

**State Historic Preservation Review Board  
Friday, December 4, 2020 9:30 a.m.  
Teleconference via Microsoft Teams**

**Present:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki (via phone), Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards (Chair, via phone), Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan (via phone), Mr. McMillan Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren

**Absent:** none

**Staff:** Jenny Scofield, Todd Levine, Mary Dunne, Jonathan Kinney, Cathy Labadia, Jane Schneider, Elizabeth Shapiro, Marena Wisniewski

**Guests:** Tod Bryant (consultant), Leah Glaser (consultant), Daryn Reyman-Lock (consultant), Michael Stein (architect), Maya Vardi (City of New Haven)

**I. Call to Order**

Mr. Edwards called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

**II. Review of Public Comment Procedures**

Ms. Scofield announced that under the emergency procedures [for digital meetings under Executive Order 7B] the meeting will be recorded. She requested that each person wishing to speak state their name before giving comments. All Board votes will be taken by roll call.

**III. Approval of the September 18, 2020 meeting minutes**

Mr. Edwards requested comments on the September minutes. Dr. Bucki and Mr. Herzan provided minor edits. Ms. Scofield also acknowledged receipt of edits from Mr. Wigren.

**A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Mr. Herzan to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2020 meeting, as amended (Y-9, N-0, Abstained-0).**

**Board members voting yes:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren.

**IV. Action Items**

**A. Completed National Register Nominations**

All registration forms are subject to changes made by the State Historic Preservation Review Board (SRB) and by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) staff.

Ms. Scofield reported that for the nominations on this agenda, the property owners and other interested parties were notified by email of the pending nomination, 30 days prior to the meeting.

Nominations and meeting materials were posted on the State Historic Preservation Office website during the noticing period.

**1. New Haven (Goffe Street) Armory, New Haven (Criteria A and C, Criteria Consideration G, state level)**

Ms. Scofield summarized that the armory was constructed from 1928 to 1930 on a two-acre lot in the Dixwell Avenue neighborhood. It was designed by Payne and Keefe with Dwight Smith. Staff recommends the property for listing under Criterion A for Military History as the home of the New Haven Second Company's Governor's Foote Guard and the 102<sup>nd</sup> Regiment of the National Guard. It is also significant for Social History for its role as a community center and for its association with New Haven's annual Black Expo and events surrounding the Black Panther rally in the 1970s. It has state level significance and meets Criterion Consideration G for social history related the Black Expo and Black Panther rally. The period of significance extends through the 1970s for those events. It meets Criterion C for its property type. The period of significance is from completion of the building in 1930 to 1979, through the first era of Civil Rights-related activities at the site.

Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the City of New Haven Mayor and City Plan Department, New Haven Historic District Commission, Ethnic Heritage Center and New Haven Preservation Trust 30 days before the meeting. The Certified Local Government (CLG) response is in process. One letter of support was received from Ed Cherry of the Ethnic Heritage Center and staff invited him to review the nomination. No letters of objection were received. Dr. Leah Glaser attended the meeting as consultant for the nomination

Mr. Edwards invited public comment on the nomination.

Dr. Bucki endorsed the nomination.

Mr. McMillan stated that the discussion of Consideration G is a compelling component of this nomination. It is well-documented and supported, but he asked what the story is behind this being an armory that mobilized in response to anticipated to civil unrest and then transitioned to the site of a Black expo. There is an interesting story to be told there. Dr. Glaser responded that it was a community center before the rally and has always functioned for both military and community purposes. However, it is notable that within a few months, this place that was used for assembly against the rally was then reclaimed by the community. It is profound and telling in terms of the evolution of the Black Power Movement of the time and shift from an aggressive movement to one more economically based that Jesse Jackson helped with.

Mr. Wigren stated that he is familiar with the community use of armories in other places. He recommended stressing the nationwide impact of the Black Panther Movement in terms of the breadth of reporting and levels of concern as a way of strengthening the Consideration G argument. In connection with that, the New Haven courthouse where the trial was held is on the National Register partly for that reason. The Kent State massacre site is also on the National Register. Reference those and mention how this fits in. Note the mobilization of the state guard

during World War II, including the black unit, as Ed Cherry mentioned in his letter. Mr. Wigren asked if there were any other war-time events associated with this armory.

Dr. Bucki mentioned an exhibition held at the armory in the 1990s of the ghost army inflatable tanks made in New Haven. The inflatable tanks were used as decoys during World War II. Dr. Glaser responded that lots of events occurred at the armory outside of the period of significance. Dr. Glaser noted that she met with Frank Carrano who was Commander of the building through the 1980s and 1990s and helped identify the uses of all the spaces in the armory. It was primarily a place for assembly and training; he emphasized the community use as well.

Mr. Edwards shared that the armory was used by the larger community in many ways. He was once asked by the New Haven Symphony in the 1960s to decorate the drill hall for a gala fundraising dance and convert it into the Piazza San Marco using painted panels.

Mr. Herzan congratulated Dr. Glaser on brining attention to this overlooked resource through the nomination. He commented on the architecture section of the nomination in the significance statement. He asked Dr. Glaser to look at the first paragraph again and clarify what was extraordinary about the building in terms of architecture. It is not obvious to an uninformed reader and some of the sentences are unclear. Mr. Wigren commented that extraordinary needs comparisons; discuss it in comparison to other armories. There is also confusion of architectural stylistic terms such as Military Romanesque, Gothic, and Deco-style streamlining, and in other parts of the text the building is describe as not military in character. These terms don't go together and are contradictory. Dr. Glaser noted that there are some different design elements to the building but agreed to clarify the terms. She noted that building is extraordinary for its large unobstructed space and size. Mr. Wigren stated that armories typically do have a large unobstructed space and asked what is different about this one. Mr. Edwards observed that there was another earlier armory near State Street with a smaller drill hall, which became obsolete because it was too small. Mr. Wigren stated that there was one on Meadow Street near the railroad station and there was an armory on Orange Street. Mr. Edwards noted that he was thinking of the Orange Street one. They were smaller, but the state armory was bigger than this one.

Mr. Wigren requested a correction of the description of trim and foundation material. The brownstone is actually concrete called cast stone. Photograph 18 shows the rebar. This was a very common material. At least two companies in New Haven made this high-quality, decorative pre-cast concrete. It was used a lot in the 1910s and 1920s. A bank building located at Dixwell and Circular avenues in Hamden is listed in the National Register and is identified as a local masterpiece of this material in the nomination. Mr. Edwards added that it was likely not accidental that a locally produced material was specified in the government contract for construction of the armory.

Mr. Herzan noted a typo on p. 8-15. He requested that the consultant be consistent about the spelling of centuries.

Mr. Wigren requested more explanation of the phrase "second revolution of the African American Civil Rights Movement" on p. 8-21 in the Criterion Consideration G narrative. Dr. Bucki commented that she has never heard of the Black Power Movement referred to in that way.

Dr. Feder requested that the word monolith on p. 7-4 be edited. Monolith means a single stone.

Mr. Herzan requested that the use of the hyphen in the spelling of African American be checked and made consistent. Dr. Glaser responded that the hyphen was removed based on SHPO comments; the spelling was modeled after the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture.

Mr. Barlow referenced the mention in the nomination of tanks being parked on the streets of New Haven. He shared that a family relative was there on the day of the rally. Armored vehicles were on the streets. They were self-made vehicles by that state police and they were so armored that the tires kept blowing out.

**A motion was made by Mr. Wigren, second by Dr. Bucki to list the New Haven Armory in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-9, N-0, Abstained= 0).**

**Board members voting yes:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren.

## **2. Waltersville School, Bridgeport (Criteria A and C, local)**

Ms. Scofield summarized that this is a nomination for an early twentieth-century school in Bridgeport. It was built in 1902 and 1917. It is recommended eligible for listing by staff at the local level under Criteria A and C. Under Criterion A, it is proposed for education but also social history because it was located in an area and served a population with a high number of immigrants. It does pick up on the Progressive Era curriculum, but also had programming specific to the population there. It is proposed for listing under Criterion C for Architecture for the typical characteristics of the Progressive Era space and also the specific spaces for vocational and gender-based curriculum. The period of significance extends from 1902, the construction date of the earlier building, to 1940 when the demographics of the population shifted, and most students were Connecticut-born. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the Mayor of the City of Bridgeport, and the CEO of the Apex Building Corporation, who is the developer, 30 days before the meeting. The City is not a Certified Local Government (CLG) response was positive. No letters of support or objection were received. Dr. Daryn Reyman-Lock and Mr. Tod Bryant attended the meeting as the consultants for the nomination.

Mr. Edwards invited public comment on the nomination.

Dr. Bucki stated that she didn't realize the extent of the history of special education curriculum in Waltersville. The nomination was nicely put together with the Americanization issues of the Progressive Era and into the 1920s.

Dr. Bucki noted incorrect dates for the Progressive Era on p. 8-12. The Progressive Movement ends by 1918 or 1920, around the end of World War I. It is overreaching to extend the date into the 1930s. The movement did lead to the expansion of curriculum in the 1920s and 1930s. Dr.

Bucki commented that it is unfortunate that there are no school records. She asked if there are parallels in other cities. Bridgeport was well known in the Progressive Era as having a forward-looking agenda under the Republican leadership of John T. King, in terms of urban design and city planning. Special education may also have been unusual for the time period.

Dr. Bucki noted that so much has been torn down in Bridgeport and asked about the plans for repurposing the property. Mr. Bryant responded that Apex Building is a minority owned developer of affordable housing. The property will be affordable housing a historic rehabilitation tax credit project. The building will be restored, and the classrooms will remain intact. Mr. Edwards stated that that information is not relevant to the Board's review.

Mr. Bryant shared that in he wrote a State Register nomination for the Spireworth School in New Haven, which was purpose-built for special education in 1925. It was the first school in New Haven built for that purpose. Waltersville may have been the leader in this kind of work.

Mr. Herzan referenced Figure 5 and asked about the newer portion of the school. The two sections of the school read as separate buildings with a small connector. Was the later portion of the school historically perceived of as an addition? Mr. Bryant responded that the Junior High School is an integral part of the other building. The connector goes all the way to the basement. Mr. Herzan observed that stylistically the two portions of the school are very separate. Ms. Scofield clarified that Mr. Herzan is asking about how the National Park Service would want the resource counted. If they are two freestanding buildings that are later connected, they are usually counted separately and if one is built intentionally as an addition, it is counted as one.

Mr. Edwards observed that the Sanborn map (Figure 2) on p. 9-32 is not legible on the printed copy of the nomination. Mr. Bryant responded that it looks clear on the digital version. Ms. Scofield noted that the choice of fill color might be the issue. Mr. Bryant agreed to reduce the fill.

Mr. Herzan requested that the spelling of Leoni [a New Haven architect] be corrected on p. 8-23.

Mr. Wigren asked why Waltersville was chosen for these special class. He asked if there was a high level of need in the neighborhood or available space. Dr. Reyman-Lock responded that she did not find a direct source with that answer. She inferred that there was a need in the neighborhood reading between the lines of various sources. Mr. Wigren asked about the connection between the curriculum and the design and construction of the building. For example, there is a reference to a shoe-shine stand, but it sounds like that is still in existence. If it is, add a photo and discussion of that. He asked if there are any other ways in which the curriculum has shaped the design of the building. It is discussed in general terms such as light, ventilation, and heating, but are there specific classrooms for domestic science, etc.? Mr. Bryant responded no; it is difficult to tell what the historic uses of the classrooms were, except that there is still a dental chair in one room. Dr. Reyman-Lock noted that there was a dental school there in the 1950s. Discussion followed about adding a photograph of the chair to the nomination.

Mr. Wigren mentioned a book about school design by Warren Briggs, a Bridgeport architect. The book is called *Modern American School Buildings* and was published in 1899.

Mr. Wigren referenced the mention of John Dewey on p. 8-13; he asked what worthy membership means in that discussion. Dr. Reyman-Lock answered that Dewey was looking for kids to get some education in the school system that they could transfer home to be a vital part of the family; in the case of girls, it is domestic science work.

Ms. Scofield mentioned that this is the first nomination coming through where research closures due to COVID has been an issue. She asked the Board to share if they have any research sources available that could help with this nomination. Mr. Bryant added that there were some archives he couldn't get into. Ms. Scofield stated that Dr. Reyman-Lock put some footnotes in the nomination about potential sources that were not available so far.

In terms of limited access to archives, Ms. Dyer-Carroll referenced the narrative under vocational training and Americanization on p.8-18 and 8-19. If there isn't additional information available, she requested that this section be edited for better flow. Dr. Reyman-Lock left notes in the form; if can't get into more sources, she will edit the text to flow better. Mr. Bryant asked how to approach the fact that these research gaps may remain for months. Mr. Edwards asked if this is a situation where the nomination would be amended once the research information was available. Ms. Scofield responded that you could do an amendment as long as there is enough justification for the areas of significance that are claimed. If you can justify the significance with what you have, it can move forward, but if you can't, the National Park Service may return the nomination for more information. Dr. Bucki asked if this is sufficient; it seems that the nomination is sufficient as it is.

Mr. McMillan observed that in the larger picture, this is the third or fourth Progressive Era school nomination the Board has looked at in the last three years. It is a very similar story each time, which is that there is a lot happening, there is an immigrant population, it was vocational, and the building looks like the building without a direct tie to curriculum. He asked if we are looking at the school as an example of a common, thematic type in Connecticut or if it is really significant for the reasons claimed under Criterion A. He asked how significant this type of building is. Dr. Reyman-Lock responded that the mentally handicapped/special education curriculum is unique. The vocational and Americanization side of the story seemed more common. Mr. McMillan asked if there is enough here to support a nomination. In terms of the special education component, he asked if we have curriculum; do we have stories of what the students went on to do; do we have elements of the building that reflect how they were trained? There is more of a story to be told. Mr. Bryant stated that he does not know how to find that information. Dr. Reyman-Lock added that there is nothing more about curriculum that she's found. The superintendent's reports were published in the municipal register; there is nothing more that exists within the Board of Education in terms of reporting what curriculum had happened. She found in weird places reports of what the students went on to – in one survey, the students became clerks and painters. She tried to note how this impacted the greater community.

Dr. Bucki noted that there was a lot of eugenics in the 1920s, so we don't really know how "feeble-minded" people were. It could be that they are just foreign students. She would not consider this a modern special education curriculum. Mr. Bryant commented that there was no real criteria for deciding who is identified for special education. Truants, people considered mentally deficient and regular classroom disruptors were all placed in the same class. Dr. Reyman-Lock added that the school was changing the enrollment, at least in the initial class because they started



year with 70 students and ended with 25. They were obviously shifting students around based on ability. By 1916, intellectual testing started. Dr. Bucki mentioned that the 1914 superintendent's report talks about students ill with tuberculosis also being mentally handicapped; it is an interesting early flawed effort to categorize intellectual activity.

[Mr. Wigren temporarily took over as chair for the meeting.]

Mr. Herzan referenced photograph 7 and asked about the architectural integrity of the building. He is troubled by the infill on the monumental entrance way; it detracts from the building. Mr. Bryant responded that he would look at plans to see what the intent for that infill is. Mr. Wigren stated that the future plans are not relevant; the SRB has to evaluate the integrity for listing now. Mr. Herzan asked if this building should be classified as non-contributing because of the poor infill and window replacements. Mr. Bryant asked if you would make the whole junior high school building non-contributing; he noted that would affect the tax credits. SRB members clarified that the tax credits are not part of the review of the property for National Register listing. Mr. Bryant referenced a historic photograph and argued that the rest of the building is intact. Mr. Herzan asked if this section of the building could be classified as non-contributing under Architecture. Ms. Scofield responded that you could describe the alteration in the integrity statement, but a decision would need to be made whether or not this whole section of the school contributes or not. Mr. Herzan stated that he is not sure the threshold for integrity is met.

Mr. Wigren asked if the alterations damage the integrity under both Criteria A and C. The SRB discussed the integrity and criteria applied. Mr. Herzan requested that if Criterion C is maintained in the nomination that the addition be classified as non-contributing. Ms. Saunders asked if that would require a major restructuring of the nomination. Ms. Scofield responded that an option is to not argue for Criterion C. You only need to meet one of the criteria to be listed, but you need to make a good case under that criterion to carry the nomination. Dr. Bucki asked about the original condition of the building.

Mr. Edwards referenced the plans shown on pages 9-41 to 9-43. The recess within the arch only exists at the first floor. Mr. Bryant compared Figure 7 and Photograph 7. He stated that the windows and entrance are in the same place but have been altered and dryvit infill has been added. Mr. Edwards suggested investigating what is behind the dryvit if access allows. The SRB discussed tabling the nomination to investigate the condition of the arch. Mr. Bryant asked Mr. Stein about how easy it is to remove dryvit. Mr. Stein answered that often material is encapsulated under the dryvit; if you remove it you may reveal the original construction. There are likely fasteners to the substrate of the dryvit; if it is an old dryvit system, it would be an insulation board nailed through to whatever is behind it. Mr. Bryant commented that you can see the window openings from the interior. Mr. Herzan asked if a photograph of that could be added.

Mr. Edwards asked the consultants to confirm that the elevator shaft is in the connector between the two buildings. It would help us understand whether this portion of the building is an addition. The elevator served both buildings.

Mr. Herzan asked if the local history center, library, or museum had historic images of the building and whether the consultants contacted staff at those facilities. Ms. Scofield mentioned the former city historian as a potential reference.

Mr. Herzan asked if procedurally, the SRB could approve the nomination conditionally, pending information about the original condition, or if the nomination should be tabled. Ms. Scofield suggested that if the SRB feels the property meets Criterion A, to move it forward, but discuss whether or not to leave Criterion C in the nomination.

Mr. Edwards asked if there is a proposal to proceed without Criterion C. Mr. Herzan proposed to move the nomination forward under Criterion A only because of the integrity issues.

**A motion was made by Mr. Wigren, second by Mr. Herzan to amend the recommendation for National Register listing of the Waltersville School to Criterion A only (Y-9, N-0, Abstained= 0).**

**Board members voting in favor of amending the motion:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren.

**A motion was made by Dr. Bucki, second by Mr. Herzan to list the Waltersville School in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-1, Abstained= 0).**

**Board members voting yes:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren.

**Board members voting no:** Mr. McMillan.

## **B. Review of Eligibility Status of National Register Listed Property**

### **1. William S. Jones House, 172 Post Rd W, Kings Highway North Historic District, Westport**

Ms. Scofield summarized that this a property identified in the Kings Highway North Historic District, listed in 1998. There are some changes proposed. The Board is asked to discuss the changes to the property as it is now, evaluate its integrity, and discuss whether it continues to contribute to the district. SHPO staff Todd Levine and Marena Wisniewski are present to answer questions. Ms. Scofield noted Mr. Michael Stein is present as the architect representing the owner.

Mr. Stein clarified that there is an error in the agenda title; this is an outbuilding associated with the Williams S. Jones House. The address of the Jones House is 174 Post Road West and this building is 172. Ms. Wisniewski clarified that it may be erroneous, but on p. 7-7 of the nomination, the property is listed as the William S. Jones House at 172 Post Road West, constructed ca. 1860 and moved/reconstructed in 1989 Mr. Levine stated that the property is listed as a contributing property to the district. It is a potential CEPA case, but there is a plan to move the building within the property.

The Board discussed the buildings on the property and the location of the Jones House at 174 Post Road West in relation to the outbuilding.

Dr. Bucki asked why the building was included in the district nomination. Ms. Wisniewski answered that the building was categorized as an outbuilding from the mid-nineteenth century,



which fit into the period of significance and areas of significance recognized in the nomination. She stated that after completion of a site visit to the property, it does not appear to reflect characteristics of a c. 1860 outbuilding. The building is a single-story Ranch house with a CMU foundation and a dug-out crawl space. It has dimensional lumber and the sub-floor is diagonal cross-bracing. The chimney appears to reflect the mid-twentieth century. There is no evidence of conversion from an outbuilding to a climate-controlled residence. She did not observe any framing members that date prior to the mid-twentieth century.

The SRB questioned the use of the term reconstructed in the nomination.

Ms. Saunders stated that you can't see this building from the district and that it does not contribute. Mr. Herzan asked for clarification of the relationship between this building and the Jones House. Ms. Wisniewski responded that the building is identified in the nomination as a vernacular outbuilding, but the buildings were historically on the same parcel. The parcel has been subdivided and there are multi-story buildings on it now. The house (174) was moved up the hill and an addition was added. In the nomination it was presumed that this building (172) was also relocated.

The period of significance for the district is 1736 to 1948.

**A motion was made by Mr. Wigren, second by Mr. Herzan that 172 Post Road West does not contribute to the significance of the Kings Highway North Historic District (Y-9, N-0, Abstained= 0).**

**Board members voting in favor:** Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren.

**Board members not present:** Mr. Barlow

## **C. State Review Board Bylaws and Policy Statements**

### **1. Bylaws**

Ms. Scofield introduced discussion of the bylaws. She summarized that the Board has been working off of the 1987 bylaws. Ms. Scofield brought the bylaws to the December 1, 2017 meeting for review. The Board looked at the state and federal regulations and reaffirmed the 1987 bylaws as a starting point for editing. Ms. Scofield noted that she transcribed a portion of the 1987 bylaws and made edits in track changes. At the June 2018 meeting, the Board voted to address the definition of a quorum. The Board discussed edits to the bylaws but did not vote on them. Ms. Scofield has been working on minor edits to the state statutes to correct typos and correct Board members' terms. She requested that the Board move forward with the bylaws while the proposed changes to the statutes move through the process. Ms. Scofield suggested that additional edits or improvements could be made to the bylaws at any time. The current version of the bylaws includes the Board's comments from 2018.

Mr. Edwards asked if the bylaws should include language for SHPO to determine when the Board meets in person versus digitally. Ms. Saunders noted that a statement was added under Article IV, under meetings and remote conference procedures. Make sure that we can accommodate evolving technology. Ms. Scofield answered that in 2018, before remote conferencing was common, there was a comment to add a procedure for remote participation of Board members who couldn't get to the meeting. Ms. Scofield changed the language to say that the Board meet either in person or remotely. She did not specify how many times the Board should meet in person, to allow flexibility, particularly in the current environment.

Dr. Bucki asked about the comment bubbles in the draft bylaws and asked if there are still revisions to make. Ms. Scofield responded no that some of the comments are just notes to be aware of. There are two notes to be addressed based on the proposed legislative changes. They can be addressed in the bylaws with footnotes.

**A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Mr. Herzan to approve the Bylaws as discussed (Y-7, N-0, Abstained= 0).**

**Board members voting yes:** Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren.

**Board members not present:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Feder

## **2. Policy Statement – Relocation of National Register-Listed Property**

Ms. Scofield introduced the policy statements. The goal for this statement is to clarify requirements for pre-move and post-move documentations for relocations. The National Park Service has regulations but does not define the level of detail or format of the documentations. This policy establishes a minimum standard for documentation.

Mr. Edwards stated that he supports the policy statements. Ms. Saunders commented that it is helpful to have a clear regulatory list of standards to meet. Mr. Herzan agreed and noted that it is helpful to the applicant to know what it expected of them.

Mr. McMillan asked that clarification be added to the statement regarding who would decide when a Historic Structure Report is needed.

**The Board voted to approve the Policy Statement for Relocation of National Register-Listed Property, as discussed (Y-8, N-0, Abstained= 0).**

**Board members voting yes:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren.

**Board members not present:** Dr. Feder

### **3. Policy Statement – Review of Eligibility Status of National Register-Listed Property**

Ms. Scofield summarized that for several years, SHPO staff has asked the Board to reevaluate the National Register status of properties for which the Attorney General's office is considering action under the Connecticut Environmental Protection Act. This policy statement would be helpful to SHPO to establish that part of the Board's role is to make recommendations to the SHPO and to describe the format in which the issue would be discussed.

Mr. Herzan noted a typo.

**The Board voted to approve the Policy Statement for Relocation of National Register-Listed Property, as discussed (Y-8, N-0, Abstained= 0).**

**Board members voting yes:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren.

**Board members not present:** Dr. Feder

## **V. Discussion**

### **A. SRB 2021 Schedule**

Ms. Scofield asked the SRB if there were any conflicts regarding the proposed 2021 meeting dates. None were heard and the dates were accepted.

## **VI. New Business**

No new business was discussed.

## **VII. Staff Report**

Ms. Scofield announced that she participated in a National Register workshop with the National Park Service, which was held virtually this year. She also reported on the proposed rule change to the National Register regulations initially proposed in spring 2019. The rule change is in the final stage of the process at t OIRA (Information and Regulatory Affairs in the White House Office of Management and Budget). Ms. Scofield organized a meeting with OIRA, which was attended by representatives from SHPO, Preservation Connecticut, Connecticut Preservation Action, and the state's federally recognized tribes.

## **VIII. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:02 p.m.