

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, November 1, 2023 @ 9:30 am**

HYBRID MEETING

Meetings were held both virtually on Microsoft Teams and in-person at 450 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, CT.

MINUTES

Council: Ms. Elizabeth Acly, Ms. Vincencia Adusei, Ms. Elizabeth Burgess, Vice-Chairman Paul Butkus, Mr. Thomas Elmore, Dr. Leah Glaser, Dr. Andy Horowitz, and Ms. Sara Nelson

Absent: Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Dr. Deanna Rhodes, and Dr. Sarah Sportman

Staff: Mr. Cory Atkinson, Ms. Julie Carmelich, Ms. Mary Dunne, Ms. Erin Fink, Ms. Deborah Gaston, Mr. Jonathan Kinney, Ms. Cathy Labadia, Mr. Todd Levine, Ms. Elizabeth Shapiro, and Ms. Marena Wisniewski

Guests: Ms. Jane Montanaro, 1st Selectman Curtis Rand, Ms. Cindy Cormier, Ms. Anne Young, Mr. Andrew Melillo, Ms. Carol LaDue, Mr. David Goslin, and Mr. Christian Allen

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order @ 9:32 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Vice-Chairman Butkus read aloud the Review of Public Comment Procedures

III. Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest

Vice-Chairman Butkus read aloud the Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest and asked if there were any conflicts with staff members or Council.

Ms. Burgess recused herself from agenda item V.B.3 – Stowe Center.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes and Transcripts

A. Minutes – October 4, 2023 Meeting

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Ms. Adusei, the Council voted to approve the October 4, 2023 meeting minutes.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-3 Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

1. Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, Town of Ridgefield, human skeletal remains analysis.

On a motion by Mr. Elmore, second, Ms. Nelson the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Certified Local Government, Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, funded by the Historic Preservation Fund of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All federal and state grant guidelines and requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommended this application for funding.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-3 Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

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

Ms. Dunne presented the application. The Town of Ridgefield requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to complete an analysis of recovered skeletal remains from the 1777 Battle of Ridgefield. SHPO has partnered with the National Park Service and the Town of Ridgefield under the American Battlefield Protection Act for additional grants related to the battle. Any discoveries will be a part of the on-going investigation into the history of the Battle of Ridgefield. Mr. Steven Barakas and Mr. Nick Bellantoni were not on the call due to a scheduling conflict, but Ms. Cathy Labadia, Staff Archeologist, was on the call for any questions or concerns.

Ms. Nelson wanted to clarify a formatting issue on Page 15. Ms. Dunne clarified that the formatting had jumped to the next page, and she will reformat the page. The information presented was correct.

Dr. Horowitz commented that the soldiers will be reburied with full military honors, but questioned how would the proper authorities know if the soldier is American or British? Ms. Dunne added that is the whole point of the DNA process to ensure remains are respectfully returned. Ms. Labadia also added the American soldiers would be considered militia, which now is The National Guard.

SHPO has been working with the Office of Military Affairs on this very question. If they are determined to be American, they will receive full military honors. However, if they are English, the English have decided they do not want the remains returned.

We would like to work with the British Government to see if their original decision still stands or if they would want to have these individuals reinterred with military honors with representation from the British Government.

Ms. Acly asked if anything like this has happened in the past. Ms. Labadia replied yes, the individuals were reinterred near or where they fell, and some type of monument was erected.

Vice Chairman Butkus questioned, from a genetic standpoint, if the person immigrated to the United States from England and they were fighting for the Patriots, what would the distinction be from someone fighting for the British? Would it be more based on the artifacts that were found in the burial site? Ms. Labadia replied, "that was a good question". This would be done by looking at an isotope analysis. The location where they were born, the body absorbs different elements that are in the air and water, and how the body absorbs those is different depending upon where they were living and grew up. This analysis will help to where those individuals spent the early part of their life. Once again, it's not going to be definitive. They could have grown up in England, moved here and then joined the militia. It's not 100%, but she thinks if we have several individuals who are interred and all of them show that they grew up in England, all of them are 100% English ancestry. She thinks we can start to make some educated guesses that they are more likely from a British regiment than American militia. Vice Chairman Butkus also asked if there were any artifacts found and what was the significance of the fact that some soldiers had clothing on and others did not. Ms. Labadia added that this could have been due to rank or stripping the bodies for badly needed supplies. Hopefully all these questions can be answered in the research.

Ms. Acly added she thought it was very exciting that so many people are working together to complete this project. Is there a list of names of any of the soldiers? Ms. Labadia replied yes there are names of soldiers and hopefully through DNA, if it is not so degraded, we may be able to find an ancestral line to the fallen soldiers.

Dr. Horowitz added, through his quick Wikipedia research, he learned there were about 120 casualties at the site. The historian is listed as TBD and should be changed. The Ridgefield Historical Society should be able to help with some of these genetic questions.

**2. Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant,
Town of Salisbury, structural study of CNE Railroad building, Lakeville**

On a motion by Ms. Burgess, second Ms. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Certified Local Government, Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, funded by the Historic Preservation Fund of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All federal and state grant guidelines and requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommended this application for funding.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-3 Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

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

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Salisbury requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 for a structural analysis to determine feasibility of potential relocation of the Central New England Railroad Building, located at 7 Allen Street. The applicant was previously funded for a site assessment. The area is subject to flooding and heavy truck traffic. Crosskey Architects were hired to complete a study which is included in the application. Their suggestion was to complete a slight shift of location. Ms. Dunne has been conversing with Ms. Jenny Scofield, our Register Coordinator, to make sure the proposed relocation did not have any adverse effect on its listing. The purpose of this grant is to complete specifications and to evaluate the feasibility for the potential relocation of the Central New England Railroad building. 1st Selectman Curtis Rand and Ms. Scofield were on the call for any questions or concerns.

Ms. Dunne also stated, following her conversations with Ms. Scofield, that the proposed relocation would have to go before the State Review board. However, a document for the Park Service may not be required because the relocation is with the existing footprint of the building. There will only be a slight shift in movement of the building. The orientation or designation will not change, and Ms. Scofield did not foresee an impact on this listing.

1st Selectman Rand described the conditions of the area effected by weather and heavy truck travel. The town paid for its own analysis. Due to the pavement being resurfaced several times, the brick has been obscured and now the pavement is right up against the sill. Box trucks are constantly nicking the corner of the building, requiring constant repair. The building is 20 feet wide and may be moved about 14 feet, maybe 30% of the building will be within the same footprint that it is now. The town paid for an analysis of paint in which there are 6 different colors. The plan is to restore the entire building. Planning and Zoning hired Colliers to complete a study on traffic flow and pedestrian safety around the building. They recommended moving the building back as well.

- 3. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, Harriet Beecher Stowe Center, 77 Forest St., Hartford, \$200,000, Repairs to the carriage house visitor center slate roof, repointing of brick masonry, restoration of windows, exterior trim repair and painting, mechanical systems upgrades and ADA compliant entry doors and restrooms.**

Ms. Burgess was recused from this item.

On a motion by Mr. Elmore, second by Ms. Adusei, 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 grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommended this application for funding.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-3 Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Harriet Beecher Stowe Center

Amount: \$200,000

Ms. Fink presented this application. The Harriet Beecher Stowe Center requested funding in the amount of \$200,000 for repairs to the carriage House, Visitor center, slate roof repointing, a brick masonry restoration of windows, exterior trim repair and painting, mechanical system upgrades, and ADA compliant entry doors and restrooms. The Harriet Beecher Stowe Center has received several grants from our office in the past, and they are carefully undertaking a major \$1,000,000 restoration of the full campus. This grant applies specifically to the visitor center. The funds will assist with making the property ADA accessible and upgrading the HVAC. It was noticed this morning that the large bid document file in OneDrive did not include the drawings that they referenced. The drawings were placed in OneDrive this morning. If the Council members have questions about the drawings, they can contact Ms. Fink within the 90-day period that applicants have to finalize the bid and construction documents. Ms. Cynthia Cormier and Mr. Dave Goslin, project architect, were on the call.

Ms. Adusei asked for clarity on the budget and the quotes for windows and masonry. Ms. Fink replied that this grant is for the maximum for the Historic Restoration Fund at \$200,000. If it does come in higher, the Harriet Beecher Stowe Center would need to dip into some of their other project funds to cover that amount. But we can't exceed the \$200,000, so even if the quote came back higher, we would have to work with that number.

Ms. Acly asked about the Kronenberger quotes. Mr. Goslin replied, the project has already gone out to bid. Ms. Cormier added work began on the DECD funds already in hand, along with the National Endowment of Humanities grant in hand. The project went out to bid. June 7th was our first public opening and we didn't get enough bids at that time to make it competitive. There was a second public bid

opening on August 10th and the Applicant now has bids in hand that will be shared with their grant manager and construction specialist at DECD next week so that they can move the project forward and start the construction in April. The project is scheduled to start April 1st, 2024.

Ms. Fink stated it was her understanding, through DECD's Capital Projects where Stowe received funding, that they went out to bid for other parts of the projects and this specific part has not gone out to bid yet. She believed the applicant was responding on the bid forms as part of the other DECD projects and put the budget justification in the bid form as well.

Ms. Nelson stated that Council hasn't seen the drawings yet. She understands that folks can forward comments to Ms. Fink within the 90-day review period, but her concern is that HPC is a public body that conducts public reviews. Ms. Nelson suggested convening a subcommittee who could review the drawings and then respond on behalf of the Council to maintain transparency. Ms. Nelson saw Ms. Fink had trouble uploading the drawings to OneDrive because it was combined with other material. Moving forward, Ms. Fink could ask the applicants to provide individual contract document drawings and a contract document project manual. That's something that architects do anyway. The drawings in this and the project manual are complementary, so the scope of a project is not understood by one or the other, both items need to be seen together.

Ms. Comier wanted to clarify even though the bids that have gone out are for the work on the visitor center that they would like to start in April. These are for masonry repair, carpentry, front door, gypsum wall board, flooring, plumbing, and heating. They've been working on this project to get it to this point, getting the specs and drawings from Mr. Goslin, and doing a lot of fundraising. This piece is part of a bigger project they're doing with site improvements. The visitor center project is the most important project for the Stowe Center and the funds they have raised to date are for it, but they need additional funding to complete it and if they don't raise the necessary funds, they've been working with the construction manager on value engineering and limiting the scope of the work, so as to not go over budget.

Ms. Nelson again recommended the formation of a subcommittee and consolidating a list of any questions that could be sent back to Ms. Fink. The construction schedule is set to begin in April. Ms. Nelson asked if this was something that could be finished at the next general meeting of the Council or should the sub-committee just submit the questions and comments to Ms. Fink.

Vice Chairman Butkus agreed with having the subcommittee meet to review the documents and consolidating a list of any questions. In trying to determine the correct procedure, Vice-Chairman Butkus asked if Council could approve the funding in concept with a follow-up of any comments that we have from the subcommittee, or should we postpone the official approval until the next meeting?

Ms. Fink asked if it was possible that Council members could submit questions to her. If question are received, because there's a chance that there might not be any, would it be possible for Ms. Fink to compile them and present them at the next HPC meeting.

Ms. Nelson stated that the appointed subcommittee could review the drawings in concert with the project manual between now and the next meeting, and depending upon the chair's direction, they could be submitting their compiled comments. If you want to deputize the committee to speak on behalf of the Council and make your vote conditional upon the review of the subcommittee.

Mr. Elmore asked the Council if they remember when we had 12 HRF grants? The Council broke it up into three different groups and each of the groups listed their questions for each of the applications, then one person from each group presented that discussion at the next meeting to expedite the review process. He would be in favor of doing that here versus submitting the comments without the Council's review or input in advance. A ZOOM meeting was set up and everyone got together as a group, and it worked out well. Vice Chairman Butkus agree with Mr. Elmore.

Mr. Elmore, Ms. Acly, Ms. Nelson, and Vice-Chairman Butkus volunteered to set up the subcommittee to review the document.

Mr. Adusei mentioned she had the time to spend on the plans this morning and the questions she had were just making sure that the bids are comparing and that there's enough funding in there, but the plans were detailed. She didn't go through 100% of them, but the 60% she did view seemed to be in good shape. If the team can finalize the remaining items that are in question, it should be good to go. She will finish reviewing it and will email her questions if anything else comes up.

Vice Chairman Butkus requested a motion to reword the motion. On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Mr. Elmore, 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. Approval is subject to the review of documents by the designated subcommittee. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below listed applicant upon receipt of grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-5, N-0, Abstaining-2, Absent-3 Recused-1) (Roll call vote)

The Historic Preservation Council voted to approve the modified language presented by Ms. Nelson. Motion passes as amended.

(Y-5, N-0, Abstaining-2, Absent-3 Recused-1) (Roll call vote)

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

1. Greenwich Historic District Commission Study Report, Bruce Park, Greenwich

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Mr. Elmore, Pursuant to CGS §7-147 q (c), the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance and boundary for the proposed Bruce Park, Greenwich, Connecticut as presented in the study report transmitted by the Town of Greenwich Historic District Commission on September 25, 2023. Staff recommended this item for approval.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-3 Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this report to the Council. A similar report was discussed at last month's meeting. Ms. Dunne briefly went over the process and explained these reports are submitted to SHPO under state enabling legislation that allows municipalities to identify what is historically or architecturally significant in their specific community and then put in place local legislation to protect those resources. The Council's duty under state statute is to comment on the boundary and ordinance. In local historic districts and local property reports, there is no contributing or noncontributing, everything that falls within the boundary of the property or district falls under review of the local Commission, whether it was built in 2020 or 1920 or 1820. Ms. Ann Young and Mr. Andrew Miller from the Town of Greenwich and Local Historic District Commission were on the call to answer any questions of concerns.

Mr. Butkus asked for clarity on the distinction between the contributing and noncontributing sculptures or objects. Ms. Dunne replied it helps to clarify what the town finds significant architecturally or historically about the resource that they want to designate and making sure everything falls within the boundaries especially since a lot of these noncontributing resources, or most of them, are sculptures. She would suggest using something different than contributing and non-contributing, because those are terms used in the National Register.

Mr. Elmore asked if this designation would make it difficult for them to make future improvements? For example, a dredging project, or putting in a ball field, does the designation prevent that from happening, or does it just mean that they must go in front of their municipal commissions for approvals?

Ms. Dunne replied, it doesn't prevent it, but it does require review. Notice that the first site listed as contributing is open space. It's the former site of a historic resource, she imagines it is included in the boundary so that any new construction will be reviewed by the Commission if any new construction is suggested. It's important for the Commission to keep in mind what is considered historically and architecturally significant so that if, for example, someone wants to put a baseball

park in there, they can decide whether that's appropriate or not. If there is a history of recreation, then it might be appropriate.

Mr. Elmore asked do they have to come back in front of you and other staff or is it all in-house municipal level? Mr. Dunne replied it is all at the municipal level, SHPO has no purview.

Dr. Horowitz was intrigued by the renamed reference of Indian Trace Dr. and Indian Field Rd., is there any indigenous history there that anyone is aware of? Ms. Ann Young replied, Greenwich certainly does have a very strong Native American heritage. When the founding fathers came, there is documentation that they were welcomed at one point to the town, but unfortunately because of the various skirmishes, either between the British and or Dutch, Native Americans were eventually pushed out of the town. There's been quite a bit of archaeological survey at Greenwich Point, sometimes known as Todd's Point, where they landed. However, in this part of Greenwich, there has not been a lot of research. It does not mean it does not exist, it just means it has not had the opportunity of being discovered yet. Comments from the HPC would be helpful and with a designation, a thorough job will be done to help protect the park and any future archeological digs.

Mr. Andrew Melillo added that a designation would help the Town be more proactive and research and explore that history in the area. There were various tribes and most of the Indian chiefs at the time that signed the first deed in 1640 have streets named after them all throughout town. They also have the complications of Indian history where we have Dutch maps saying we had a Senoi tribe, and that tribe never existed in the area but was just a misnomer. It's a rich history, but not a pleasant one after a certain point in time between the first settlers and the natives. But, this would be a welcome opportunity to protect this area. The park has drastically changed over the years from a swamp with a covered wooden bridge to a more filled in park with I-95 going through it.

It is very common because one of the first names of that area, that peninsula from the first settlers was Indian field. The name Indian just kind of stuck after a while and everything around the area is Indian field. It was that area that was originally named the Indian Common, Common Land, and Indian Neck.

Dr. Horowitz wanted to know more about the cotton magnet Mr. Robert Bruce. Ms. Young added Mr. Bruce was a private man devoted to his daughters. He was a philanthropist. He donated the town hall to Greenwich, and he certainly was hoping to be able to alleviate some of the sufferings of working-class women by having them be able to come out. He was also concerned about health. He had devoted one of the first tuberculosis pavilions more towards the Backcountry portion of Greenwich. He was considered ahead of his time. What he was doing was revolutionary. One of the things that we can really do to honor his amazing gifts to history is to protect this park. It was enjoyed by all levels of the community.

Dr. Horowitz wanted to clarify that examining the source of a philanthropist's wealth is not a matter of asking how reputable they were, nor is it a question of looking for skeletons in the closet, nor would it diminish characterization of the historic resource were he simply encouraging that same level of attention of a kind of clinical descriptive attention to the source of a philanthropist wealth. The story does not start with the gift and certainly the idea of his being a generous philanthropist gives us no information about the source of his money. Doesn't tell us if he inherited it from John Jacob Astor's opium and fur dealings, or if he, you know, developed it himself curing diseases. It doesn't discredit the park in any way, it adds information about how the world is made, which is what this sort of historic research is meant to do.

Dr. Glaser echoes several points Dr. Horowitz made. The significance of this is as a park and there's a lot of excellent local history here. Significance is so tied to context. This is very much a public park in the vein of the progressive era and design. In the design, there's reference to a civil engineer, and Dr. Glaser would love to know what his background was because he wasn't a landscape architect, whether it's connected or informed by all the other park builders at the time. Urban parks come out of this industrial era and it's a response to the ills of industrial society in a much bigger context. Dr. Glaser requested a broader context because that's what gets us to the real significance of the park, it may be a representative of that design or maybe it's an exceptional example in some cases. We need to do more than just say this is important to our community, we also need history.

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

IX. Threatened Properties - CEPA Updates

Mr. Levine presented an update to Council. There are no other threatened properties except what will be on the agenda for next Wednesday, 80 Shore Road, Waterford, CT. The demolition delay permit is 60 days. It's 30 days plus an additional 30 days if someone objects. Objections were received so the delay will run out on November 26. That's why we must act swiftly if we're going to have an opportunity for a discussion, for a potential referral to the Attorney General's office, and, if it is referred for the Office of the Attorney General, to have enough time to prepare a temporary injunction.

Mr. Elmore asked Mr. Levine would there be time for the Council to review the material before next Wednesday. Mr. Levine replied yes, submission will be at the end of the day today. This is a particular instance where the structural integrity or adaptive reuse of the existing site is not particularly in question because it was lived in two months ago or three months ago. Mr. Levine has spoken to the owner, and he is not questioning the structural integrity of the house. While we will not have enough time for Crosskey Architects to come take

a look for adaptive reuse, it's a single-family home now. It could be a single-family home next week, so we're not currently exploring adaptive reuse as an alternative because its current use fits the definition of a feasible alternative.

Mr. Elmore asked about the public's input. Mr. Levine replied that the aim is to have them sign petitions and get organized. There were an overwhelming number of signatures. 500 signatures already and 20 letters since Friday and today is only Wednesday. There were only 100 signatures by Sunday and by Monday morning there were over 400. There was enough for us to say let's do the investigation. We recognized that time is short and have reached out to the owner and officially invited them to participate. We are expecting the owner to participate after speaking with his attorney. This isn't going to be a regular 400-page packet that we submit to you guys because the actual prudent and feasible alternative is its current use. We don't have drawings, Mr. Dave Gosling, Ms. Beth Acly, nor Mr. Jim Grant will be asked to complete a structural analysis. There's no question that it's structurally fine. Mr. Levine will get as much information for the Council as possible and submit by the end of today.

Mr. Butkus asked what the owner's intent is? Mr. Levine spoke with the owner two times yesterday, totaling about an hour and a half on the phone. They discussed the process, the law, how it works and his intentions, and if there's any opportunity for him to pivot...keeping the main block of the building or portions of other buildings on site. Mr. Elmore asked for this to be discussed in the meeting next week.

X. Preservation Restrictions

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kevin Burger, GIS Analysis will start Monday November 13, 2023. He comes to us with GIS experience at the municipal level in several locations, including the City of Hartford and most recently as a GIS analyst for Eversource Energy. We look forward to introducing Kevin at our December meeting and hopefully moving forward with some training on that system as he gets up to speed and starts some training opportunities.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

Ms. Shapiro reported that the museum season ended this past weekend, and all were busy! The museums will begin to have their reports ready in December, as they close their books.

Old New-Gate

- “Light Into the Dungeon” at Old New-Gate cleared over \$50,000 for the museum, with sold-out tours on nearly every open day, and over a thousand visitors to the museum for the last two weekends.

Eric Sloane

- 512 people attended the Touch a Trade event on October 21, despite the rainy forecast, with the majority being family groups. Mr. Andrew Rowand's comment was, "So many kids!" The rain held off all day thankfully. Between the CT Antique Machinery Association and the Sloane Museum, there were 30 presentation stations.
- The SHPO booth was non-stop action and the event stayed so busy they had to shut down booths so presenters could get lunch.
- The event seems to continue to cement stronger partnerships with organizations that attend, and this year the talk is to plan for a larger, collaborative event with the [Timber Framers Guild](#).

The Henry Whitfield Museum

- The CT Archaeology Fair was held on-site on October 14, and it rained and rained. Thanks to Dr. Sarah Sportman and all those who played a huge role in making the event a success, especially Ms. Cathy Labadia and Mr. Cory Atkinson from SHPO (Cory stood in the rain and helped kids learn to throw Atlatls, so he gets a medal for that.)
- Dr. Bill Farley, Archaeology Professor from SCSU who has led digs on the site for the last several years did a great presentation on what we have learned about the site from archaeology, and he really put all the work together for me – I learned a lot.
- Whitfield will host their final event of the year, Firelight Festival, on Friday December 1.

Prudence Crandall Museum

- The museum continues to host multiple group tours Friday-Monday, and visitors are now interacting with the new exhibit, which is allowing us to do some testing and revamping of the tour flow.
- Meanwhile, there are some issues with the exhibit panels that are being worked on addressing with the provider, as well as inside and outdoor work that will take place onsite before the end of the year.
- There are still some issues with the restoration work that was done over the past few years, including a few issues with shingles and rusting nail heads. SHPO will be on site later this week with Kronenberger and a team member from the Department of Administrative Services who managed the work. Perhaps we'll get this issue resolved.

XIII. Old Business

XIV. New Business

1. 2024 Meeting Schedule

Mr. Kinney distributed a draft meeting schedule for 2024 with two columns, one with the date for the first Wednesday of every month, the other column with an adjusted schedule, taking into consideration conflicts with holidays. Ms. Burgess added Rosh Hashanah is on October 2nd.

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second Mr. Elmore, the Historic Preservation Council voted to accept the adjusted 2024 HPC meeting schedule.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-3 Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

2. HPC Training Requests

Chairman Butkus mentioned that for the new members of the Council it would be good to have a refresher on the Historic Restoration Fund grant program so all will be clear as to what level of documentation is required at what stage. Mr. Kinney asked the design professionals on the Council what the minimum level of design documents the Council would need to feel comfortable upon review knowing there are multiple levels. Mr. Kinney also asked Ms. Dunne what level the plans and specifications SHPO is funding are being developed to. Ms. Dunne replied, SHPO is funding plans, through Survey and Planning to the Design Development level.

Ms. Adusei added stated that typically in the industry 80 to 100% plans are ideal because then you know that there's enough details. It's important that when Council votes on the budget that the Applicants have substantially completed the plans so that they don't come back for more money because they didn't have enough details for the contractors. Her preference in the perfect world would be 100%, but she thinks 90% would be ideal. Vice Chairman Butkus asked if those are the construction documents? Ms. Adusei replied yes, because you know quite frankly, you can't really price based on the design development or the schematic drawings. The construction documents are needed to provide accurate pricing.

Mr. Kinney stated So, essentially you are looking beyond design development, but an 80 or so percent completed set of construction documents with specs would allow you to really understand what's being proposed and could justify the budget, but also would still allow some flexibility before the 100% set is completed to incorporate any changes that you guys are recommending or seeing. He was trying to understand where the Council's thoughts are and what their needs are.

Ms. Adusei continued, technically anything that is less of the 80% if the price increases the contractor is justified because they did not have all the details to price accordingly.

Ms. Nelson agreed with everything that Ms. Adusei was saying with a lot of support, but the one thing that she will argue at a lower level of documentation is that sometimes you want to be able to have input at a stage where not every detail is mostly drawn because you suggest an alternate way of proceeding with something. She completely agrees about the budget and to make sure that the scope is well articulated enough that the budget reflects that. There must be the built-in flexibility for the owner to have not spent all their pre-development dollars if, in fact, we're going to suggest an alternate way of considering solving a problem.

Ms. Acly added the challenge is that there are so many different types of projects, can we come up with some patterns, like let's build on maybe what we've dug up before and we maybe didn't finish because everything is so custom in this industry. If we just stick with it for a little while, maybe we can come up with some of those patterns to be a little more prescriptive about it.

Mr. Kinney added he believes it would be beneficial and he and Erin would find it helpful as well. He will coordinate some dates within the next month to set that up remotely so whoever wants to participate on Council is certainly welcome to.

Vice Chairman Butkus reiterated Council's request for training as related to the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act and the Protection Act as we're seeing that we have a new Protection Act agenda item coming up, especially with new members we might not have training prior to that, but it seems like it's a good time to get a clarity between the two different laws, especially coming off of the Deborah Chapel matter.

Mr. Kinney agreed with Vice Chairman Butkus, he still owes the Council a training on the Protection Act, but I think it might be helpful also to talk about Policy Act a little bit just to see how they relate to each other and how the interplay between the two processes works. He will check with the Attorney General's office on availability.

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies - Jane Montanaro

Ms. Montanaro reported that Preservation CT is hosting an event this weekend in partnership with Dudley Farms in Guilford Saturday from 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. They will be speaking about preservation in person on the Dudley Farm site. Ms. Beth Payne, the Museum Director, will speak about ongoing preservation efforts, upcoming events, new exhibits, and will conduct a tour of the historic farmstead.

Funding is now available, through the 1772 Foundation, to provide matching grants for museums, historical societies, and nonprofit organizations. Applications for 2024 awards are opening by December 1st, 2023. Letters of inquiry are due and can be uploaded to the website preservationct.org. There is a portal for all the grants to come through and it is \$10,000 for maintenance and repairs.

XVI. Public Forum – Ms. Carol LaDue

Ms. Ladue addressed the Council with her passion for the Lithuanian Church of Saint Joseph in Waterbury. She discussed her family history of immigrating from Lithuania and her grandmother working as a seamstress in sweatshops in the lower East side of New York. She is a practicing Roman Catholic and Mr. Christian Allen prepared a statement of history on the area and the people that lived there online for the Council to hear. The area around the church and the church itself is in desperate need of repair. The Archdiocese of Hartford made the decision to close the church. They are seeking our assistance in helping to save the church due to it being the oldest Lithuanian church in

North American built in 1894. It is the best example of Lithuanian architecture in North America. The area is called Brooklyn Waterbury after Brooklyn New York. Mr. Allen lives in an apartment in Brooklyn Waterbury that still has remnants of Lithuanian embellishments, solidly constructed in the 1900s, of masonry and beautiful windows. She has come before the Council to give a little history and seek our assistance in getting the church designated.

Mr. Kinney added SHPO will work internally at the staff level with Ms. LaDue and will provide an update at the next Council meeting.

XVII. Adjournment

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Dr. Glaser, the meeting was adjourned at 11:56 a.m.

***Next regularly scheduled Council meeting:
Wednesday, December 6 – Hybrid Format***