

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, November 6, 2024 @ 9:30 am**

Microsoft Teams Meeting

Meeting will be held virtually on Microsoft Teams (see code for meeting in your email or contact Jonathan. Kinney@ct.gov for the code)

MEETING

Council: Ms. Elizabeth Acly, Ms. Vincencia Adusei, Ms. Elizabeth Burgess, Chairman Paul Butkus, Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Mr. Thomas Elmore, Dr. Leah Glaser, Dr. Andy Horowitz, Ms. Sara Nelson, Ms. Deanna Rhodes, and Dr. Sarah Sportman

Absent: N/A

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

Guests: Ms. Sara Klein, Mr. Eric Gleau, Ms. Donna Douglas, Mr. Robert Bernier, Ms. Natalie Sweeney, Ms. Alisha Milardo, Mr. Tod Bryant, Mr. Joseph Klaynberg, Ms. Jane Montanaro, Ms. Mary Falvey, Ms. Joyce Leiz, Ms. Priyanka Panjwani, Mr. John Colonse, Mr. Jim Miller, Mr. Herman Cartes-Barrios, and Ms. Jeannie Reinhardt, Ms. Patricia Gardner, MS. Amy Atamian, and Ms. Julia Bemhart

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order @9:34 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Chairman Butkus read aloud the Review of Public Comment Procedures.

III. Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest

Chairman Butkus read aloud the Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest and asked if there were any conflicts with staff members or Council. There were none.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes and Transcripts

A. Minutes – October 2, 2024 Meeting

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Dr. Horowitz, the Council voted to approve the October 2, 2024 meeting minutes.

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

B. Minutes – Part II, August 7, 2024 Meeting (CEPA Item)

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Ms. Carnell, the Council voted to approve the August 7, 2024 meeting minutes with corrections.

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

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

1. Survey and Planning Grant, Archer Memorial A.M.E. Zion Church Cemetery, Geophysical Survey for Human Burials, Church Cemetery, Windsor, CT

On a motion by Ms. Rhodes, second by Ms. Burgess, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommended this application for approval.

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

Applicant: Archer Memorial AME Zion Church
Amount: \$5,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. Archer Memorial AME Zion Church requested funding in the amount of \$5,000 to conduct a geophysical survey for human burials. The church and cemetery are listed on the Connecticut Freedom Trail. They are working on a project with CCSU that will entail ground disturbance. The point of the survey is to make sure no burials are disturbed in the process of this project. This was discussed with our staff archaeologist Mr. Cory Atkinson and SHPO does support this application. Ms. Patricia Gardner was on the call to answer any question or concerns.

2. Survey and Planning Grant, Friends of Fort Griswold Battlefield State Park Foundation, Inc. Landscape Condition Assessment, Fort Griswold State Park, Groton, CT

On a motion by Ms. Rhodes, second by Dr. Horowitz, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommended this application for approval.

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

Applicant: Friends of Fort Griswold Battlefield State Park
Amount: \$6,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Friends of Fort Griswold State Park requested funding in the amount of \$6,000 to complete a landscape condition assessment. In case the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection need to do some work at this site, they wanted to get ahead of it and make sure an assessment was in place. Ms. Halle Keeler, Friends of Griswold, was not on the call, but Ms. Dunne answered any questions or concerns

Ms. Burgess asked if there was an immediate concern about the landscape that the assessment will unveil? Ms. Dunne replied not that she was aware of, and referred the question to staff archaeologist Ms. Cathy Labadia for more information. Ms. Labadia added that staff was called out to the site by the Friends Group to look at an area of the ramparts that are eroding and a water issue. So they're hoping to provide DEEP with an opportunity for a landscape plan that can help save the ramparts as well and water flow in a more efficient way. She wouldn't say it's immediate, but it is certainly a pressing issue.

Ms. Nelson added it was unclear what the final product would be. There is a substantial amount of information that already does exist for the property. The Friends Group is very knowledgeable and know exactly what it is they're looking for. This may not end up being a DEEP managed project. Four of DEEP's properties Friend's Groups are allowed to procure their own funding and engage in activities on the property independently of DEEP and she believes this is what the Friends Group is hoping to do. They don't see any money set aside by the State to make these repairs. They plan on applying for semi-quincentennial funding and other sources of 250th funding to help implement whatever plan is put together.

To answer Ms. Nelson's question, there are two things they are trying to understand. The first is the historic character of the property during the period of significance and second, they want to understand what the least intensive measures are that can be undertaken to help divert water and stop the eroding of the embankment. Chairman

Butkus added invasive species, a horticultural approach, and structural and site grading issues as well.

Ms. Acly added that it looks like there's some scour underneath the walls or maybe that was just vegetation. In one of those pictures, there's an area of erosion underneath the wall. Ms. Acly recommended being mindful of thinking beyond landscape and planting just to make sure they get to the root cause of what's really happening there. Ms. Labadia added DEEP's engineers are working on this project. She did not recall seeing any scouring, but they do have a problem with burrowing animals.

3. Survey and Planning Grant, Town of Redding, Condition Assessment, Gilbert and Bennett Wire Mill Site, Redding, CT

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Ms. Adusei, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommended this application for approval.

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

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

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Redding requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to complete a conditions assessment of the Bennett Wire Mill Site. Ms. Dunne stated that she did speak to the Town because she did have a concern over the budget being too small. They would like to update the 2015 report and add a few buildings to it. It was confirmed that any additional costs would be pick up by the Town or other funding resources. Ms. Julia Pemberton and Ms. Amy Atamian were on the call for any questions or concerns.

Chairman Butkus commented that it is critical to understand and clarify in the RFP what the goals are because doing the assessment on one building can consume all of the funding if not done correctly. Deciding which building to start with would be more feasible. Be clear what the expectations are, stabilization or intended use and adjust accordingly. Ms. Nelson and Ms. Acly agreed with Chairman Butkus.

4. Survey and Planning Grant, CT Audubon Society, Schematic drawings for Roger Tory Peterson Estuary Center, Old Lyme, CT

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Ms. Burgess, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant

guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommended this application for approval.

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

Applicant: Connecticut Audubon Society

Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Connecticut Audubon Society requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to complete schematic design drawings for restoration of the Roger Tory Peerson Estuary Center. There are concerns with the treatment of the oldest part of the building. SHPO met with the CT Audubon Society and they competitively selected the architect a few years ago when they moved into the building. A master plan was created at that time. After having lived with the building for a couple of years, they are continuing with that architect to start with schematic level designs to revisit how they want to program and use the space. The main concern about the historic block of the building was alleviated. It's not going to be altered much at all, but they do want to use the space to provide educational programing. Ms. Alicia Millardo and Ms. Joyce Leiz were on the call from the Connecticut Audubon Society to answer any questions or concerns.

Ms. Nelson stated, when working with the Audubon Society, be very clear that schematic design does not lead to bid documents and permit documents. Refer to the phases of design development correctly and the expectation of what the phases are going to provide.

Ms. Dunne replied, when she gets a budget that goes beyond the scope of the preplanning, she generally checks back with the applicant to make them aware certain costs will not be covered by the grant, but they can certainly come back for additional funding. It was the recommendation of the architect that they're working with, that they start with schematic designs. They can certainly come back for the next phase and if they decide to go to a HRF, some of that administration cost would be covered under that grant.

Mr. Elmore added he read the notes differently than Ms. Nelson. He read that the grant is for \$20,000 for schematic design, total budget is \$135,000 to carry it forward. They do have, at least it seems like they have sufficient money to carry the broader scope.

Ms. Adusei added she also assumed that the \$20,000 was for the schematic design and then the \$80,000 would be for the construction drawings phase. It is worth clarification and Ms. Adusei also added that she didn't see anything about a contingency, and for the owner, that's always a good thing. She did read that the remaining is going to be \$80,000 for the architectural and they have also have the breakdown for what she believes is the structural. Just make sure this is clarified.

Ms. Dunne commented she will make sure this is clear in future applications to make sure that the focus is on the existing task and what is going to be paid for.

Chairman Butkus added the applicant can put out the RFP for the entire project knowing they are only getting \$20,000 from SHPO. They do not have to bid the schematic separately because we are providing a smaller amount.

Mr. Elmore asked if there was landscape accessibility need as part of this project. Ms. Dunne replied the focus was on the building and believes they want to provide better access for their programming. She will make sure the applicant takes this into consideration.

Ms. Leiz, Executive Director, clarified that the request is strictly for the building and they will be addressing the landscaping with other funding in the future.

5. Eugene O'Neill Memorial Theater Center, Plans and Specifications for repairs to the Monte Cristo Cottage, New London

On a motion by Ms. Rhodes, second by Ms. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommends the application for funding under the condition that the architect examines the exterior siding and makes recommendations for selective repair and replacement. Staff recommended this application for approval.

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

Applicant: Eugene O'Neill Memorial Theater Company
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Eugene O'Neill Memorial Theater Company requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to complete architectural plans and specifications for the restoration of the Monte Cristo Cottage. The applicant has received a Save America's Treasures grant and are asking for the plans and specifications to fulfill the scope of work in the SAT application. The scope included selective repair and replacement of deteriorated material. It looked like it was stated in the application that the siding was to be taken off, but SHPO does not recommend that. The applicant is aware SHPO would consider the application on the condition they follow the recommendations in the assessment and only replace the exterior siding that is beyond repair. This project will be reviewed under Environmental Review. Mr. Rob Mooney was not on the call, but Ms. Dunne answered any questions or concerns from the Council.

Chairman Butkus mentioned addressing the concern with moisture infiltration issues and the siding should be part of the study. This may involve removing and reinstalling siding to install a vapor barrier. This should also be part the RFP as to the best strategy for this project for preserving instead of replacing.

Ms. Nelson and Ms. Acly agreed with Chairman Butkus on finding the root cause of the moisture first.

6. Survey and Planning Grant, Town of Ellington, Historic Resources Inventory

On a motion by Ms. Burgess, second by Dr. Rhodes, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development. Staff recommended this application for approval.

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

Applicant: Town of Ellington

Amount: \$20,000

Project: Historic Resources Inventory for the Town of Ellington

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Ellington requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to complete a Historic Resource Inventory. SHPO is happy the Town of Ellington has initiated this request. Mr. John Collier was on the call for any questions or concerns.

Chairman Butkus asked if the HRI can include an overview of all potential resources and then focus more on a limited number as the funding allows. For example, the HRI can focus on the first 100 properties, but it should be clear that there are an additional 400 more buildings to consider, whatever the number might be, to identify them as a potential contributing resource sooner than later. Then it can't be said "because it's not on the HRI, it's not historic and we can tear it down."

If the intention is truly to get awareness out there, include that first pass of identifying all the buildings within the town, then provide a full analysis of the first 100. In the future, if they're looking at a town wide project, you don't want to miss something, or at least find a mechanism to raise the awareness that there are 500 buildings in town that are eligible for inclusion.

Ms. Dunne agreed with Chairman Butkus that it's important to capture all possibilities. Whenever a building is threatened, if it's documented somewhere that it's a potential historic resource that really helps. She will make sure this is documented in the RFP because this is a limited amount of money. SHPO would encourage the applicant to come back for subsequent grants. It will make things a lot easier having already done that initial legwork. If there is more funding down the road, the applicant can have access to another grant.

7. Historic Restoration Fund Grant - First Church of Christ Congregational (First Church Middletown, United Church of Christ), 190 Court Street, Middletown. Restoration of wood trim, exterior painting, stained glass window protection, ADA entry ramp, \$200,000.

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second, by Ms. Acly, 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. Staff recommended the application for funding.

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

Applicant: First Church of Christ Congregational
Amount: \$200,000

Ms. Fink presented this application. The First Church of Christ Congregational requested funding in the amount of \$200,000 to restore and repair damaged exterior wood trim, paint exterior wood trim, window frames, and doors, protect historic stained-glass windows, selected masonry work, and create an ADA entry ramp at the main church entry. The Applicant started working with SHPO several years ago and has followed the steps needed to receive a Historic Restoration Fund grant. They were awarded a grant to be listed on the State Register of Historic Places and after the building was listed, the church commissioned a conditions assessment of the building. The conditions assessment identified several key areas of urgently needed rehabilitation. The church also identified the need for an ADA entrance for their community. The church was awarded a second Survey and Planning grant for construction drawings. Northeast Collaborative Architects completed their drawings and specifications. Mr. Trevor Davis and Mr. Jim Miller were on the call.

The church does not currently have the resources for both the window restoration and the exterior woodwork restoration. The church feels painting is the most critical maintenance issue, and the restoration of the stained-glass windows will be a future project including fundraising and grants. The project is anticipated to take about six months and Ms. Fink will work closely with them on the bid package and bidding process. On Monday morning, Ms. Fink added in two documents. One is the drawing of the building, showing the location of the stained-glass windows and the second document is an analysis done by a stained-glass window expert documenting their condition, a possible scope of work for restoration as well as their recommendations for the storm windows or protective coverings.

Ms. Adusei asked if the total budget of \$541,000 includes the owner's contingency? She noticed that the contractor has the proposal set for \$541,000. Is there another budget that includes the conditions and contingency? Ms. Fink replied, it was not included in the grant application because the applicant was asking for the full grant amount, but after looking at their available funding in their yearly funding, it looks like they do have the funds to cover any overages.

Ms. Adusei noticed that it's prevailing wage and did not know how long ago the proposal was done, but the cost of carpentry has gone up about twice the amount, so please check to make sure everything is covered. Ms. Fink replied, the applicant did get two different quotes, one with a prevailing wage and one without. They are looking to get an updated quotes on this project.

Ms. Carnell thanked Ms. Fink for the additional information on the stained-glass windows and asked what the need was for the protective window coverings, was there a problem with graffiti, environmental, or both? Ms. Fink responded that she believe the reason was mostly environmental. Mr. Miller added the protective windows covering were mostly for exterior protection from the elements and there was no problem with vandalism. Ms. Carnell added what concerned her was proper ventilation because if the windows are not installed correctly, it can lead to heat buildup, condensation and accelerate deterioration of stained-glass windows. It was mentioned but not well-detailed.

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

1. Marrow Machine Company, 28-30 Laurel Street, Hartford

On a motion by Dr. Horowitz, second by Dr. Glaser, the Historic Preservation Council voted to list the Marrow Machine Company Building, 28-30 Laurel Street, Hartford, to the State Register of Historic Places.

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

Ms. Wisniewski presented this application. Staff recommended approval of listing of the Marrow Machine Company building, located at 28-30 Laurel St., Hartford to the State Register of Historic Places, under Criterion 1 at the local level, in the area of industry, as a location of the Merrill Machine Company during a period of production and as a location where many of the companies' patents were developed. The building is also significant for its association with namesake J. Millard Marrow, who owned and developed sewing machine technology that became standard within the industry. There have been alterations to the property over time, but it does retain most of its integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Mr. Herman Cortez-Barrios and Ms. Natalie Sweeney of Life Care Design were authors of the nomination and were on the call to help answer any questions as well as an owner's representative.

Ms. Carnell provided her comments for all three nominations with Ms. Wisniewski, and they will be passed along to the authors. Ms. Carnell added this is a very strong nomination, but there could have been more information on the workforce of the company.

2. West Norwalk Chapel, 186 West Norwalk Road, Norwalk

On a motion by Dr. Horowitz, second by Ms. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to list the West Norwalk Chapel, 186 West Norwalk Road, Norwalk, to the State Register of Historic Places.

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

Ms. Wisniewski presented this application. Staff recommended approval of listing of the West Norwalk Chapel, located at 186 W. Norwalk Rd. Norwalk to the State Register of Historic Places under Criterion One at the local level in the area of social history. The property is an example of a non-denominational Protestant religious building that served a remote neighborhood from the late 19th century through the middle of the 20th century. Alterations have been very minimal, with the Chapel retaining its integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association of a 19th century rural chapel. Mr. Todd Bryant, author of the nomination, was on the call along with several representatives from the Chapel Association itself.

Ms. Carnell commented this was a strong nomination and a pleasure to read.

Chairman Butkus asked what the future plans were for the building. Ms. Wisniewski replied there is a very vibrant association involved with maintaining the Chapel and putting it into some community use. There is a very enthusiastic group here and they are hoping that this designation is the first step to open them up to some financial incentives.

3. Scobie Store, 664 Orange Center Road, Orange

On a motion by Dr. Horowitz, second by Ms. Acly, the Historic Preservation Council voted to list the Scobie General Store, located at 664 Orange Center Road, Orange, to the State Register of Historic Places.

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

Ms. Wisniewski presented this application. Staff recommended approval of the listing of the general store, located at 664 Orange Center Rd., to the State Register of Historic Places under Criterion One at the local level in the area of commerce as a well preserved example of a local store servicing a variety of needs for a burgeoning community. There have been alterations to the property in the past, but its restoration was based on good photographic evidence, and the property maintains its integrity of location, design, setting, workmanship, feeling, and association as a 19th century general store. Ms. Jeannie Reinhardt, who contributed an awful lot of research to the nomination, is here to help answer questions as well as members of the Rogers family, including Ms. Nancy Rogers, the owner, and Mr. Brian Didona.

Chairman Butkus asked if the building is currently in residential use and with nomination to the State Register, would they become eligible for the Historic Homes

Rehabilitation Tax Credit? Ms. Wisniewski responded to Chairman Butkus that at least one of the units must be owner occupied to qualify for the program.

Ms. Rhodes commented, upon looking at the original pictures of the store and then when it was converted into a house, that she would like to hear more from the architectural historians about those changes and if it still has the same character that it did when it was a country store.

Ms. Wisniewski replied, there was a restoration that was done in the 1970s. The original period of significance is for when the structure was a store. Typically, when talking about treatments for historic properties, restoration is one of the rarer ones, and it's difficult because there's often not a lot of documentation. In this case, documentation was presented as true photographic evidence, not based on an illustration or drawings. SHPO felt comfortable that the restoration was a restoration that was done using appropriate documentation, and so it continues to maintain that feeling and association of the store. This was an excellent nomination. Ms. Jeannie Reinhardt did some excellent research, and Jordan did an excellent job. Again, this is a really unique example of a resource where there is some restoration work that was done and documented.

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

1. Local Historic Property Study Report, 216 Hillspoint Road, Westport

On a motion by Ms. Nelson, second by Ms. Burgess, pursuant to CGS §7-147 q (c), the Historic Preservation Council brought this item to the table for discussion.

On a motion by Ms. Rhodes, second by Ms. Nelson, this item will be tabled until the December 4, 2024 meeting in order to obtain additional information.

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

Ms. Dunne presented this application. Chairman Butkus asked a question about the property being on three separate parcels. Ms. Dunne indicated that she would need to clarify whether or not the three parcels should technically be considered a historic district. Ms. Donna Douglas was on the call for any questions or concerns. Ms. Dunne asked if this application can be tabled until next month's meeting of December 4, 2024.

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

IX. Threatened Properties - CEPA Updates - Todd Levine

25 & 31-35 South Main Street - Norwalk

Mr. Todd Levine reported that the Office of the Attorney General and SHPO met with the owners about 3 weeks ago to discuss alternatives to demolition, including a

“facadectomy” or the possibility of retention of the buildings as is. If forced to do either of these, the applicant has stated that they would simply walk away from the project. At the HPC meeting, there was discussion about some level of distinction between the first two or three floors with a set back and then the tower. We talked about a six-foot set back. They did not agree with that. A three-foot setback was suggested to work this out, but we have not heard from them. Mr. Levine asked the OAG’s office if they had heard any response, and they said no. This morning, we heard from the owner’s legal counsel, and they anticipate having a draft revised plans to share by the end of the week in response to our meeting on site. They are changing something, but it won't be a facadectomy nor the retention of the buildings as they are.

X. Preservation Restrictions

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney provided Council with an overview of the Statewide Historic Preservation planning process. Development of the Statewide Historic Preservation plan is a responsibility bestowed on the SHPO by the National Park Service. SHPO is charged with taking the lead on developing the plan, but it's very important to note that the plan is not just for the SHPO office, but it is to be adopted and implemented by whoever is interested in doing so at the state local level by individual citizens. Part of our responsibility is to ensure that there's a robust outreach and engagement plan with the public and with partners.

SHPO has been working with our consultant to develop a series of meetings. The first public meeting was hosted last week on the 29th with three more to follow. The second one is scheduled for this afternoon and that's with our partner organizations. Invitations went out to the HPC members. The HPC is a close partner of SHPO and we are interested in hearing HPC’s feedback on several things. After the partner meeting, we are planning a public official meeting which will be geared towards municipal officials and CLGs, commissions, and COGS on November 19th. The final meeting will be a second follow-up public meeting which is scheduled for December 11th. There will be an additional opportunity for the public to provide input. In addition to that, in conjunction with all these meetings, we have developed an online survey tool, which was rolled out last week. The link to the survey will be added to the chat and all the members of the Council have received it. Please feel free to share it with your organization or anybody who may be interested in taking it.

Draft goals and a draft vision statement were put together for the plan which were also shared out with the list of invited partners. SHPO is also working to analyze the previous plan. That's an important part in understanding what was accomplished as part of the previous plan and what our partner organizations and what other entities in the state did. SHPO would like to hear what our partners were doing and accomplished to further those goals from the previous plan. Mr. Kinney also shared a quick timeline of the planning process. We are conducting these outreach meetings and conversations from October to December. Then, January through March we will really be focusing on writing and assembling all the pieces of the plan. We hope to have a draft down to the NPS by April with comments back from them in May and continuing to work throughout that period with a final product due to the NPS in June 2025.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

No report this month.

XIII. Old Business

XIV. New Business

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies – Ms. Jane Montanaro

Ms. Montanaro reported that Preservation Connecticut is sponsoring a talk at the Inter-Religious Eco Justice network next Wednesday. It is a zoom meeting and Ms. Montanaro will be presenting on houses of worship combining energy efficiency and restoration and preservation planning, and on the same day, Ms. Renee Tribert from Preservation CT will be presenting with the Connecticut Council of Small Towns, presenting historic preservation resources for municipalities.

On Saturday, November 16th, we're going to be meeting in person in Hartford at the Linus Plimpton House, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Asylum Ave. in the Asylum Hill National Register District. It is a partnership program with Hartford Preservation Alliance and NINA and we will be touring a NINA rehabbed house on the market. It's an owner occupied, three-family house and will be speaking about what goes into a project like that and promoting that type of preservation work to others.

XVI. Public Forum

XVII. Adjournment

On a motion by Dr. Horowitz, second by Ms. Nelson, this meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Deborah D. Gaston

***Next regularly scheduled Council meeting:
Wednesday, December 4, 2024 – Meeting Format TBD***