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, second by Dr. Faber, the original motion was brought to the table for discussion. The amount of funding requested in the original motion, \$132,250.50, was based on a quote from March 2021. Since that time, the price has increased, and the Applicant is now requesting \$171,289.50.

On a motion from Ms. Burgess, second by Mr. Butkus, the motion was revised to reflect the new funding request of \$171,289.50.

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

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Mr. Butkus, the revised motion was brought to the table for discussion.

Ms. Fink presented this application. The Salvation Army requested funding in the amount of \$171,289.50 for a complete modernization of the elevator in the building at 74 Central Avenue in Waterbury. This includes hydraulic cylinder replacement, door operator upgrade, hydraulic power unit installation, elevator soft starter, ADA fixture upgrade, vandal resistant fixture upgrade, and cab interior upgrades. Staff recommended the application for funding.

Chairman Elmore stated that he just wants to make Council members aware that he did some quick math. The original budget projections were put together in March of 2021, the revised ones within the last week. That represents a 30% increase in 14 months, so just keep in mind as everybody's working on their own projects and going after big grants, how significantly and how rapidly prices are changing.

Ms. Fink continued, the project is extremely urgent because the state requires that elevators with single bottom cylinders, built prior to 1975, be addressed to be compliant with the new state elevator code. The building serves the community as a family homeless shelter where there are family services in the form of job placement, child education, health visits, and whatever else is needed to address the crisis that the family is going through. The elevator is needed to get the families to these spaces. There's also a food pantry, staff offices and chapel that need access. There is no one place or program that can provide the services the Salvation Army does in Waterbury. The existing opening and dimensions do not need to be altered, but staff archaeologist Ms. Cathy Labadia will be consulted to determine if there will be any ground disturbance when a second piston is added.

Ms. Fink read through the questions that Council members submitted online ahead of the meeting and the Applicant's responses. These questions and the responses were shown to those in attendance at the meeting on a presentation slide (**see appended presentation for a complete list of the questions that were submitted ahead of time for each agenda item**).

Ms. Acly commented about the rails. There are interior handrails in the cab, but there are also structural rails that go on the outside of the cab to help guide it up and down and they are typically connected to the structural shaft walls. If there is some work needed to upgrade the rails, a structural engineer be consulted. The elevator manufacturer would probably require that as well to ensure that they are fastened in a structurally safe way. The elevator shop drawings have specific loads that those rails need to be designed to take.

Ms. Burgess asked how many floors the elevator covers. Ms. Fink replied 3. Ms. Burgess' understanding is that the length of the cylinder above ground is how far below ground it will need to go. So, approximately 25 feet below ground. She is glad Ms. Labadia is involved in this project, not knowing what you're going to find underneath ground.

Ms. S. Nelson added she did not have direct experience, but there are a lot of different specs for elevators, and it is not a given that the vertical rise is repeated below ground. Ms. Burgess added she only has the experience at the Stowe Center and that is what they found.

Mr. Butkus added that would be like a telescoping cylinder versus one single shaft that's going up and down.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Fink why Ms. Labadia was involved. Ms. Fink replied she is the staff archeologist, so if any works is proposed below ground, Ms. Labadia will review it to confirm the ground disturbance will not negatively impact any archaeological resources.

5. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, Rocky Hill Congregational Church, steeple and belfry repairs and recreation, 805 Old Main Street, Rocky Hill, CT

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, second by Ms. C. Nelson, 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.

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

Applicant: Rocky Hill Congregational Church
Amount: \$62,500

Ms. Fink presented this application. The Rocky Hill Congregational Church requested funding in the amount of \$62,500 for steeple, belfry, parapet, and top parapet restoration and recreation including painting, carpentry repairs, additional supports, roof patching, and scaffolding. Staff recommended the application for funding. The church completed a conditions assessment in 2019 through a Survey and Planning grant, and after identifying the need for the parapet restoration requested a subsequent Survey and Planning grant to complete construction drawings and specifications for the project in 2021. Moser, Pilon, and Nelson Architects and Mackie Engineers, LLC completed the construction documents for the project. The budget for this funding request was based upon the architects estimate in January of 2021. The cost of white oak is about the same, but the cost of stainless steel has risen. So, the contingency will likely be used, and the

church has additional funding to cover the difference. Staff will work closely with both the architect and engineer to refine the bid specifications if needed.

Ms. Fink read through the questions that Council members submitted online ahead of the meeting and the Applicant's responses. These questions and the responses were shown to those in attendance at the meeting on a presentation slide (**see appended presentation for a complete list of the questions that were submitted ahead of time for each agenda item**).

Chairman Elmore asked if Ms. Fink could set up SurveyMonkey so Council can zoom in further? He was not able to see the specs so he could read them. The only thing he could read was the end outline specs, which are not bid ready specs, they just identify the sections and minimal information.

Ms. Fink replied that she believed the only way to do it would be to click on the link and download the actual drawings and then zoom in on Adobe or zoom in the web browser. She was not sure if you can zoom on PowerPoint as well. Ms. Carmelich, Ms. Dunne, Mr. Kinney, and herself, reviewed the specifications in SurveyMonkey and did feel that these were complete construction documents. Mr. Dave Sageman is on the call for any questions or concerns.

Mr. Sageman commented that it was his understanding the documents prepared with the recent Survey and Planning grant could be used to go out to bid with.

Ms. Acly stated that some of the detailed questions came from her because she somehow didn't see the detail plan sheets at the end of the set. Ms. Acly apologize for making the Applicant answer all the questions.

Mr. Sageman thanked the Council and especially Ms. Fink and Ms. Dunne for their assistance on preparing this application.

6. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, New Britain Museum of American Art, roof replacement and structural repairs to the Landers House, 56 Lexington St., New Britain, CT

Ms. Acly recused herself 11:04 a.m.

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Ms. S. Nelson, 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.

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

Applicant: New Britain Museum of American Art
Amount: \$113,221

Ms. Fink presented this application. The New Britain Museum of American Art requested funding in the amount of \$113,221 for the replacement and repair of three low sloped roofs. The first project is a projecting bay with a membrane roof. The 2nd is a sunroom porch with a gravel surface built up roof and the third is a portico with a gravel surface built up roof as well. Staff recommended this project for funding. The museum received a Survey and Planning grant for a condition assessment, which was completed by architect Mr. Bob Hurd and structural engineer Ms. Beth Acly. Additional schematic design drawings were provided by both Bob and Beth to illustrate the assembly methods and pitch changes when the three low sloped roofs were identified as the top preservation priority. Both consultants are well versed in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and their proposal and drawings meet those standards.

The museum has competitively bid a previous project on the Landers House and selected Downes Construction. For the sake of continuity and because of the contractor's familiarity with the project, the museum will continue with Downes as their construction manager and will also retain Bob and Beth to complete the final specs and construction drawings.

Ms. Fink read through the questions that Council members submitted online ahead of the meeting and the Applicant's responses. These questions and the responses were shown to those in attendance at the meeting on a presentation slide (**see appended presentation for a complete list of the questions that were submitted ahead of time for each agenda item**).

Chairman Elmore stated that a lot of those questions about the contracts came from him. What is the owner planning? Is the owner going to get one single contract with the construction manager and the construction manager is going to get subcontracts from all the workers? Ms. Fink replied yes. Chairman Elmore asked if they would rebid this when the construction drawings are done, and the specs are done. Ms. Fink replied they have not gone out to bid yet. They wanted to get this application approved and then they'll go into full construction documents.

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

IX. Threatened Properties – Todd Levine

Suffield – 520 North Main Street

Mr. Levine reported that he and Assistant Attorney General John Russo are going to be meeting with the owner of the Suffield tobacco shed next week for one last attempt to convince him to keep the building. If not, then Mr. Russo's going to do his report and send it up the road with the request to do an injunction.

Groton – 17 Gravel Street

Mr. Levine reported that he, Ms. Stacey Vairo, Ms. Marena Wisniewski, Mr. Dave Goslin, and Mr. Jim Grant had a good meeting in Groton last week with the property owner and his architect.

They have a verbal agreement on what we discussed. Until the owner gets something to them in writing though, a CEPA hearing in June is still being planned. By Friday afternoon, he is going to tell him to either withdraw the demo application or give SHPO a signed letter saying he won't demo for 60 days just to give everyone more time. In theory, all were in agreement at the end of the meeting. Mr. Levine will be able to confirm on Friday if they're going to be on the agenda for June or not.

X. Preservation Restrictions

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney reported to the Council that the current plan is to have the transcript from the CEPA meeting on May 4th, the minutes from today's special meeting, and the minutes from the upcoming regular meeting on 6/1 prepared and out to Council for their review prior to the July 6th meeting.

The SHPO's two UCONN graduate interns are putting the finishing touches on the updated historic preservation economic impact study they have been working on this year and Mr. Kinney hopes to be able to share the finished report with Council shortly.

Mr. Kinney reported that the process of hiring a new SHPO staff member is moving forward. 14 candidates were interviewed for the position of National Register Specialist – Archaeologist and he is working with human resources to get a second round of interview set up for the candidates who will advance in the selection process.

Finally, despite a few scheduling setbacks, Mr. Kinney will continue to work to get training set up for Council regarding CEPA and a variety of other topics.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Jonathan Kinney (read on behalf of Elizabeth Shapiro)

Museums

Staffing

Thanks to Ms. Morgan Bengel, Mr. Andrew Rowand, and Ms. Deborah Gaston, they have identified eight museum seasonal employees. Six have accepted the position and four have started work. There have been delays working with HR – they are simply overburdened and understaffed. As of this minute, they will yet again not have a full staff for the museums, it looks like they will have to operate with 6-7 seasonal employees, which is taxing on permanent staff, as you can imagine.

The Eric Sloane Museum opened April 30, Henry Whitfield opened May 3, New-Gate opened May 13, having had to postpone opening due to hiring issues. The Prudence Crandall Museum will open on CT Open House Day on June 11.

This is the first summer that all the museums have been open since 2019!

Prudence Crandall Museum

Final projects are being completed by Kronenberger at the Crandall Museum. Over three days, – April 27, 28 & 29th – the Conex storage containers were emptied, and collections and office materials were returned to Crandall. Museum staff were on hand to assist for parts of each day, and the entire staff was there on Friday April 30th for the final push. A lot was accomplished, and Joanie DiMartino is finishing up that work over the next two weeks.

The workroom project is almost done, except for repairing some plaster that was damaged during an attempt to remove old wallpaper. Thanks to SHPO for helping to advise with that situation.

The spring clean-up on site was finished this week, and the underbrush that had grown substantially over the past two years has been cleared out and the site is looking great. The first on-site school group, the 7th grade class from the Canterbury Middle School, had an on-site visit to the museum yesterday. 55 kids and their teachers were divided into three groups and spent twenty minutes with Ms. Joan DiMartino, Ms. Jodi Polsgrove, and Ms. Liz Shapiro. This was the onsite follow-up to a very successful in-school pre-visit done the week before. This was the first test of the new school program for middle school, and we think it was successful.

The very substantial cataloging project of the archaeology collections is also nearly done. She will make sure to share some of the more interesting findings with you later.

As a reminder, when the museum opens, it will open for timed tours only, and the building will basically open without any collections or exhibits initially. There

will be text and movable interpretive signage coming, but that is designed to augment the visitor experience after the guided tour.

New-Gate

Site administrator Ms. Morgan Bengel has been deep into opening procedures for the site and planning for this summer's events. The pre-bid visit was held at the end of April for the work that will be done to stabilize the four-story cell block, and three contracting companies attended. Two have submitted bids. Morgan has created a series of recorded videos to train seasonal employees and volunteers on things from opening procedures, to using the POS system, to giving mine tours to the overall history of the site. There are "self-tests" that are attached to each video, so she can ensure that everyone on site is trained. This year New-Gate will have – with one exception – an all-new seasonal staff, which will take more management.

Connecticut Prison Arts (CPA) will host their annual meeting and party at New-Gate on June 9 in the evening. Ms. Shapiro is very happy about how the relationship is moving with CPA, an organization with strong alignment to the site's mission.

The FONG (Friends of Old New-Gate) group requested and received \$40,000 from East Granby's ARPA funds to be used to replace the entry walk to the museum's visitor's center and to add some picnic tables to the area near the parking lot. We will be meeting next week to negotiate what that project will look like. We're excited because the current walkway is bluestone – pretty but very slippery – and is not ADA compliant.

Henry Whitfield

The grant application to the NPS for the America 250 grant has been submitted with the assistance of Cathy Labadia (text edits), Jonathan Kinney and Mary Dunne – budget and uploads. Thanks to all for that amazing team effort. The grant, if received, would cover most of the restoration work that needs to be completed on the site identified in a 2017 historic structure report, and confirmed (with additions) by the consultants for the 2020 conservation assessment grant.

Eric Sloane

Mr. Andrew Rowand is busy making relationships with the town of Kent!

The Town's flower sale was held on April 23rd on the grounds of the Sloane Museum, and the following weekend (the last in April) the museum opened its doors for the season free of charge to coincide and support the CT Antique Machinery Associations Spring Power-up event. (CAMA is located on property adjacent to the museum property, sharing the same entrance, so the partnership is a good one for both organizations.) The total visitation for the weekend in the building (not counting visitors to the cabin exhibit) was 650 people on Saturday

and Sunday. CAMA sold between 1,500 and 2,000 tickets, their largest spring festival yet.

The giftshop sales for the two days totaled \$1,000. Mr. Rowand sent Ms. Shapiro a note late last week saying that the museum has already doubled gift shop sales for the month of May from last year.

Fortuitously, the new museum sign was installed just prior to the festival, and it looks terrific. Finally, there is a new sign on the building so that people know that what they are seeing in the parking lot is the museum.

On May 5th and 6th, Mr. Jim Mauck, former president of the Friends of Eric Sloane and members of the group worked on-site tidying the cabin for the season. We are grateful to them for their assistance.

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

The museum will also present the traditional July 4th bell ringing and community event that was started by Eric Sloane himself.

ETC:

Finally, a special thank you to new staff member Ms. Jodi Polsgrove, who is proving a real team player in adjusting her work reporting station to any of the museums that have critical staffing needs. She's also done great work rethinking the school programs for the Crandall Museum, and for the Henry Whitfield Museum in time to share new materials with teachers for the 2023 school year.

XIII. Old Business

XIV. New Business

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies

Jane Montanaro was not in attendance.

XVI. Public Forum

Chairman Elmore stated that he would like to talk about the Survey Monkey program a bit. He mentioned that he would like to click on a link and see all of the photos. Ms. Fink replied she will try to figure out how to do it if it can be done.

Ms. C. Nelson added she could not get in to SurveyMonkey at all. Ms. Fink replied she had set a deadline so all questions could be addressed before the meeting.

Ms. S. Nelson added, as an architect who reviews a lot of drawings, she was hoping that perhaps Survey Monkey could be used in a way that duplicates the way she prefers to work. She tends to review all the photographs, kind of in a big assemblage, as Chairman Elmore was talking about, on the screen in front of her. Oftentimes, they're printed out along with the specifications and so on, so she can very fluidly look back and forth between drawings, photographs, and specifications. When you are opening things individually and clicking on it or clicking back and forth it, it tends to slow down the review process and she loses that focus on the details, so she wonders if there's a way that we can aggregate the photographs. That was one review comment, so there's less time navigating.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. S. Nelson if she wanted to have multiple documents open at the same time? Ms. S. Nelson replied, yes.

Ms. S. Nelson also referenced the way that comments from other Council members are displayed when reviewing something in the Survey Monkey system. She is really interested in others' comments, but the way they get printed out in the final PDF means that you're reading through pages and pages of blank boxes because people won't have comments on every item. Is there a way that Ms. Fink can distill down what each Council member said on a single page as opposed to going through pages and pages and wondering who made a specific comment? Finally, Ms. S. Nelson asked if there is a way to be able to print out an inclusive PDF that contains all the information, as they used to be?

Ms. Acly suggested that he had figured out a work around for that. She likes to do the same, have multiple things open at the same time and there's an option to download the application with attachments and it dumps it all into a folder for each applicant. Once she figured out this process, she was able to create a folder for photos, a folder for plans, etc. Ms. Acly suggested that Ms. Fink could do that download, Council members could do the review using the PDF, and then they can go into Survey Monkey and add their comments. It's a little bit of work and it takes a little extra time, but it's worth it because then when she is reviewing it, she can do it with all my apps that she usually uses. But if we're all going through the same thing, it might be beneficial from a time perspective if that were all done into the Dropbox already. Ms. Acly stated that she did appreciate having a review deadline of a week ahead of the meeting.

Ms. Carnell stated that she was wondering if it might be worth reintroducing an element that used to be part of the HRF program and that is referring to when staff used to require that applicants attend a session in person at the SHPO office, where they were given a very detailed overview of the program and it was very clear what all the requirements were. This was probably from a time when there were fewer applications, and the applications were for higher grant amounts. So

maybe it's not worth it for some of the smaller grants, but, for example, instead of just saying, design development drawings are what we want to see, Ms. Mancuso used to have examples up and say this is what we're looking for. From an applicant standpoint, anyway, it was just clear what was needed.

Ms. C. Nelson added that she has her two computers next to her, so if you have two computers, sometimes that also helps you with having two venues up for different kinds of information.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Fink was kind of feedback she has received from applicants on the SurveyMonkey process. Ms. Fink replied they love it. They can add collaborators, so they invite everybody from their organization. They can save drafts and they know exactly what's required. It is easier than adding multiple Word documents and helps to keep them organized.

Mr. Butkus asked about the extent of information that gets put into the Survey Monkey system, specifically about the history of the organization and whether he should be responding to these as he typically does not respond to those, but instead focuses on the actual project and what they're requiring from a technical standpoint. He was wondering what the desire is, from the SHPO side, for getting feedback on all that other information. He is not a historian, so he is not going to get too far into the weeds about how they're describing everything. He would prefer to use his expertise on the actual work product that's being proposed. Are you finding that feedback if it's coming in from other people helpful?

Ms. Fink replied that it is very helpful to hear what the organization does for the community, because we need to be able to argue that the state funding is far reaching and is touching as many applicants and groups of people in the town as it can be. It is also important to hear what is significant about the resource, what fabric remains, what the property was historically, what the proposed new use is (if there is a change). All that information is helpful when we go to prepare statewide plans or advocate for funding, and it's also helpful because there are a couple of members on the Council who are public historians who really like to read that information to sort of understand the resource.

Dr. Glaser commented, there's very little that she can talk about with some of the technical stuff, but she thinks it's important to understand the significance of the resource so we can justify spending all this money on these buildings. The public doesn't really understand buildings for building's sake, and she thinks that it's important as a broader issue to justify the reason we are preserving in the first place. That is the public historian's role here.

Mr. Butkus added it was more the question of the comment box on all that information. The information is great for everyone to see, but if there's a box there, is there an expectation that we're all going to comment on it or it's just if you want to comment. MR. Butkus doesn't want to not respond if he is being asked to. Ms. Fink replied, you can write in it or not, it is not required.

Dr. Glaser stated that she frequently cannot speak to the technical building aspects of the applications, so she will not respond but can fill out all the other boxes.

Chairman Elmore added that this is what makes the diversity of the group so wonderful. Each person has their different area of expertise.

Ms. Acly added that she wanted to ask a very similar question. Does Ms. Fink want each Council member commenting within the area of the application that ties closely with their own realm of expertise, or would it be easier to just have one box for all comments?

Ms. Fink replied that it is helpful to have everything broken out because of the way she sees it on her screen. She has two screens, so she can see the application and then the comments on the other. She also can screen shot and go over the info with the applicants.

Ms. Acly was just thinking about SHPO as an entity using this information for other things. Has SHPO found a good way to land this information in your server or, integrate it with whatever your databases are.

Ms. Fink replied, she saves all the documents to Dropbox. She also puts them on SHPO's shared drive. For example, for the economic impact study SHPO is currently finishing up, staff had to put together case studies of how far the grant funding has gone, before and after photos, etc. The more detail that's required in these online applications now just gives her more information to work with. It's great.

Dr. Faber commented that the old applications used to have a preservation plan narrative. She would love to see that again, in addition to the table with that sort of conditions assessment, you know preservation plan, that's super helpful. If Council could have something that sort of demonstrates their philosophy towards historic preservation, that would mean a lot to her. Ms. Fink replied, will do.

Ms. C. Nelson commented, in terms of the preservation plan, she also likes hearing about what they've done in the past, so she understands if it's in sequence or it's a series and they're making progress.

Chairman Elmore added he wants to hear what they're doing in the future, case in point, that house with the porches. How are they going to prevent that when the next administration comes in and focuses on other properties or other budgetary requirements.

Ms. Carnell had a question about the requirement of contingencies in the budgets. She was looking at them and they varied from say 0 to 5% to 15%. For the construction of people among us, what do you like to see? Is there a standard that we're asking for? Does it depend on the entity whose prepared the budget?

Ms. S. Nelson replied every building may have different sets of circumstances and different levels of investigation and different exposure to unknowns. And when

she is dealing with a building that's at the high end of unknowns, the contingency is going to be higher than if it's a simple building where you can see everything. The industry also has graduated contingency, based on the level of documentation. So, for a restoration project in schematic design you might have a 20% contingency and that contingency drops down the more you've studied the building and the more your documents have been developed, so that gets factored in too.

Ms. Acly's sense of these contingencies is that they're typically owner contingencies and less that a contractor has built that contingency into their price. She totally agrees with everything Ms. S. Nelson said, but she'll just say that when we're talking about structural work that we can't see, we sort of say in our office the only surprise in these buildings is when there's no surprise.

Mr. Butkus added the more documentation and investigation you do beforehand, the better you can be at the time of bidding and the fewer unknowns you have, the better. It is just foolhardy for owners to go into a project without having the understanding that they're going to have to have extra money lying around. If they don't have that bandwidth to do something, reconsider starting it.

Chairman Elmore changed the subject and asked SHPO staff, based on the discussion at the last meeting about the tobacco shed in Suffield and the facts that it is not a house, it is listed on the National Register, and it fell through the funding cracks, if there is a way to develop a program specifically for outbuildings, maybe not do full structural repairs, but perhaps a new roof. Chairman Elmore stated that he lives in Suffield, and they are losing a lot of barns.

Chairman Elmore spoke to a gentleman on the town's conservation commission, who is a tobacco farmer, and his son just put a metal roof on a tobacco barn, which cost \$20,000 to \$25,000. He's looking at 40 plus or minus years on that roof. He saw more than half a dozen tobacco barns, half of which had metal roofs, and half of which had shingle roofs, that they are going to be converting. They have the ability, but a lot of homeowners don't, and therefore we're finding these wonderful English barns that slowly get a roof leak and then five years later they're on the ground. He is wondering what other Council members feel and he would like to hear from staff if there's a way to get creative here. He knows the pot of money is finite, but we're losing our heritage.

Ms. C. Nelson commented that Preservation Connecticut has had themes of grants and that barns were a big theme for a while. Maybe they could take that initiative, which was not permanent, and investigate making it more permanent since so much work was done on that in terms of inventory and condition assessments, promotion, and getting the public involved. She went to quite a few of the meetings both for the town she worked in and the town she lived in, learned a lot, met a lot of people, and those folks had also put in a lot of effort into finding other

creative methods. We might talk to Stacey Vairo and whoever else is at Preservation Connecticut.

Mr. Levine commented that he ran the Historic Barns of Connecticut program when he was at Preservation Connecticut. The program started, in conjunction with a National Trust for Historic Preservation program and documented 100 barns. They recognize from that little report that Connecticut was losing barns rapidly. That's when they started Historic Barns of Connecticut. They got a grant from the State and documented over 8500 barns. They raised private funds to give barn grants to private citizens, worked with SHPO to allow barns to be a part of the Historic Tax Credit Program, attended a national conference, and had some great momentum. Then Mr. Levine left and joined the SHPO staff, and the project was shelved. Mr. Levine will be speaking with Jane Montanaro next week about the barns. SHPO also recognizes the importance of the tobacco sheds, especially after the connection to Dr. Martin L. King, Jr. We started the project two years ago out, saved five sheds, and lost three of them within two years. The barns lost near Bradley Airport were not historic, but were still a part of our cultural landscape.

Mr. Kinney interjected that he has been speaking with Stacey Vairo about reaching out to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to see if we could potentially dovetail some of SHPO's programs with theirs as far as funding goes. Mr. Kinney will be reaching out to USDA shortly to try to set up at least a preliminary conversation to see if there's anything there.

Chairman Elmore commented that barns are a significant element of the landscape as are other minor outbuildings, such as a wellhead or a pigsty or a corn crib. He'd like to open this idea up to outbuildings as well.

Dr. Glaser wanted to add that some outbuildings may have been included under the barn survey, but Mr. Levine can confirm that. Also at Preservation Connecticut, Mike Forino and Jordan Sorenson both have a knowledge base in outbuildings and barns.

Mr. Levine added that part of the project was listing 200 sites on the State Register. To get around the potential problem of smaller agricultural buildings being missed, they listed the entire site including the house and all the outbuildings so that we wouldn't lose any of them.

Ms. Carnell commented that in her town of Simsbury, while the town has been really happy to get money from the State to preserve some tobacco barns, shortly before that project got underway, the Historic District Commission gave a certificate of appropriateness to demolish a tobacco barn in the local historic district, much to her frustration and the reason for it was they wanted to put a metal roof on the building, which was not appropriate. So, we gave them two options, either a tar paper roof, which is what they had had for decades, or an asphalt shingle roof, and the owner wasn't happy with either option, so he just left the building rot for a bit and then claimed that the building was too deteriorated to

save. This was not, but there was no shepherd to try and save the barn. Prior to that, she had asked Julie Carmelich if there was anything that SHPO could offer? Ms. Carmelich said no, because the historic home tax credit does not cover outbuildings unless the residence is also part of the project. One way of addressing this is can we can we adjust that program so that homeowners or property owners could use those tax credits for historic outbuildings.

Mr. Butkus added, we need to bring these issues up to our legislative task force. If we need a modification to a statute to include these things, the worst thing is to go through a process where we say you must preserve this and then offer absolutely no resources or incentives to do that. This is asking for alienating the public to say you're just going to have a big club over our head with no carrot to help us do that. The other thing was whether we can look into owners partnering with a local 501(C)3 to get a preservation easement on that structure. Would that make that structure eligible because it's under the guise of that nonprofit, to try to find creative ways to utilize the funding mechanisms that do exist so it kind of achieves the goals that we're after.

Chairman Elmore thanked the staff for not thinking this is a silly idea and would like to see what can be accomplished. Mr. Kinney agreed. He believes we all acknowledge this as a resource type that we're losing rapidly and we're certainly working to see what we can do, and this is not a new phenomenon. Mr. Levine has been working on this for quite a while. Thank you for this discussion and we can certainly bring it back and talk about it internally to see if there's any, any things we can do.

Mr. Levine suggested that everybody write down their ideas and thoughts so they can be shared. As Ms. Carnell and Mr. Butkus suggested, these are legislatively driven issues.

XVII. Adjournment

On a motion by Ms. C. Nelson, second Dr. Faber the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by:

**Deborah D. Gaston
Jonathan Kinney**

***Next regularly scheduled Council meeting:
Wednesday June 1, 2022 – Meeting format to be determined***