

MINUTES

198th MEETING

NEW YORK STATE BOARD FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

March 12, 2025

**Meeting held at
New York State Museum
Albany, New York**

Virtual option for the public via WebEx webinar
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K0grl6AWAw4>

The meeting was held in person at the Huxley Theater of the New York State Museum, Albany, Albany County, New York.

The following people attended the meeting (*denotes remote participation via WebEx):

SRB Members

Douglas Perrelli, Chair
Wint Aldrich
Carol Clark
Molly Garfinkel
Wayne Goodman
Kristin Herron
Erika Krieger
Jennifer Lemak
Heather Mabee
Peter Reuben
Gretchen Sorin

OPRHP Staff

Melissa Baer*
Ashley Barrett*
Daniel Boggs
Chris Brazee
Olivia Brazee*
Beth Cumming*
Erin Czernecki
Weston Davey*
Molly Donahue*
Sara Evenson
Megan Eves
Andy Farry*
Johnathan Farris
Nancy Herter
Campbell Higle
Olivia Holland
Kathy Howe
Jeff Iovannone
Bill Krattinger*
Leslie Krupa
Aine Leader-Nagy
Kathleen LaFrank
Julie Maresco
Dan McEneny
Travis Magaluk*

Sara McIvor*
Mariana Montes-Staines*
Kristian Price*
Katherine Raymond*
Derek Rohde*
Jessica Schreyer
Robyn Sedgwick*
Matthew Shepherd*
Chelsea Towers
Christina Vagvolgyi*
Jessica Vavrasek

Guests

Nancy Bargar*
Paul Bentley*
Kevin Berner*
Carol Bodner, Jefferson Historical Society*
Claudette Brady, Save Harlem Now*
Mary Wallace Bridges*
Chris Cirillo, Ascendant*
Kathleen Curran, Lynbrook Library*
Angela Dews*
Scott Doyle, Heritage Consulting*
Annette Dunkelman, CAMP
Mark Dunkelman, CAMP
Ippolita Ferrari*
Curry Ford*
Ray Gillen Schenectady Metroplex*
Robyn Gilloon, Lynbrook Library*
John Giordano, Village of Lynbrook*
Saundra Heath, Mount Morris Park Community Improvement Association*
Lynn Hendy*
James Hull, NYCHA*
Carey King, Uptown Grand Central*
Chana Kotzin*
Jana La Sorte, NYC Parks
Marissa Marvelli
Andrew Mizesak*
Myra Van Moore*
Tapashi Narine, NYC Parks
Lindsay Papke*
Bill Parke*
Lindsay Peterson, Higgins Quasebarth & Partners, LLC *
Gregory Pinto, Clinton Brown Company Architecture, PC

Marcus Pollard, Commonwealth Preservation Group*
Angelique Racine, Save Harlem Now*
Jessie Ravage*
Jonathan D. Schechter, Jewish Federation Cemetery Corporation*
Stephanie Sharp
John P. Smagner*
Kyle M. Stetz*
Tom Stetz*
Madlyn Stokely, Mount Morris Park Community Improvement Association*
Rosalyn Graves Wilson*

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Doug Perrelli at 10:34 a.m. on Wednesday, March 12, 2025, at the New York State Museum's Huxley Auditorium in Albany. He noted that the meeting was also being held virtually via WebEx to members of the public.

Board secretary Kathy Howe called the roll. The following board members were present and gave a brief summary of their roles on the board:

- Wint Aldrich: Former Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation at State Parks; fills the position of historian on the board
- Carol Clark: Adjunct Professor of Historic Preservation at Columbia University, Pratt Institute, and NYU, and a former Deputy Commissioner at State Parks
- Molly Garfinkel: Co-Director of City Lore's Place Matters program; architectural historian and public historian
- Wayne Goodman: Executive Director for the Landmark Society of Western New York in Rochester
- Kristin Herron: Director for Design Arts and Museums representing the New York State Council on the Arts
- Erika Krieger: Architect; Assistant Director for Variances at the New York State Department of State, representing the Secretary of State
- Jennifer Lemak: Chief Curator of History at the New York State Museum; represents the Commissioner of Education
- Heather Mabee: Chair of the Saratoga-Capital District Regional State Parks Commission, representing Bryan Erwin from the State Council of Parks
- Douglas Perrelli: Board Chair and archaeologist; professor in the anthropology department of the University of Buffalo; past president of the New York Archaeological Council
- Peter Reuben: Director of the Department of Environmental Conservation's Office of Indian Nation Affairs and DEC's Agency Preservation Officer; representing DEC's commissioner

- Gretchen Sorin: Historian and Professor of the Cooperstown Graduate Program in Museum Studies, which is part of SUNY Oneonta

Absent member: Jay DiLorenzo

There being 11 members present, a quorum was confirmed.

Approval of Past Minutes

Doug asked board members if they had any comments or questions regarding the minutes from the December 2024 State Review Board meeting. There were none.

Motion to approve: Erika Krieger

Second: Wayne Goodman

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Presentation on the NYS Unmarked Burial Site Protection Act and Updates to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

Jessica Schreyer, Archaeology Unit Program Coordinator, OPRHP's Division for Historic Preservation

-and-

Jessica Vavrasek, NAGPRA Project Coordinator, OPRHP's Division for Historic Preservation

Discussion/Questions:

Doug asked about the procedure for contacting the coroner or medical examiner should someone find remains. Is there a statewide number to call or would you call the county? He also asked if there is a list of officials' contact information to call. Jessica S. said that we do not have a list, but she advises calling 911 and then law enforcement will bring in the coroner or the medical examiner.

Doug requested that the recordation form and today's PPT presentation be shared with the board.

Gretchen asked if the NYS Unmarked Burial Site Protection Act can also apply to documentary sources such as a historic map that might indicate a slave burial ground or a Native American burial ground that hasn't been discovered yet or is the program solely for archaeological sites that have been discovered? Jessica S. said the program is solely for incidental archaeological finds and construction finds that result in evidence of tangible remains.

Wint said that the kind of documentation that Gretchen referred to ought to be shared somewhere in confidence. Nancy Herter, Director of DHP's Technical Preservation Bureau, said that if you would like to report documentation on a cemetery or an unmarked burial ground you can always reach out to us, and we will be happy to record that information in our site file system. She added that our site file system is only accessible to certain people, so you don't have to worry about someone who's unauthorized looking at that information. Access to those files is reserved for professional archaeologists, Indian Nations, and staff from state and federal agencies who routinely do historic preservation reviews. This information is kept confidential in order to protect those sites.

Erika asked how often sites are discovered unintentionally and is there a part of the state where they are discovered with greater frequency than elsewhere. Jessica S. responded that discoveries of human remains are not very frequent, perhaps occurring about once a year.

Wint asked if NAGPRA addresses the commerce in these materials or would that be covered under a different law. He could imagine a situation where artifacts found years ago might get into private collections or be offered for sale and then tribes discovering this and saying that the artifacts are their cultural property. Does the law prohibit the sale and require involvement by the Native American communities? Jessica V. said that the law does not cover this situation, but it has come up as a topic with the Northeastern NAGPRA working group she is on. The Nations are concerned about this because things have been sold or traded in the past that probably shouldn't have been. The Nations may feel that they weren't paid enough for the time and the labor that their ancestors put into making the artifact. The Nations may say, for example, that even though someone paid for an object that it was not bought fairly because the object falls into a category of artifacts that really belong with the Nation and should never leave the Nation. The Nation may ask for the object back and, while there is no provision under the law that the person who purchased the object return it to the Nation, it is still a good idea to do so. Doug followed up on Wint's question, stating that NAGPRA is a law that has teeth for federal jurisdictions and not private owners.

Heather asked how information on the NYS Unmarked Burial Site Protection Act gets out to the general contractor who lives in a tiny town and is digging up a site for a project and then comes upon some human remains and calls the local coroner. How would the contractor know to get the information about the discovery of human remains to us? Jessica S. said that we are trying to get the information out, and members of the burial committee are meeting with an association of coroners this month. Most people call the police first when they find human remains because they think that there's a possibility that they're recent. The police would then decide to bring in the other parties. She said that the committee is working on how best to disseminate the information to people who may be digging.

National Register Nomination Reviews

Chelsea Towers welcomed the nomination sponsors, consultants, and property owners who have worked very hard alongside staff to prepare today's nominations. She thanked Erin Czernecki for preparing the presentation slides. She welcomed our newest staff members, Julie Maresco and Johnathan Farris, who will be giving their first presentations today.

Chelsea noted that we will be presenting 21 nominations from 14 counties across the state recognizing significance in a wide range of areas including architecture, Jewish heritage, entertainment, recreation, social history, commerce, performing arts, and many other areas. Of these nominations, 13 are honorary designations and nine are for commercial tax credit projects. The St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church complex nomination will not be presented at today's meeting due to complications with the notification process. We hope to present that nomination at a future meeting. For guests joining remotely and who have a special interest in the nominations presented here today, they are welcome to offer comments following the presentation of their specific nomination. Each virtual attendee should have the ability to unmute themselves when it is their turn to speak.

Nomination 1: Marcus Garvey Park, New York, New York County

Kathy Howe

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History, Ethnic Heritage/Black, Performing Arts,
Entertainment/Recreation, Community Planning & Development

C: Landscape Architecture

Period of Significance: 1836-1973

Kathy noted that an Underrepresented Communities (URC) Grant from the National Park Service funded the nomination. The URC grant program works towards diversifying listings submitted to the National Register of Historic Places. URC grants are funded by the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF). We have received other URC grants in the past including several for NYC LGBTQ nominations and the Casita Rincon Criollo nomination.

The Marcus Garvey Park project resulted not only in this nomination but also in several oral histories and an interactive ArcGIS Story Map called "Park Power." Kathy thanked the consulting team of Neil Larson and Associates, specifically Marissa Marvelli, lead researcher and author of the nomination, and Jenna Dublin-Boc, who conducted the oral histories and produced the Story Map.

She also thanked the advisory committee of community members and City Parks staff who greatly contributed to this project. Members of the committee included Madlyn Stokely, Timnit Abraha, and others of the Mount Morris Park Community Improvement

Association; Valerie Jo Bradley of the Marcus Garvey Park Alliance; Valerie Jo Bradley and Claudette Brady of Save Harlem Now!; Tapashi Narine, Sybil Young, and other City Parks staff members; and representatives from Community Boards 10 and 11.

We received letters of support from the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission and the Mount Morris Park Community Improvement Association.

Discussion: Madlyn Stokely, past president of the Mount Morris Park Community Improvement Association and daughter of community organizer Hilda Stokely, provided her comments to the Board. She said that she was feeling so emotional and thanked everyone for getting to the point today of acknowledging the importance of the park to the community. She spoke of the coordination, struggle, fights, and successes that the community had, particularly at a time when the Black voice in New York City was so suppressed. Having this acknowledged and having it listed in the Register will be so significant to the Harlem community. She said that those of us who are now working in community organizing often refer back to the women and men who worked before to get us to this point. This park is critical to our well-being and survival; it's not just a luxury; it has been a necessity in Harlem. She appreciates that we got to this point and hopes that the Board will see that this is a park and a community movement that deserves recognition.

Sandra Heath, president of the Mount Morris Park Community Improvement Association, concurred with Madlyn Stokely's comments. She said that it is really moving to look at the progression of the park and to be a part of this moment in time. She is grateful to the full team who worked on the project. She said that it's hard to speak, as her heart was beating hard. She noted the importance of this work and this designation as we think about who will be having conversations about the park 300 years from now. She stressed that it is important that, in the future, people look back on the history documented in the designation.

Gretchen said that the history and analysis presented in this nomination was so thorough and very well done, adding that it was thrilling to be able to read something that was about African-American history that was not about public housing projects. She said that this was one of the best nominations of the session. She commended everyone who was involved and added that it was incredibly well written.

Carol echoed what Gretchen said, adding that it was an excellent nomination. Molly amplified Gretchen and Carol's comments and added how important the oral history component was to help bring the story home. She said that to read the acknowledgement of people finally having a place to sit while attending a concert was so moving and a lot to think about in terms of equity. Three hundred years from now this will be an important road map, and it is equally important in this current moment to understand and have precedent for community coalition building and making change at

the local level. Molly added that we are grateful to have this nomination right at this time.

Gretchen asked where the oral histories will be housed. Kathy said that they will be publicly accessible in our CRIS database and they have also been shared and will be available on the Mount Morris Park Community Improvement Association's website and at City Parks. Kathy thanked City Parks staff for being such wonderful project partners and asked if anyone from City Parks wished to speak.

Tapashi Narine, the Historic Harlem Parks Administrator at NYC Parks, spoke next. Marcus Garvey Park is one of the parks that Tapashi oversees. She thanked Kathy at SHPO and the consultants Jenna Dublin-Boc and Marissa Marvelli for their work on this project. She mentioned the Story Map produced by the consultants is accessible to the public and that she has shared it widely including with the Community Boards. City Parks is very thankful to have this information and that Marcus Garvey has received this nomination. She added that as we are approaching America's 250th birthday and Marcus Garvey is one of the earliest parks in our [city] park system, it is a major accomplishment that we've made it so far, and it's great to have this historical information in our hands.

Motion to approve: Gretchen Sorin

Second: Carol Clark

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 2: Church of St. Edward the Martyr, New York, New York County

Jeff Iovannone, PhD

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture

Criteria Consideration A

Period of Significance: 1887-1961

Jeff said that the nomination was prepared by graduate student Lindsay Papke as part of Professor Andrew S. Dolkart's National Register course in the Graduate School of Architecture Planning and Preservation at Columbia University. We received a letter of support from the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Heather Mabee

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 3: Roosa House, Marbletown, Ulster County

Julie Maresco

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: ca. 1790-ca. 1810

The nomination draft was prepared by consultant Gregory Pinto and homeowner Ippolita Ferrari and edited by Julie.

Discussion: Erika asked if there might have once been a window opening on the second floor of the façade at the far right that was, perhaps, later blocked in. Julie said that it's possible that it was closed in. The current appearance makes it very asymmetrical. Wint said that it looks as if the building had been added on to at the far right end.

Motion to approve: Erika Krieger

Second: Wayne Goodman

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 4: Hillsdale Hamlet Historic District Boundary Expansion, Hillsdale, Columbia County

Julie Maresco

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: ca. 1790-ca. 1945

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Doug Perrelli

Second: Heather Mabee

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 5: Stuyvesant Gardens I, Brooklyn, Kings County

Chris Brazee

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Politics/Government, Social History

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1972

Chris said that we received a letter from the Certified Local Government (NYC LPC). This is a tax credit project with an approved Part 1. The nomination was prepared by Heritage Consulting.

Discussion: James Hall, Senior Project Manager with the New York City Housing Authority's (NYCHA) Real Estate Development team said that this one and the other NYCHA projects that are also on today's agenda are all going to be RAD (Rental Assistance Demonstration) conversions through NYCHA's PACT Program (Permanent Affordability Commitment Together). NYCHA is very excited to be presenting these projects to the New York State Board for Historic Preservation. The historic tax credit program has been critical to their mission to provide quality public housing to New York City residents while also preserving the architectural and social history of New York City. James thanked the SHPO team for their work on these projects. He said that the Stuyvesant Gardens I development is part of the larger Ocean Hill and Stuyvesant Gardens PACT project. It is located in the Bed-Stuy neighborhood of Brooklyn and consists of approximately 331 units. This project represents an opportunity to preserve the perimeter block design in which the buildings maintain the streetscape continuity while providing central common areas within the block as open space. The historic tax credit program will be instrumental in financing comprehensive repair work for residents.

James Hall said that the later NYCHA properties on the agenda are three sites within the Jackie Robinson and Harlem scattered sites portfolio. These developments are Corsi, Jackie Robinson Houses, and Morris Park Seniors and all located in Harlem. They comprise approximately 47 percent of the units in the overall PACT project of over a thousand units. NYCHA anticipates beginning construction this year and the historic tax credits are going to be critical in financing the comprehensive repair work for NYCHA residents.

Scott Doyle of Heritage Consulting, said that he is available to answer any questions on these nominations.

Gretchen said that she understands why it makes sense that politics/government and social history are the areas of significance under Criterion A but wanted to know why we would also say that they are eligible under Criterion C for architecture. She is curious as to why we are classifying Stuyvesant Gardens I for architecture; is it just because an architect designed them? Chris said that this development is significant for architecture because it is a fairly unusual example within the NYCHA design portfolio due to its perimeter block plan, low-rise height, and Brutalist design.

Carol said that she was pleased to see that Richard Rothstein's *The Color of Law* was cited in the nomination, which is a positive development in our ongoing conversations regarding public housing nominations.

Motion to approve: Carol Clark

Second: Heather Mabee

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 6: Home for the Aged in Ulster County, Kingston, Ulster County

Chris Brazee

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1929-1974

Chris said that we received letters of support from the Mayor and the Historic Preservation Commission. This nomination was also prepared by Heritage Consulting and is a tax credit project with an approved Part 1.

Discussion: Scott Doyle of Heritage Consulting thanked the board and added that the project has a Part 2 with a conditional approval, so the project is moving forward.

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Jennifer Lemak

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 7: Walter Coulter Homestead Farm, Bovina, Delaware County

Erin Czernecki

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Agriculture

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: ca. 1825-1948

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Heather Mabee

Second: Wint Aldrich

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 8: Jefferson Historic District, Jefferson, Schoharie County

Erin Czernecki

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Community Planning & Development

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: ca. 1805-1936

Erin said that the nomination was sponsored by the Jefferson Historical Society with grant funding provided by the Preservation League of New York State. It was prepared by preservation consultant Jessie Ravage. We received three letters of support for the historic district and eight letters of objection.

Discussion: Kristin corrected for the record that the grant was from the Preservation League of New York State and the New York State Council on the Arts. She then asked if we knew the reasons for the objections. Erin said that objections came from private property owners who had concerns about whether or not the historic district would place any regulations as to what they can and cannot do to their properties. She added that we had quite a few meetings along with a public meeting which we do for all historic districts. At that meeting, she did her best to get the information out about what National Register listing means to the property owner and to allay concerns. Doug asked if the objectors participated in the public meeting. She did not know for sure if the people who sent in objection letters were present at the public meeting. She said that there were a few people at the meeting that did have concerns.

Doug asked if the 1936 school is in the district. Erin said yes, the school is in the district. Doug also asked if the church is now a maple museum and Erin confirmed that is the case.

Wint asked what percentage of owners objected. Erin responded that we have about 82 property owners in the district and eight of those objected, so that is 10 percent.

Motion to approve: Erika Krieger

Second: Gretchen Sorin

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 9: Cattaraugus County Memorial and Historical Building, Little Valley, Cattaraugus County

Dan Boggs

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History

Criteria Consideration F: Commemorative Property

Period of Significance: 1914-1962

Dan said that today the building is the home of the Citizens Advocating Memorial Preservation (CAMP), a private group dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the Cattaraugus County Memorial and Historical Building. This is an example of grassroots preservation, and the building appears to have deep meaning and significance to the community. Their reasons for seeking listing are both honorific and the possibility of obtaining grants for the building's successful rehabilitation. This nomination was prepared by Clinton Brown Company Architecture and has received 20 letters of support.

Discussion: Mark Dunkelman of the Citizens Advocating Memorial Preservation addressed the Board. He said that he lives in Providence, Rhode Island, and is here today representing CAMP, which was formed in 2014 to prevent the planned demolition of the Cattaraugus County Memorial and Historical Building. CAMP was successful in that effort and, in 2017, purchased the building from the County. Since then, they have worked to prevent further deterioration of the structure and have developed plans for its rehabilitation. From the beginning, they've been advised that listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places is key to a successful outcome. For the members of CAMP, the Memorial and Historical Building is more than the brightest architectural gem in the village of Little Valley, it is more than an abandoned structure that was once a source of civic pride and can be once again, and it is more than a building that should be saved because of its obvious historical importance as the county's most prominent and significant Civil War monument standing proudly in the heart of the county seat to honor all 3,500 of the County's Civil War veterans who saved our nation from splitting under during its gravest crisis and helped to eradicate the sin of slavery from the land. Many members of CAMP and their supporters are descendants of Cattaraugus County Civil War soldiers; some of their ancestors were present on September 7th, 1914, when the War Memorial was dedicated. Mark said that his great-grandfather, Corporal John L. Hunts of the 154th New York Volunteer Infantry, was there. He found his image in a panoramic photograph taken on the occasion. He added that he could only imagine the pride that his grandfather and fellow veterans felt when they read the inscription on the plaque above the doors, "To the memory of its soldiers and sailors in the War of the Rebellion, this building is erected by Cattaraugus County." To CAMP members the memorial is a shrine. He thanked the board for their consideration.

Greg Pinto, the consultant who wrote the nomination, spoke next. Greg said that as the primary author of the nomination and the one digging into the history and trying to come at this nomination from every angle possible that he simply wanted to thank the board for their time and consideration of this unique and important building. He said that Mark and the other members of CAMP have done so much to fight for this old building. Listing will help Little Valley as a whole. He thanked CAMP as well as Dan, Chelsea, and everyone at SHPO for their time and consideration with the nomination process, which has been a long one, but he feels that it has been very rewarding.

Wint said that it may not be central to what we're doing here today but he asked what happened to the collections. Mark Dunkelman said that the Memorial Building served as intended as the County Historical Museum until 2004, when the museum collection was moved 23 miles away from the county seat to a town called Machias. Cattaraugus County had poured a million dollars into renovating a historic structure known as the Stone House, which was the former county poor farm, so that is where the museum went. The Memorial Building, which could have used that million dollars over the years to maintain it, just continued to deteriorate and sit empty until the County voted unanimously in 2013 to use \$125,000 in Casino funds to demolish it.

Kristin appreciates that there's a love of this building in the community, but she said that she is struggling with the integrity of the building. She said that she would love to hear her colleagues' thoughts on the integrity issue since the case has to be made under Criterion A – Social History and Criteria Consideration F – Commemorative Monument, which must be inherently related to the architectural design of the building. If the case is to be made about the memorialization as a Civil War Memorial and yet the building doesn't represent the way it was then, can those two things be separated? How can we make the case that the building tells the Social History story and commemorative purpose if the monument's integrity is in question? She said she would love to hear other perspectives on this issue.

Doug asked for a professional opinion from SHPO staff on this issue and added that, in his opinion, one can easily separate Criterion A in the social history context from an architectural argument. He does not think that the building must be eligible under architecture to fulfill its significance under social history. He asked if that made sense.

Kathy reminded Doug that it is up to the Board to decide if they think the building is eligible. She assumed that the main question pertinent to architectural integrity was the loss of the dome along with some of the details at the entrance. She suggested that the Board members ask themselves if there is enough physical fabric remaining to represent the social history of this memorial under Criterion A. The Board needs to consider not only the exterior but also what is left on the interior, but she can't answer that question for the Board. Doug asked the technical question, can something be eligible under Criterion A without being eligible under architecture? Kathy said that you

still need to be able to “read” the building and its spaces and what it is supposed to represent. It is a memorial, but it was also more than just a memorial; it served as a museum and a library, so it had different social history uses.

Doug asked how far away is this building from a Criterion C argument for architecture. If the loss of the dome is the primary problem, would a possible reconstruction of it make a difference? Would that be equivalent to something like replacement windows? Kathy said that she doesn't know what the rehabilitation plans are for the building. She said that the loss of the dome is where SHPO staff struggled the most in evaluating the building. She does not know if future plans include a new dome. Doug asked to again see the historic photos versus current-day views. Kathy said that what was also lost was the attic parapet. She added that while integrity is an important factor to weigh, we also need to consider its local level of significance and what this building means to the community as the CAMP advocate shared with us.

Molly brought up Consideration F: Commemorative Monument, saying that she is interpreting that the building was not only built as a monument but that it is still considered a monument today as we have heard very clearly from the CAMP representative and the nomination author. In the minds of the community, this is a monument that has served that purpose its entire life. While it is empty of materials related to the museum or explicit education, as a monument it is educational, which is, in theory, its purpose. She said that given that the elements of this monument are legible and the interior has integrity as well, perhaps we could argue that, though we cannot evaluate this based on any future rehabilitation plans, the intention is to remain a monument in some form in perpetuity. It was explicitly designed as such and has retained that purpose, so it is important for us to consider this.

Gretchen said that she has long thought that the National Register guidelines are old-fashioned and antiquated. She said that though she wished that the building still had its dome there are many resources in communities that we have looked at where we have struggled with the issue of integrity and, as a historian who also deals with the history of museums as well as the history of African-American communities, she feels that the history of this building fits right into the context of the history of museums; this kind of “cabinet of stuff” that was preserved to protect a particular story. She loved the photo of the lady with the gun and the photo to the right. It is also the story of what happens when these folks come back from the Civil War, so she sees this as an important local historical story, even as part of a larger national story. Even though the building has lost a lot of its integrity, there are lots of historic buildings out there that have lost their integrity that need to be recognized, so she is supportive of this nomination. Erika agreed with Gretchen on those points.

Wint liked the fact that when built and opened, the term the slaveholders' “Rebellion” was used on the plaque rather than saying the Civil War and that is what they remembered out in Cattaraugus County. Heather said that it is important that right on

the building, written in stone, are the words commemorating those Civil War veterans. She also pointed out that there is another plaque to the side as well. These words written in stone really show that this is a commemorative monument. Kristin asked if those stone plaques are still on the building. The current-day images were shown to the Board confirming that the commemorative plaques remain.

Motion to approve: Gretchen Sorin
Second: Molly Garfinkel
Recused: 1 (Wayne Goodman)
Abstentions: 0
Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed

After the vote, Mark Dunkelman added that they have discovered the original plans for this building and that they intend to put that dome back. The Board members applauded.

Nomination 10: First Presbyterian Church, Jamestown, Chautauqua County

Dan Boggs

Criteria/Areas of Significance:
C: Architecture
Period of Significance: 1925-1966

Dan said that the nomination was prepared by John Patrick Magner.

Discussion: Erika asked if there was a reason for the asymmetrical design of the façade. Dan responded that the building was patterned after or influenced by several different, mostly Italian, churches and that architect, Ralph Adams Cram, designed it in such a way that it would appear to have been reworked over time.

Motion to approve: Doug Perrelli
Second: Molly Garfinkel
Abstentions: 0
Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 11: Ahavas Achim Cemetery, Cheektowaga, Erie County

Campbell Higle

Criteria/Areas of Significance:
A: Ethnic Heritage: Jewish
C: Architecture
Criteria Consideration D: Cemetery

Period of Significance: 1917-1975

Campbell said that this is an honorary nomination sponsored by the Buffalo Jewish Federation Cemetery Corporation. It was written by Dr. Chana Revell Kotzin. We received a letter of support from Assemblyman Chludzinski.

Discussion: Doug said that the addition of the glossary in this nomination was most helpful and informative. He asked if the building in the cemetery (known as the Adler Chapel) is open to the public. Campbell said that Ahavas Achim is one of several Jewish cemeteries located in the area. One of the nearby cemeteries, B'nai Israel Cemetery, which is just to the north of Achavas Achim, has an ohel (a tomb or mausoleum) for Rabbi Joseph Rabinowitz, who was the first Orthodox Rabbi to die in North America. Rabbi Rabinowitz's ohel is a pilgrimage site. Ahavas Achim plans to renovate the Adler Chapel for use as a visitor center for those who visit the nearby ohel and other cemeteries. The building will also accommodate restrooms, which are necessary due to the practice of washing your hands when you leave a cemetery.

Jonathan D. Schechter of the Jewish Federation Cemetery Corporation thanked Campbell for their support as well as Dr. Chana Kotzin, who was invaluable to this nomination project. He said that the corporation has prepared a budget and raised about 50 percent of the funds for the reuse of the chapel as a visitors center. He said that thousands of individuals come to pray at the gravesite of Rabbi Joseph Rabinowitz, who was the first Hasidic Eastern European rabbi to pass away in the United States. He was from outside Kiev and his grave has become a very holy site. This is one of the reasons the organization started looking at the idea of nominating the cemetery as they were looking at the building and its potential for rehabilitation. The group began talking with SHPO staff and realized that they have something special here with the gates and the history of the community and so they decided to pursue listing for the cemetery.

Dr. Chana Kotzin reiterated everything that Jonathan said and thanked Campbell. She said that very little remains of the Jewish built environment in Greater Buffalo for this era. She said that the cemetery structures in Achavas Achim are highly unusual compared to other cemeteries in the area. It is not just that the built environment is missing for Jewish history in Greater Buffalo but a lot of the archival material relating to this specific congregation is almost non-existent. There has been a collecting project for archival materials for Jewish community organizations in Buffalo but, sadly, this particular congregation has the least remaining archival materials, and its built structures are either demolished or have been repurposed so this particular cemetery is, literally, the only thing that maintains a continual, historical, physical record of the community itself.

Motion to approve: Carol Clark

Second: Kristin Herron

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 12: Colgate-Rochester (Crozer) Divinity School, Rochester, Monroe County
Johnathan Farris, PhD

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Education, Religion

C: Architecture, Landscape Architecture

Period of Significance: 1932-1974

Johnathan said that the nomination was written by Dr. Jeff Iovannone and Tyler Lucero of the Landmark Society of Western New York. It is a commercial tax credit project. We have received one letter of objection from the owner of the two connected Tudor dorms. Johnathan spoke with a representative of the objecting owners as recently as yesterday clarifying that the listing puts no restrictions on what they could do with the dwelling and had hoped to receive a retraction but that did not happen. The nomination is supported by the City of Rochester, which has locally landmarked most of the campus.

Discussion: Doug asked who owns the property and what is the plan for the campus. Johnathan said that there are several LLCs largely represented by one person who owns most of the campus and then there is a separate landlord for the two previously mentioned dormitories. The tax credit project includes converting the President's House into luxury apartments. There are currently lots of different functions scattered throughout the complex including a charter school, event space that you can use for weddings, etc., and the American Heart Association has an office in one of the dormitory buildings.

Wint asked if the Baptist institution has moved to some other location. Johnathan said that they bought a commercial building downtown.

Doug informed the board that Wayne Goodman is recusing himself because of the Landmark Society of Western New York's involvement with entities involved in this project.

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Molly Garfinkel

Abstentions: 0

Recused: 1 (Wayne Goodman)

Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 13: Syracuse Boys Club, Syracuse, Onondaga County

Kath LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1922-1982

Kath said that this nomination and the nomination for the unrelated building next door – both owned by the same owner – were prepared by Kim Daileader of EHT Traceries. Both are commercial tax credit projects with approved PDILs. We have received a letter of support from the Syracuse Historic Preservation Commission.

Discussion: Doug mentioned the workshop where they made the kayaks and asked about a term that he had never seen before which was “sloyd.” Kath said that this term has to do with an educational workshop for industrial things. Kristin looked it up and, if we trust Wikipedia, “sloyd” is a system of handcraft-based education started in Finland in 1865.

Motion to approve: Wayne Goodman

Second: Jennifer Lemak

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 14: Utica Mutual Insurance Company Office Building, Syracuse, Onondaga County

Kath LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1956-1960

We have received a letter of support for this nomination from the Syracuse Historic Preservation Commission. We have an approved Part 2.

Discussion: Doug asked if it is being nominated under Criterion C only and Kath confirmed that. Gretchen asked what the plans are for the building. Kath believes that they plan to rehab it for housing, but she was not sure of that.

Motion to approve: Molly Garfinkel

Second: Gretchen Sorin

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 15: Corsi Houses, New York, New York County

Kath LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History, Politics

Period of Significance: 1973

Kath said that she has three public housing projects to present, all located in East Harlem and all built in the postwar period. They are all variations of an important theme. We received letters of support for all three from the NYC Landmark Preservation Commission. These tax credit nominations were prepared by Heritage Consulting.

Discussion: Scott Doyle of Heritage Consulting thanked Kath and Chris for their assistance with the Part 1s and National Register nominations for all three of the NYCHA properties being presented at today's meeting. He also thanked SHPO staff Sara McIvor, Olivia Braze, and Beth Cumming for their assistance on the Part 2 applications.

Motion to approve: Carol Clark

Second: Molly Garfinkel

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 16: Morris Park Senior Citizens Home, New York, New York County

Kath LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History

Period of Significance: 1963

Kath noted that the title slide is incorrect; the correct name of this building is the Morris Park Senior Citizens Home.

Discussion: Gretchen asked why this building isn't eligible under Criterion C for architecture. Kath said that we didn't feel that it measured up architecturally the way that the previous one did. She said that we could look at that again. Doug said that it is interesting that some NYCHA properties come in under Criterion A, others Criterion C, and still others both A and C. Kath said that we felt strongly that the Criterion C one – Stuyvesant Gardens I - that Chris presented today was a great example of Brutalist architecture with a distinctive four-story plan with interior courtyards, whereas Morris Park Senior Citizens Home is just an apartment building.

Motion to approve: Carol Clark
Second: Doug Perrelli
Abstentions: 0
Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 17: Jackie Robinson Houses, New York, New York County

Kath LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History, Community Planning & Development

Period of Significance: 1973-1974

Discussion: Gretchen asked why this housing complex isn't being considered under Criterion C for architecture. Kath said that we didn't think that there was anything architecturally outstanding about it. Gretchen noted that we have previously, not today, approved many NYCHA buildings under Architecture that were designed by white architects even though those buildings are just boxes and now we have a complex designed by a Black architect - and there are so few examples of architecture throughout the country by Black architects - and then we only call those buildings historically significant and not architecturally significant. She said that she doesn't see the difference and she thought that the play area at Jackie Robinson looked fabulous.

Kath said that she can talk to NPS about this one again but Architecture as an area of significance is not supported by the NYCHA draft historic context. She added that the only NYCHA properties that are eligible for Architecture were some of the early ones and some of the outstanding Brutalist ones that were designed by master architects. Gretchen asked if master architect was the criteria and Kath said that is correct, the work of a master may be eligible under Criterion C.

Kristin said that the nomination noted that Bond became one of the most prominent Black architects in the United States and at the time of his death he was considered the most influential African-American so wouldn't that support that Architecture should be one of the criteria? Kath responded by saying that the nomination also notes that the building as completed did not follow Bond's original design. She said she could have Heritage Consulting look into that further to find out the specifics of the original design.

Doug asked that as part of the historic context, is there any room for the fact that the architect was Black as a contributing set of information under Criterion A. Kath said that one of the areas that is undeveloped in the draft NYCHA historic context is how best to evaluate potential architectural significance.

Carol had a couple of comments on two different fronts. She worked with Max Bond extensively in her capacity as the Executive Director of the AIA New York Chapter and having watched his practice and seeing him for many years that he was a master architect however one would wish to define that. But, quite apart from that, she wanted to encourage the staff to work with Heritage Consulting because it says in the nomination that the design was not built according to the initial conception, it says that on page nine, and it goes on two sentences later to say the same thing and then on page 16 says it a third time. She was very curious to know the reasons why it wasn't built according to Bond's plans and, in addition, we only need to mention that once perhaps twice but not three times. Kath said that the nomination needs some editing. She and Chris work extensively with Heritage and often have to rewrite and add to their nominations. Carol added that she finds their nominations not up to some of the other standards of similar nominations we've seen so she can appreciate that that is a task but, before they come to the board in draft form, they could be tighter than this one.

Kath said that a new staff person is working at Heritage now who used to be the NR Coordinator at the Kansas SHPO. Moving forward this consultant will take the lead on the nominations and do a closer read on them before they get submitted to SHPO.

Gretchen asked if this was a tax credit project. Kath confirmed that this is a tax credit project. She added that she would get more information on Max Bond as he was a very prominent architect but that she wouldn't call Jackie Robinson Houses one of his major works especially if it wasn't even built the way he originally designed it.

Gretchen asked if it would hurt the project if the Board tabled it or postponed it until the next meeting. Doug repeated the question. Scott Doyle of Heritage Consulting said that tabling it would have ramifications on the closing, which is scheduled for later this summer. Doug said that the decision is up to the Board and that the tax credit issue should not be an influence on whether or not we vote on a specific nomination. Kath said that NYCHA has a very aggressive schedule of sending projects to us and we can barely keep up with the demand. She said that, of course, the decision is up to the board. Doug said that if the nomination needs more work, then it needs more work and so he will ask for a motion. Erika asked if could amend it here in this meeting. Carol said that she didn't think that we can amend something now that is lacking the information.

Scott Doyle said that there is a lot of information in the nomination about Bond's role with ARCH (Architects Renewal Committee of Harlem) And that establishes his role in community design and development and architectural design. He added that properties must only meet one NR criterion for approval. He said that we could put additional notations in there that further research into the architectural design and the impact and significance of Bond's firm with the property is warranted.

Wayne asked if a Part 1 has been submitted and approved. Scott said that yes, the Part 1 was approved. Kath said that she believed that the Part 2 was also approved. Scott confirmed that the Part 2 has been approved by the National Park Service.

Kath asked if the board wants to see more context on Max Bond and whether or not the complex should be architecturally significant, and the nomination edited for clarity. Doug and Carol responded that yes, that is correct. Kath said that she was going to do that anyway; and that she always makes edits after the review board. Gretchen responded that it needs more research to determine what the original plan for the building was and what ended up being built and more on Max Bond and the architectural argument. Kath said that she will do that. She added that what she found very interesting was the connection to the two community groups and how they stopped the bulldozing and got a project that they wanted built. Gretchen said Criteria A and C need to be addressed.

Gretchen made a motion that the nomination be tabled so that the additional research questions discussed can be addressed and the draft nomination revised accordingly.

Motion to table: Gretchen Sorin

Second: Kristin Herron

Abstentions: 0

Vote: 11 recommending tabling the nomination, 0 opposed

Wint added that the only piece of architecture by Bond that he is familiar is the addition to the Harvard Club of New York City on West 44th Street. This addition was designed late in Bond's career and is an outstanding design because it adjoined and served a major building by McKim, Mead & White.

Kath added that not every work designed by a master architect is necessarily a masterful work. She will be happy to get as much information on Bond as she can for this nomination.

Nomination 18: St. George's Lodge No. 6 Masonic Temple and Club, Schenectady, Schenectady County

Kath LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1919-1974

Kath said that this is a tax credit project, and we have a letter of support from the CLG and Metroplex. The nomination was prepared by Marcus Pollard, a consultant with Commonwealth Preservation Group in Virginia.

Discussion: Marcus Pollard said that this was the first nomination in New York that he has worked on and he thanked the board. He said that the building is likely going to be a residential conversion. Erika asked when the sprinkler system was added. The consultant said that he did not have an exact date on it but that it may be from the Masonic era.

Motion to approve: Heather Mabee

Second: Gretchen Sorin

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 19: Lynbrook Public Library, Lynbrook, Nassau County

Sara Evenson

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1929-1965

Sara said that the nomination was prepared by Kathleen Curran, Reference Librarian at the Lynbrook Public Library with support from the Office of the Village Historian and Village Administrator. We received one letter of support for this nomination.

Discussion: John Giordano, the Village Clerk of Lynbrook, thanked SHPO staff for the assistance provided over the past few years in the preparation of the nomination. He added that his family has been living in the village since 1980 and that his mother was a librarian here. He asked the board to consider the historic significance of the building both for its association with the women's movement and the fact that it was designed by Herts & Talent, the same firm that designed many historic buildings in Manhattan.

Motion to approve: Jennifer Lemak

Second: Wint Aldrich

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Nomination 20: Smith Octagon House, Stockport, Columbia County

Olivia Holland

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: ca. 1860-1920

Olivia said that the house, after falling into disrepair, was fully restored in 2002 and has since been maintained by its current owners. The nomination was prepared by consultants Marissa Marvelli and Neil Larson.

Discussion: Doug said that the photography in this nomination is so good and comprehensive but it made him want to see what the building looked like at its low point. He would have liked to have seen some “before” photos. Kristin appreciated the discussion of spiritualism and the families that lived here.

Motion to approve: Kristin Herron

Second: Wayne Goodman

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Wint said that reference was made to a 13-sided barn in Jefferson. He was wondering if there was ever a 13-sided house.

Nomination 21: Charles D. & Elizabeth Lantry House, Kingston, Ulster County

Olivia Holland

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: ca. 1894

Olivia said that we received letters of support from Steven T. Noble, Kingston Mayor, and Mark Grunblatt, Chair of Kingston’s Historic Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Heather Mabee

Second: Doug Perrelli

Abstentions: 0

Vote: Recommended 11 in favor, 0 opposed

Deputy Commissioner’s Report

Presented by Dan McEneny, Director, DHP, on behalf of Daniel Mackay, Deputy Commissioner

Dan McEneny said that Daniel Mackay sends his regards and that he was unable to attend the SRB today as he is attending the 250th Commemoration Commission at Philipse Manor Hall along with Commissioner Pro Tem Randy Simons, who is co-chairing with State Education. The next meeting for the 250th Commemoration

Commission will be June 7th in Flushing. Daniel asked Dan to share some comments on his behalf.

Dan thanked Heather Mabee, who is now serving as Bryan Erwin's proxy on this board. Heather is an enormous history fan, a huge booster of all things in Saratoga County as well, particularly the 250th commemoration. He thanked Doug, Gretchen, and Carol for reviewing the draft NYCHA context, which means a lot to us as it will help streamline these very complicated projects. While they will be having an academic discussion regarding the context, this is a very important history involving very impactful housing projects. He thanked Molly, Tom Maggs, and Wayne for serving on the historic preservation awards committee.

It is currently budget season in Albany and, as part of the Governor's budget, there is a very critical piece of legislation to the tax credit program related to affordable housing. This consists of two components. One of them would make any state tax credit project, regardless of the census tract, eligible if it is to create affordable housing. We're looking at new catchment areas that don't see any activity and those are based on "higher earner" census tract areas like Long Island and Westchester County; these are some of the areas that need affordable housing the most, so that is in the Governor's proposal. There is a technical amendment in the budget as well, which is about financing; it involves transferability which allows people to have separate investors in the state and the federal credit. Since working with this program since 2008, transferability has been a big discussion and a big wish list item; particularly the Preservation League has been advocating for this with housing advocates. That is big news for this program so we will see what happens; hopefully, there will be an on-time budget in April.

We are also tracking two separate bills. State Senator Fahy and Assemblywoman Woerner, who has been a lead in the assembly on many tax credit issues, have some common sense approaches to the homeowner tax credit program. They have proposed some things that would prevent it from being diminished. The program currently allows people making under \$60,000 to take the credit as a refund; that will go away in 2025 without the passage of that bill as well as a diminishment of the total amount of the credit to beneath \$50,000 per year. We are watching this very closely.

Dan and Deputy Commissioner McKay were in D.C. last week for National Advocacy Week, which is hosted by Preservation Action, the National Council of SHPOs, with heavy involvement from the National Trust. All states and territories can participate in this event. Dan said that in his ten years of attending the event, that this was the most extraordinary year he's ever seen on the Hill. He introduced and thanked new DHP staff member Megan Eves, who coordinated and scheduled meetings with 17 of the 26 Congressional offices and both Senate offices, which is an extraordinary number of meetings. He offered big compliments to Cordell Reaves's entire team, who prepared individual district informational sheets that included the granular numbers of dollars spent and invested, the number of federal grants that run through their Districts, and

more. These one-sheets are tailor-made, curated discussions about historic preservation. The meetings were unusual as everybody had something different to say, offered different perspectives, and were part of different committees. We met with people serving on different committees such as natural resources and appropriations. The main part of our job is to push for our portion of the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) and that is a good amount of funding. About \$1.7 million in HPF comes to New York State. The HPF also includes various grant programs, some of which may be considered DEI-type grants such as Underrepresented Communities and Civil Rights grants. While the proposal to continue funding these grant programs was requested, Dan said that he doesn't know what will happen with those programs. He added that we are talking about resolving something and trying to get a continuing resolution before government potentially shuts down on Friday. Congress is trying to resolve a past appropriation and a future appropriation.

He complimented the advocacy team including Caitlin Meives from the Preservation League and Andrea Goldwyn from the New York Landmarks Conservancy. He added that it is important to give a big thank you to our federal counterparts in the National Park Service. Their report was guarded and they are facing the possibility of staff reduction. We have already seen reductions in cultural resource staff at the Federal Highway Administration and the General Services Administration. The extraordinary work of our Board and our staff ends up in the hands of capable federal employees who make these projects happen. He thanked everyone at the National Park Service and other federal agencies doing cultural resource work.

Wint asked Dan what can be said when you're meeting with the offices of the members of Congress and the Senate about preserving that National Park Service function that is so important to us. Dan said that it is important to both speak up for NPS staff and our own staff. While he said that it is very typical for us to go to Washington and use superlatives about New York State being the leader in NR listings, tax credit numbers, Section 106, and successful grant applications, but that this year wasn't a time for superlatives at all. It was a time to listen and a time to ask how we could help. The very fact is that a diminishment in the federal workforce is going to put enormous challenges on New York State employees to get the work done. It's a reminder that our office is very generously overmatched; New York State values the regulatory role of preservation and recognizes the work we do. Every federal law seems to have a state counter law so you put them together and we have a strong justification for also keeping us well funded but to let elected officials know that when there is not somebody [doing reviews in Washington] we're looking at Register nominations that get sent to NPS that could just automatically get listed after 45 days. Commercial tax credit projects could either build up or get rubber-stamped at NPS if there are staffing cuts. NPS grants are going away; we experienced our grants portal shutting down so we expedited every payment we could make out of that before it happened. The current situation is a challenge so it is very important to let our elected officials know how we can help, and it turns out that they want information from us.

New Business

Kathy informed the board of the upcoming statewide preservation conference in Poughkeepsie on May 6-8 at the Double Tree Inn Hilton. She encouraged board members to sign up for the conference as it would be good to have SRB representation at the event. Also taking place as part of the event is our annual preservation award ceremony on the evening of May 7th. Cordell's team is hard at work on the preservation awards. We have a very exciting roster of awards this year.

The conference is organized by the Landmark Society, the Greater Hudson Heritage Network (GHHN), and OPRHP's Division for Historic Preservation. This year, thanks to the involvement of GHHN, we will be including some museum-related sessions in addition to preservation sessions.

The next SRB meeting is on Wednesday June 11th. It is scheduled to be here at the NYS Museum in Albany because the technology works well for us at this venue. To help alleviate the difficult parking situation we are going to look at paying for a block of parking spots in the parking garage just below the museum.

Wint asked if we are still waiting on an announcement regarding a new OPRHP commissioner. Dan confirmed that we are still waiting. Doug asked if Randy Simons, Commissioner Pro Tem, is still on the list. Dan said that he could not comment on that. Heather said that as a volunteer she can comment on that, noting that yes, Randy is on the list.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Gretchen Sorin and seconded by Wayne Goodman. The motion was carried by unanimous consent and the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Minutes prepared and submitted by board secretary Kathy Howe.