

**MINUTES**

**195<sup>th</sup> MEETING**

**NEW YORK STATE BOARD FOR  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

**June 12, 2024**

**Meeting held at  
Peebles Island Visitors' Center  
Waterford, New York**

**Virtual option for the public via WebEx webinar  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CBroeE1ty-c>**

The meeting was held in person at the Peebles Island Visitors' Center, Waterford, New York.

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

**SRB Members**

Douglas Perrelli, Chair  
Wint Aldrich  
Carol Clark  
Fabiana Chiu-Rinaldi  
Jay DiLorenzo  
Molly Garfinkel  
Erika Krieger  
Tom Maggs  
Gretchen Sorin  
Charles Vandrei

**OPRHP Staff**

Virginia Bartos  
Daniel Boggs  
Chris Brazee  
Olivia Brazee  
Sloane Bullough  
Beth Cumming\*  
Erin Czernecki  
Weston Davey  
Molly Donahue\*  
Sara Evenson  
Nancy Herter  
Campbell Higle  
Kathy Howe  
Jeff Iovannone  
Liam Kelley  
Bill Krattinger  
Leslie Krupa  
Aine Leader-Nagy  
Kathleen LaFrank  
Nathan Lennard  
Daniel Mackay  
Dan McEneny  
Theresa Moriarity  
Tabitha O'Connell  
Lisa Petruzzelli

Katherine Raymond\*  
Michael Schifferli\*  
Jessica Schreyer  
Robyn Sedgwick\*  
Matthew Shepherd  
Sydney Snyder  
Mariana Staines\*  
Chelsea Towers  
Jennifer Walkowski

### **Guests**

Kendal Anderson\*  
Nicole Augstein, Steiner\*  
Ralph Barone\*  
Wayne A. Benjamin\*  
Chris Brandt, Bero Architecture\*  
Chris Cirillo, Ascendant\*  
China Clarke, NYS Department of State\*  
Jake Colony, Steiner\*  
Amanda Davis, NYC LGBT History Project\*  
Ward Dennis, Higgins Quasebarth\*  
Kelsey Dootson\*  
Andrae Evans, Town of Irondequoit\*  
Kristin Herron, NYSCA\*  
Mark Jackson\*  
Ken Lustbader, NYC LGBT History Project\*  
Linda Mackey\*  
David Maroti\*  
Dimitri at Delphi\*  
Christin Paglialunga, NYC EDC\*  
Lindsay Peterson, Higgins Quasebarth\*  
Gregory Pinto, Clinton Brown Architecture\*  
J.R. Reed, NYCHA\*  
Eleanore Reznik\*  
John Sanchez\*  
Richard Sidebottom, Ryan, LLC\*  
Gloria Simons\*  
Jim Somoza\*  
Doug Steiner, Steiner Studios\*  
Peter Volandes, Volmar\*

### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Douglas Perrelli at 10:45 a.m. He welcomed everyone to the 195th meeting of the New York State Board for Historic Preservation taking place at the Peebles Island State Park Visitors Center. This meeting included

guests participating in person and virtually through WebEx. The roll was called, during which the following responded as present and in-person and briefly described their role or function as it relates to their service on this board.

- Douglas Perrelli: Board Chair, Archaeologist, Clinical Assistant Professor of Anthropology, SUNY Buffalo; President of the New York Archaeological Council
- Wint Aldrich: Historian, former Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation and Vice Chair of the Hudson Valley Greenway's Communities Council.
- Carol Clark: former Deputy Commissioner at NYS Parks, Adjunct Professor of Historic Preservation at Columbia University, Pratt Institute, and the NYU School of Professional Studies
- Fabiana Chiu-Rinaldi: Arts Director of Electronic Media & Film / Folk Arts, New York State Council on the Arts serving as proxy for the NYSCA
- Jay DiLorenzo, Preservation League of New York State
- Molly Garfinkel: Managing Director of City Lore and the Director of City Lore's Place Matters program
- Erika Krieger: Registered Architect representing the NYS Department of State
- Tom Maggs, State Council of Parks proxy
- Gretchen Sorin: Director of the Cooperstown Graduate Program in Museum Studies.
- Charles Vandrei: Archaeologist, Agency Preservation Officer at Department of Environmental Conservation.

There being **ten** members participating, a quorum was confirmed.

Absent board members: Wayne Goodman and Jennifer Lemak

### **Approval of Past Minutes**

Doug asked board members if they had any comments or questions regarding the minutes from the March 14, 2024, State Review Board (SRB) meeting. He commented that we had experienced some audio difficulties at the last meeting and there were some important discussions during the meeting when Gretchen's and Daniel's audio cut out. He recommended that we approve the minutes with the stipulation that both Gretchen and Daniel review them and try to fill in the gaps so that the minutes can then be revised and finalized for the record.

Motion to approve: Tom Maggs

Second: Erika Krieger

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

## **A Century in Review: A Developmental Overview of the NYS Park System**

-Bill Krattinger, State Parks and Sites Historian/Curator of Architecture

Bill presented an overview of the history of our parks and historic sites system reflecting upon the last one hundred years of vital legislation and development trends.

Doug thanked Bill and asked for questions and comments from board members. Doug asked to what degree the road system in New York State a result of the desire to get people from cities out to our parks. Bill responded that there are portions of our parkway system that were never finished such as at the Lake Ontario State Parkway. He said that providing ways to get people to the parks was an important initiative of Parks and said that the topic should be further studied. Doug asked if Bill had given this presentation elsewhere. Bill said that he has given this talk and variations of it, depending on the interest of the audience, multiple times. Doug said that the talk was very informative and asked if Bill could present it to our various park regions around the state. Wint welcomed this idea if both Bill can afford the time to travel around the state to present it and not just to our regional staff but also to the public and the press. He said that the presentation is an eloquent statement of an enormously moving story of public action in the public interest that is unique to New York. He said while people may be familiar with the work done in the parks during the Depression but perhaps less so that the system started even earlier with the Hudson River School and the concern over conserving the wilderness. Wint complimented Bill on his research and presentation. Gretchen recommended that Bill expand upon the modern era of the parks. She said that, as Tom mentioned, legislators are interested in how Parks are serving people today.

### **Deputy Commissioner's Report - Daniel Mackay**

Daniel thanked Bill for the presentation on parks history and mentioned that WMHT is producing a documentary on the state park system as part of our Centennial programming. Bill, Cordell Reaves, and other DHP staff have been providing content for the documentary. A significant portion of Bill's material should make it into the documentary. Daniel also suggested that the information in Bill's presentation should be included in an introduction packet for new State Parks employees to familiarize them with our system's significant history. He said that he agrees that what we're accomplishing or are seeking to accomplish now across the entirety of the program is quite significant and we have had great successes with, for example, Philipse Manor Hall, and the large increase in the attendance of school groups following our \$20 million investment.

### **State Budget:**

Enacted budget record-level funding to the Office of Parks:

- \$300m capital fund (\$100m committed to Jones Beach facilities)
- Additional capital funding from Bond Act to re-open Sebago Lake in Harriman State Park and fully develop Sojourner Truth State Park in Kingston.
- Strong operations budget.

- Additional agency staff.

### **State Preservation Conference:**

The Statewide Historic Preservation Conference was held April 15-17 in Rochester, NY. Attendance was 300, with over 100 attendees registered for the CLG training.

The awards program this year featured a new award named in honor of former OPRHP commissioner Joan Davidson; Matt Davidson and his family attended to present that award. Commissioner Pro Tem Randy Simons emceed the program with great enthusiasm.

The April 2025 Statewide Preservation Conference is slated for Poughkeepsie.

### **Papscanee Island State Register District:**

Daniel informed the Board that NY SHPO/DHP is the focus of an Article 78 challenge filed by Sunoco Oil LLC for his actions as Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer to list their property within the Papscanee Island Historic District on the State Register of Historic Places.

He said that the Board members would recall those deliberations and proceedings from the June and December 2023 SRB meetings. Per the Board's recommendation and Daniel's consenting signature, the property was listed on the State Register of Historic Places in December 2023. He said that the proposed district did not have support from the majority of landowners to list on the National Register. The nomination paperwork was sent to the National Park Service in January to determine the National Register eligibility of the district, which was confirmed in January 2024.

Agency staff, in conjunction with Counsel's Office and the Office of the Attorney General are perfecting our affidavits in this matter.

He said that he did not want to take any questions as this is active litigation but wanted the Board to be aware of the Article 78 filing.

### **Maritime Heritage Grant Program**

OPRHP is announcing today this we are awarding \$294,000 in federal re-grant funds for interpretive and capital project funds for historic maritime resources. A total of 53 pre-applications were submitted for consideration; 41 final applications were received at the end of February. Pre-applications totaled \$23m in project requests.

Board members have a copy of the press release with awarded project details. We will seek to reapply for these funds from the National Park Service when next available.

### **Eastern Lake Ontario National Marine Sanctuary**

Last week in Washington DC, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) announced the designation of the nation's 16<sup>th</sup> National Marine Sanctuary, in eastern Lake Ontario, spanning from the City of Oswego to the St. Lawrence River and

out to the international boundary with Canada. This designation, the result of a seven-year grassroots effort by local community and business leaders, will bring significant NOAA funding and research capabilities to the region. The designation highlights 43 known shipwrecks and one aircraft; these cultural assets are at the heart of this designation.

The Sanctuary will be co-managed by NOAA, Department of State, and NYS Parks. A formal ribbon cutting will be held in Oswego in early September. This is the first National Marine Sanctuary in NYS waters; a second designation process is just launching to designate a deepwater canyon off New York and New Jersey.

### **Virginia Bartos Retirement**

Daniel shared the news of a significant staff departure from the National Register Unit with the retirement of Virginia Bartos, who is retiring after 23 years of dedication and commitment to the mission of the NY SHPO.

Most of her career was as a Survey and National Register program representative, where she covered various geographic territories, including the Southern Tier, Long Island, Queens, Central NY, and the Finger Lakes. Despite that strong Upstate identity, Kathy Howe shared that Virginia's favorite nominations are all from Downstate:

- The Big Duck (move) on Long Island
- John Coltrane House, Long Island
- NYS Pavilion at the 1965 World's Fair grounds in Queens
- Two churches in Forest Hills Gardens, Queens

Virginia maintained a very busy schedule of consultation reviews over the years with over 11,000 reviews under her sign-off. She prepared, presented, and listed 344 National Register nominations.

Virginia was active as the PEF Union treasurer for the local council and served as a union steward.

She always played an active role in our Peebles Island community, helping with holiday luncheons and fundraisers.

It is difficult to imagine this office and the undertaking of our work without her. She has been a constant.

We know Virginia as a committed and stalwart member of our staff, generous in sharing her expertise and experience, consistently stepping into key roles in critical moments, and welcoming new staff. Her quiet sense of humor made frequent guest appearances in both casual and professional conversation. She had the best-stocked candy dish on the third floor. But what Daniel emphasized was the trust we felt in her, born of Midwestern pragmatism, deep experience, and concise and accurate observation and analysis in many preservation projects. She will be sorely missed, and he asked the

Board to join him in wishing her well in the coming years.

### **National Register Nomination Reviews**

Chelsea Towers welcomed the nomination sponsors, consultants, and property owners who have worked very hard alongside our National Register and Tax Credit Part 1 staff to prepare the nominations that are being presented today. Today's roster includes 18 new nominations and one for additional documentation to an existing nomination from 14 counties across New York State. With these nominations, we will add over 200 properties to the National Register and recognize historic significance in a wide range of areas, including architecture, commerce, LGBT history, education, social history, and archaeology. Twelve of today's nominations are in support of commercial tax credit applications and six are honorary designations.

Since the Board last met, the Survey and National Register Unit has welcomed two additional staff members: Sara Evenson, who joins us from our own Community Affairs Unit, and Jeffrey Iovannone, who most recently worked at the Landmark Society of Western New York.

The entire staff has worked very hard to prepare the nominations and presentations you'll hear today and a special thank you goes to Virginia Bartos, who prepared the presentation slides. As you just heard from Daniel, this is Virginia's last state review board meeting. As of July 4th, she will be officially retired after 23 years of service with our agency.

For guests who are joining us remotely and who have a special interest in the nomination presentations here today, you are welcome to offer comments following the presentation of your nomination. If the representative from our staff knows that you're here today to talk, they will introduce you.

#### **Nomination 1: Hale Cemetery, Norfolk, St. Lawrence County**

Leslie Krupa

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Settlement/Exploration

C: Art

Period of Significance: 1823-1974

Leslie noted that this is an honorary nomination, and it is sponsored by the Hale Cemetery Association, who are joining the meeting remotely today. They are hopeful that listing will allow them to access additional resources to restore the arch in the cemetery.

Discussion: None.



Motion to approve: Tom Maggs

Second: Chuck Vandrei

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 2 : Berkeley Square Historic District Boundary Increase and Additional Documentation, Saranac Lake, Franklin County**

Leslie Krupa

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Health/Medicine; Commerce

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1867-1954

Leslie noted that this is an honorary nomination that is sponsored by Historic Saranac Lake, who are joining the meeting virtually today. We received one letter of objection from a commercial building owner and a letter of support from the mayor. She noted that we received a lot of positive feedback about the district from business owners when she made a site visit in April.

Discussion: Fabiana wanted to know if the business owner who objected to the district stated any specific reasons. Leslie said that he did not provide any specifics. Doug said that it is nice that nominations such as this are being updated with new information.

Motion to approve: Doug Perrelli

Second: Gretchen Sorin

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 3: Black Walnut Island 2 Site, Pine Island, Orange County**

Dan Boggs

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

D: Archaeology

Period of Significance: ca. BCE-1300 CE

Dan Boggs said that we did not receive any letters of objection for this nomination.

Discussion: Gretchen asked what kind of protections an archaeological site receives upon listing. Dan Boggs said NR-listed sites receive a level of protection from state or federally permitted or funded projects under the state and federal historic preservation laws. Also, in archaeology reports and NR nominations, the site locations are left deliberately vague.

Doug said that one of the things that archaeologists struggle with in pre-contact archaeology is whether to divulge or not divulge site locations in an archaeology site report. He said that most of the time in these reports the imagery says, “not for public access.”

Gretchen wanted to know if people are informed of the nomination once the property gets listed. Dan responded that the nomination and also today’s presentation leave the site location information as deliberately general and vague.

Wint said that it might not be appropriate for archaeological sites like this but there is no question that, generally speaking, a property listed on the National Register can be flagged by the municipal government for protection against inappropriate demolition or development and should be encouraged except in sensitive cases where you may need to be more careful about release of site information.

Chuck added that in terms of protecting site locations they are exempt from FOIL requests at both the state and federal levels. He said that we don’t have to release them at all to the public and that’s why those files are usually kept under “lock and key.”

Jay asked to what extent do we consult or speak with Indigenous populations about these sites as part of the nomination process. Doug responded that this nomination was scheduled for our last meeting but, because of a lack of consultation with the Nation, he requested that it be pulled and tabled so that the nomination could be rewritten to remove some inappropriate research questions. He said that he also insisted from the perspective of the SRB that consultation should occur and the Nation should be reviewing this nomination form. That consultation has since occurred.

Motion to approve: Doug Perrelli

Second: Tom Maggs

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

#### **Nomination 4: Audubon Park Historic District, Manhattan, New York County**

Campbell Hagle

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Community Development

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1896-1932

Campbell said that we received two letters of support and no letters of objection.

Discussion: Wint said that this small district has a particularly interesting history and that it was very well presented.

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Carol Clark

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 5: Dolgeville Universalist Church, Dolgeville, Herkimer County**

Erin Czernecki

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1895

Discussion: Gretchen commented that Dolgeville is an incredibly important little village in Herkimer County. She wanted to know if the rest of the village, including the piano hammer factory, is on the Register or why we are just coming in with an individual nomination rather than a district. Erin responded that the church nomination was individually sponsored by the owner of the property who was interested in seeking listing for this one building. She added that the piano factory complex that Gretchen referenced is already listed. If we were to pursue a historic district, we would need a sponsor to first prepare a historic resources survey of the municipality so we can get a better sense of historic district potential. Erin added that we have had some scattered surveys done as part of consultation projects through the years and that she has looked specifically at the commercial area downtown as well.

Motion to approve: Jay DiLorenzo

Second: Chuck Vandrei

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 6: Wimbledon Road Historic District, Irondequoit, Monroe County**

Virginia Bartos

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Community Planning/Development

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1927-1930

Discussion: Andrew Evans, Irondequoit Town Supervisor, thanked Chris Brandt, the author of the nomination, for his work on preparing the nomination. Irondequoit has a great history from Native American time to the current day. The supervisor also thanked the Board for their consideration of this neighborhood. Chris Brandt followed up by saying that this project has been a long time in coming and he wanted to be sure to get this completed before Virginia retired. He said that it was a collective effort of the town's historic preservation commission, of which he is the chair. He was very involved with the final drafting and editing and did a lot of the foundational research for the nomination, but the commission as a whole is noted as the author because all members of the commission contributed to the final written document.

Motion to approve: Gretchen Sorin

Second: Doug Perrelli

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 7: Oakfield High School, Oakfield, Genesee County**

Virginia Bartos

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Education

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1927-1956

This is a commercial tax credit project. We received a letter of support from the Village of Oakfield.

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Tom Maggs

Second: Erika Krieger

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**The SRB took a break for lunch from 12:30-1:15 p.m.**

**Nomination 8: National Casket Company, Syracuse, Onondaga County**

Kathleen LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Commerce

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1930-1974

This is a commercial tax credit project. We have a letter of support from the Syracuse Landmarks Board.

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Jay DiLorenzo

Second: Wint Aldrich

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 9: Neems Factory, Troy, Rensselaer County**

Kathleen LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Commerce

Period of Significance: 1886-1937

Kath said that this is a commercial tax credit project. She added that the sponsor of the nomination is the Collar Works, which is a nonprofit supporting emerging and underrepresented artists. Collar Works recently received a project grant from NYSCA.

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Tom Maggs

Second: Fabiana Chiu-Rinaldi

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

### **Nomination 10: Boston-Secor Houses, Bronx, Bronx County**

Kathleen LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Politics/Government; Social History

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1967-1969

This is a commercial tax credit project sponsored by the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA). We have a letter of support from the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Discussion: J.R. Reed, a project manager on the transactions team of NYCHA's Real Estate Development Department, said that the listing of the Boston-Secor Houses project is critical in honoring New York City's history of public housing and its architecture, while also facilitating much-needed critical comprehensive repairs to a total of 538 units in this development.

Lindsay Peterson of Higgins Quasebarth, the historic preservation consultants for this nomination, added that they have been hired by NYCHA to prepare a historic context statement for all NYCHA's properties. This context statement will cover the period of 1934 to 1973 and it will form the basis of a Multiple Property Documentation Form that will be used to evaluate all NYCHA-owned, purpose-built public housing. The context will provide the broad context of public housing theories and execution, the different typologies, and social history. She said that they are looking forward to having this much more robust document that will provide more context than we've been able to do on an individual, site-by-site basis.

Carol said that we have been reviewing NYCHA nominations for over two years and she is delighted to hear that a context statement is being prepared and that we are going in this direction.

Gretchen is pleased to say that the social history is significantly improved with this NYCHA nomination. It reflects what we were talking about this morning about expanding the story so that it's much more inclusive.

Gretchen asked Kath why she chose to put the justification for SHPO's role in the proposal. Gretchen said that we do not include a justification like this in any other nomination so why are we doing it for a public housing nomination. Kath responded that we simply wanted to convey that this is a complicated and complex history. Gretchen responded by saying that isn't all history complicated; she said that it seems unusual that we would choose to only say that for these stories regarding public housing that they're complicated. Kath said that the simplest answer is to say that we don't have, at this time, information on every single property so that our justification is taking that into account. She added that we will know a lot more once the historic context is completed in the near future. The justification serves, for now, as a very high-level explanation of the complexities of public housing history and building typologies.

Gretchen said that the historic overview portion of the nomination was well done but she felt that by having a kind of prologue almost sounded as if we were saying that we know this is difficult talking about racism so we're not going to stand by this. She said that the prologue doesn't come off the way she thinks Kath intended it to be. She added that she disagrees with the idea these public housing projects are representative of Black people's lives. Kath responded that she understands Gretchen's point and we are not saying because of racism the topic is so difficult but, rather, what we were trying to say [in the prologue] is that there are so many threads involved and the study of public housing *is* complicated because new thinking and scholarship is coming out all the time and that we are trying to keep up with it. Kath said that we cannot represent the viewpoint of every single scholar but that we are just trying to keep up with the scholarship. Gretchen said that this is the case with any history and not just public housing history. She cited that there is new scholarship coming out on the history of the American Revolution, for example, and that there was really no need to single out public housing with a special prologue/justification statement. Gretchen concluded that the prologue was unnecessary and asked that it be removed from the nomination.

Kath asked if anyone else felt the same way about the prologue. Carol said that she agreed with Gretchen that the standardized prologue should be removed as it is pointing to something we don't need to highlight. Doug agreed that the nomination doesn't need the disclaimer and should be removed.

Motion to approve: Gretchen Sorin

Second: Erika Krieger

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

### **Nomination 11: Boston Road Plaza, Bronx, Bronx County**

Chris Brazee

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History; Politics/Government

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1970-1972

Chris noted that we received a letter of support from NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission. This is a tax credit project with an approved Part One application.

Discussion: Carol said that the designers of this housing project are Davis Brody Associates and noted that it was impressive to see that NYCHA chose to select such a well-known and long-standing architecture firm. She added that the landscape was also done by a well-recognized firm. She pointed out that Mayor Lindsay had a terrific list of architects, and he chose Davis Brody from this list that included other leading architects like William F. Pederson, Kohn Pederson Fox Associates, whom we don't necessarily associate with public housing work, and Paul Rudolph, whom we know did design some public housing, and others. Gretchen said that the prologue section of this nomination, which is the same as was used in today's other NYCHA nominations should be removed. Doug agreed on that point.

Motion to approve: Carol Clark

Second: Wint Aldrich

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

### **Nomination 12: Middletown Plaza, Bronx, Bronx County**

Chris Brazee

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History; Politics/Government

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1970-1973

Chris noted that we received a letter of support from NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission. This is a tax credit project with an approved Part One application.

Discussion: Doug asked that the prologue/disclaimer be removed from this NYCHA nomination as was recommended for the two proceeding ones. Carol mentioned the scholar Catherine Bauer, who was one of the most well-known housing scholars and reformers of the recent past. Bauer was the primary author of the 1937 U.S. Housing Act, which was the first of many different housing acts that funded public housing projects for a number of decades. In 1957, after a long and varied career, the nomination says that she wrote "The Dreary Deadlock of Public Housing" for well-known magazine, *Architectural Record*. Carol pointed out that this article was a detailed and

self-critical examination of public housing's failure to solve the perceived problems that we continue to discuss today as we review these public housing nominations.

Motion to approve: Gretchen Sorin

Second: Carol Clark

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 13: Selfridge & Langford Building, Albany, Albany County**

Chris Brazee

Criteria/Area of Significance:

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1911-1978

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Tom Maggs

Second: Gretchen Sorin

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 14: Bush Terminal Historic District, Brooklyn, Kings County**

Chris Brazee

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Commerce

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1895-1971

Chris said that this is a tax credit project with an approved Part One application. We have received a letter of support from the Certified Local Government. There are a total of 43 owners in the district, one of which is a municipal agency, so of the 42 private owners, to date, we've received 29 objections, which is more than 51 percent objecting to the nomination. We are, therefore, asking the Board to recommend this district for listing on the State Register of Historic Places and for submission to the National Park Service for an official Determination of Eligibility. We will also note that the owners have up until the time that the Keeper of the Register acts to file objections, and they have an indefinite time to withdraw previously submitted objections.

Discussion: Dan McEneny let the Board know that we have a significant number of members of the public participating remotely in today's meeting who would like to comment on this nomination, so we should let their voices be heard one by one in this public process. If we could move through those comments and everybody who wishes to speak will get an opportunity to do so.



Doug Steiner, who is an owner and the sponsor of the nomination, asked to speak first. Mr. Steiner said that there is a lot of misinformation and rumor-mongering surrounding the nomination that, he feels, has unnecessarily scared people. He noted that Bush Terminal has been a National Register-eligible historic district since 1986. Mr. Steiner said that if you are in an eligible district, you can do whatever you want to do to your building and you do not need to seek clearance or approval from the State Historic Preservation Office or any kind of regulatory authority regarding historical aspects. There is nothing other than the usual NYC DOB process. He said that the matter at hand is changing Bush Terminal from an eligible to a listed district. The only change that comes with listing is that it provides the ability to get historic tax credits for alterations that you do if SHPO and the National Park Service looks favorably on those alterations. If you're not looking for historic tax credits there's no change in the regulatory oversight process; you can change your exterior, you can change your interior, you can tear down your building, or you can put up a new building. Mr. Steiner said that there is no change whatsoever with listing. He said that he thinks that the concern from Industry City and their representatives has been that NR listing will somehow create interest by the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission in designating a local historic district, which would create a lot of restrictions. He said that he doesn't like NYC LPC historic district restrictions noting that they would be a nightmare. He stressed that SHPO is not the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission and that they are two totally separate entities. Mr. Steiner said that he has been in the Brooklyn Navy Yard since 1999 and has done three historic projects; listing is just a way to get the historic tax credits. There are no restrictions on your ability to make changes to your building if you are not seeking these tax credits. Listing provides owners with a way to do a historic renovation and recoup up to 40 percent of their costs. This proposed district is going from eligible to listed and the only change in regulatory oversight is if you want to do something historic. If you want to paint your building pink polka dots you are free to do so. If you want to change it from masonry to glass you can do that; the only difference is listing will allow you to apply for 20 percent federal tax credits on eligible costs, excluding financing, demolition, and site work, as well as 20 percent state tax credits. He said that he usually finds 85 to 95 percent of costs are eligible. He stressed that if you are not seeking the historic tax credits there is no new regulatory framework or process that comes with listing.

Mr. Steiner added that there is no connection between being National Register eligible or listed and being designated as a local landmark. He said that listing is not a gateway to getting landmarks designation. He thinks that the fear of a NYC landmark designation is going to kill his project, which would otherwise be \$560 million, 888,000 sq ft, eight sound stages and try to create in Sunset Park what his company did in the Navy Yard, which is a very successful film and television production studio. He said that he has been working on this project for six years. The projected cost is \$550 million, assuming they get the historic tax credits. He said that without the historic tax credits, he won't be able to move ahead with the project. He feels that the misinformation is not dissimilar to what Industry City felt from the community when they were seeking to make changes in what they wanted. He feels sandbagged and upset about the misinformation, as there is no downside to listing, there's only upside. He said that this

is not local landmarking; this is an NR listing of the district, which has been eligible since 1986. He added that he just doesn't understand the panic that's been fomented given that there's no change in process unless you want to get tax credits equal up to 40 percent of your costs.

Jim Somoza of Industry City spoke next. Mr. Somoza said that he did want Mr. Steiner's project to move forward and that he likes the project, but nobody can guarantee that it won't lead to local landmarking. He said that nobody can guarantee that listing would not be a sort of catalyst potentially leading to landmarking. That is Mr. Somoza's main concern, and he added that when you name something a historic district it gets the attention of preservationists, and nobody can tell him otherwise. He said that he is not trying to fearmonger, but the vast majority of his neighboring owners, landlords, etc., feel the same way as Industry City does and that they do not want government participation. He said that Industry City has, to date, spent \$430 million redeveloping their project and if anybody looks at what they've done here nobody could say that they've done anything other than respect the historic nature of the buildings. He said that we don't want to have anything that possibly heads them towards government participation. Mr. Somoza said that this is not a personal thing, that this is a business thing. He understands why Mr. Steiner would be more okay with this because he is going to build new sound stages and he is going to renovate two structures. Mr. Somoza feels that Mr. Steiner will have completed his work and received the historic tax credits before local landmarking occurs, whereas Industry City will still be doing development work including on Buildings 22, 24, and 26; so Mr. Somoza feels that his company will be out there with the risk of being locally landmarked while Mr. Steiner has finished his work and gotten his tax credits before that happens. While Mr. Somoza understands why Mr. Steiner would like to take advantage of the tax credits, he said the issue is that they are on different timelines. He feels that Mr. Steiner will be done with his project before local landmarking occurs, whereas Industry City's development projects are happening later and could be impacted by local landmarking. Mr. Somoza said he and the vast majority of owners, 90 percent plus, object to the listing. He stated that we don't want to be a part of the listing which could even possibly be subject to further regulation because that is how the government works. While he has a great relationship with the city and EDC, he and his fellow owners want to be left alone and don't want anybody interfering with what they're doing. He reiterated that nobody could guarantee him that local landmarking wouldn't happen as a result of the NR listing. He said that listing is a step in that direction and that we would be crazy to say otherwise. He said that they were not trying to fearmonger and that they had conversations with their fellow landlords, and they did not try to hide any of the facts. They shared the benefits of listing and also discussed the risks that come with it. He said that everyone felt the same way as he did.

Doug Perrelli said we clearly understand the points that both Mr. Steiner and Mr. Somoza have made but we need to give other people the opportunity to speak. Mr. Somoza asked to make one more point saying that he didn't want to just come here with complaints but that he has a suggestion to make. He asked if it would be possible to break this district that has been under consideration since 1986 into two or three

separate districts. He said that Industry City had no issue with Doug Steiner or Steiner Studios going forward with something like this availing themselves of the tax credits but what we want is to be left out of the district. He said that it seems there are probably three districts: one would be Industry City, one would be the EDC/Steiner Studios/Made in New York campus, and the other would be the blocks between 44th and 51st Street and between First and Second Avenues. For now, he wants to know if it is possible to break it into three so that EDC and Doug Steiner can move forward.

Dan McEneny thanked Mr. Somoza for the question. Dan said that this is a very commonly asked question if there is a way to truncate historic districts and draw different lines but, what this Board and the State Historic Preservation Office is tasked with doing is following the National Register criteria for listing and the regulations set out by the National Park Service. The criteria and regs do not allow for dividing a functionally related complex of buildings associated with one linked history. While it would be quite convenient if we could cherry-pick and remove buildings, the nomination would be bounced back immediately from the National Park Service.

Mr. Somoza responded that his answer to that is what is their choice because the National Park Service has to follow the "book" so under their auspices it is not moving forward because we have a majority of the vote against the listing. He said he is well aware that the State does not consider owner objections so the actual effect of this is exactly what Dan just said. Isn't there a way to have a conversation about that? He said since the nomination is not going to go forward for National Register listing because of the owner objections couldn't there be a conversation about subdividing the district?

Dan said that he appreciated Mr. Somoza pointing this out and he is correct in that today the Board will consider it for nomination; the Board has a dual role of making a recommendation to the National Park Service and recommending listing for the State Register. This Board today will be making a recommendation to the National Park Service based on the documentation and again following the National Park Service criteria for listing. Dan said he agreed with Mr. Somoza that there should be an opportunity to do things a little bit differently and be a little bit more flexible, but the program regulations have not changed in many decades. Mr. Somoza asked, can't those regulations be changed? He was wondering if there is a conversation that we could have with somebody to say here's a situation where there is a benefit to a project but the vast majority of the remaining owners in the district don't want listing; can't we figure out a way to move forward. He said that we are not asking to be taken off the eligible list, but we are trying to find a compromise where just a portion of the district is moving forward to listing. Mr. Somoza said that just because the regulations have not changed for many years it doesn't necessarily mean that they have to stay that way if there is a logical alternative.

Dan responded to Mr. Somoza that we are now in the midst of a comment period, and he noted that Mr. Somoza did send in a letter of objection, and he appreciates him participating in the process but that process is not done. Whatever action this Board chooses to make today, Mr. Somoza can continue to engage with the National Park

Service right before they make a determination of eligibility which, as you know, doesn't change much for the property owner so I do encourage you to stay engaged and to elevate comments to the National Park Service about their rules and regulations but that's just about the best we can offer you at this meeting.

Doug Perrelli said that from the perspective of the Board, all we can react to is what's being presented to us. Mr. Somoza said that he understands this; he is a lawyer so he knows civil procedures, etc., but he figured that in this forum where we have Doug Steiner on the phone as well as many of the neighboring landlords it was something that he would throw out there to see if there was some way we could do this even if it's outside of this particular forum and even if this doesn't have the jurisdiction for that.

Doug Perrelli asked if other people wanted to make comments.

Ralph Barone, one of the landlords who has four properties in the district, spoke next. He said that he had originally objected to the proposed listing because he was, unfortunately, misinformed. He recently withdrew his objection and said that he is now in favor of the listing. He believed that he had been contacted by an attorney who was acting on behalf of Industry City. Mr. Barone felt that the attorney had used fear-mongering because the way that it was portrayed to him was that the area was going to be locally landmarked and that the property owners would not be able to do anything to their buildings so that is why he had originally objected. He wished that Doug Steiner would have had a conversation with everyone beforehand because it would have changed people's opinions about the proposed NR listing. He said he loves what Industry City has done and he is happy for them, but he added that Mr. Steiner's project will be hurt if we don't vote in favor of the district. He said that Mr. Steiner's project is going to bring many jobs to the neighborhood, so he only sees an upside to it.

Mr. Somoza asked Mr. Barone what business he is in. Dan McEneny interjected that this is a comment period and not a debate. Mr. Somoza responded that he was asking as he believes that there is a business relationship between Mr. Barone and Mr. Steiner. Mr. Barone said that he is a real estate developer, and he is also in the manufacturing business.

Peter Volandes, the owner of Volmar Construction, which has been located at 44<sup>th</sup> Street and 2nd Avenue for over 30 years, spoke next. He said that his business is the part of the district shown on the map as the "1902 expansion." In addition to being the owner of Volmar, he is also a trustee of the Museum of the City of New York, so he has a very keen interest in topics related to historic preservation throughout the city. Mr. Volandes said that he is a supporter of Mr. Steiner's plans but that he objects to the overreach of the proposal and what he believes to be an overreach of a designation of an entire neighborhood as a historic district. In reference to what Dan McEneny said earlier, Mr. Volandes said that "shared histories" is a very broad and general term. He feels that many of the properties that are located within the proposed district here have no historical relevance whatsoever. They are one-story buildings, similar to what he owns, and are made of block and plank with facades that have been altered many times

in the last 100 years. He sees no reason for the listing and he shares Industry City's concern that this is a path toward a local landmark designation that will impair marketability and optionality with their properties. He absolutely objects.

Mr. Barone asked if there are cases where other National Register-listed buildings have subsequently been locally landmarked. Dan McEneny said yes that there are examples where listed properties go on to be locally landmarked, but he added that it is more likely that a property is landmarked first and then added to the National Register. The local landmark process is regulatory.

Dan said that in the cases where a National Register-listed district goes on to be landmarked usually it is a much smaller footprint. He added again that, more typically, properties are landmarked by New York City first and then added to the Register later to access tax credits.

Richard Sidebottom, who works with Ryan LLC and is the tax credit consultant for Mr. Steiner, spoke next. He said that his consulting firm has worked on hundreds of tax credit projects over the last 15 to 20 years. He said that he wanted to support what Mr. Steiner said regarding the National Register listing process. He added that the positives far outweigh any sort of regulation that comes with this. The area has been recognized since 1986 and if it were not to be listed it would be a loss of an important driver of investment in the area. He noted that they have a Part Two tax credit application that has already been approved for this building and he mentioned that as part of that process with the State and the National Park Service, we have requested and received approval to do partial demolitions. He said that the feasibility of working with your building for historic tax credits does not mean the end of being able to do things to your property. He pointed out that, as has been mentioned before, what Mr. Steiner's going through is a voluntary process and the landmarks process is a completely different part of the historic preservation landscape. He thanked the Board for their consideration. He hopes that those who have objected to the listing will change their opinion and support Mr. Steiner and his investment in the neighborhood.

Mr. Steiner reiterated that there is no link between National Register listing and landmark status. He said that he has as much if not more to fear of landmark status than Industry City. He added that Industry City is a great project and they have done an amazing job. He doesn't see a link between listing the district and any kind of landmark status which is a completely different world altogether.

Doug Perrelli said that the role of the Board is to make a decision about the nomination form. The Board is not making this decision based on the tax credits but on the merits of the National Register eligibility of this district. He then asked for a motion. Wint asked what the percentage of ownership objection was. Doug said that it was over 51 percent.

Motion to approve: Tom Maggs

Second: Carol Clark

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 15: Commercial Buildings at Broadway and Michigan Avenue, Buffalo, Erie County**

Jennifer Walkowski

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Commerce/Trade; Social History

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: ca. 1840-1922

This is an approved commercial tax credit project.

Discussion:

Doug mentioned that the adjacent asphalt lot is the location of Mary Talbert's former house; it was here in her parlor where the first meeting of the entity that would become the NAACP took place in the early 1800s. Jennifer said that this property is within the Michigan Street African-American Heritage Corridor. Doug noted that located within the corridor is the Baptist Church, Peyton Harris's house, Mary Talbert's house lot, and the building being nominated today. He said that this is a really interesting part of downtown Buffalo and that he is currently doing an archaeology project at the Baptist Church.

Motion to approve: Doug Perrelli

Second: Wint Aldrich

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 16: Austin Street Police Athletic League (PAL) Building, Buffalo, Erie County**

Jennifer Walkowski

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History

Period of Significance: 1955-1974

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Erika Krieger

Second: Fabiana Chiu-Rinaldi

Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 17: Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church and Convent, Buffalo, Erie County**

Jennifer Walkowski

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

C: Architecture  
Period of Significance: 1913-1915

Discussion: None.

Motion to approve: Jay DiLorenzo  
Second: Molly Garfinkel  
Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 18: Nies Block, Salamanca, Cattaraugus County**

Jennifer Walkowski

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Commerce; Politics/Government

C: Architecture

Period of Significance: 1891-1919

Discussion: Molly asked if the Seneca Nation had been involved with the nomination. Jennifer responded that they were notified as they are property owners, but we didn't hear anything back from them. She also clarified that the Seneca are not part of the tax credit project, as they do not own the building, but they do own the land on which the building stands.

Motion to approve: Molly Garfinkel  
Second: Doug Perrelli  
Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Nomination 19: Greenwich Village Historic District Additional Documentation, Manhattan, New York County**

Kathleen LaFrank

Criteria/Areas of Significance:

A: Social History/LGBT

Criteria Consideration G: Social History/LGBT

Period of Significance: ca. 1840-1996

Kath said that this nomination update is the twelfth project funded by an Underrepresented Communities Grant from the National Park Service. We received a letter of support from the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Discussion: Ken Lustbader of the NYC LGBT History Project noted that this is the first National Register historic district that will have additional documentation for LGBTQ history so that in itself is groundbreaking and it's wonderful to review this during Pride Month. He thanked SHPO staff Kath LaFrank, Kathy Howe, Dan McEneny, and Christina Vagvolgyi and all of the people that he has worked with over the years to

create this collaborative effort that helped launch and sustain the NYC LGBT History Project and make it so successful. If it wasn't for their partnership with the State Historic Preservation Office, he said that in some ways they'd be adrift. This nomination update is a model for Provincetown, MA, which is doing the same thing in their historic district. He said the NYC LGBT History Project has uncovered so many sites and it's through these Underrepresented Communities grants that they've created a cultural landscape that they've then used for interpretation such as a walking tour he gave last night. He said that they are now on the Bloomberg Connects digital guide. He added that they have uncovered this history to affirm their motto of making an invisible history visible, so as someone who wrote their thesis on Greenwich Village in 1993 in grad school as an LGBTQ enclave it's heartening to see this 31 years later. He also thanked Amanda Davis and the interns who prepared this meticulous project. The research is in SHPO's online CRIS system now making it accessible to the public.

Kath said that she hoped that the Board took a minute to look at some of the many other famous people who lived here, which was impressive.

Molly said how deeply she admires this project. It is critical and it is urgent, and it is unthinkable that one more minute would go by that any history of Greenwich Village would not include this important highlight in this community. She thanked the NYC LGBT History Project for all of the work that they've done.

Jay asked what the level of level of significance is for this updated nomination. Kath said it is of national significance. She added that what she really likes about it is the fact that LPC designated the local Greenwich Village historic district it in the same year that Stonewall happened. She said that we later listed Stonewall and now we're getting around to going back to Greenwich Village's LGBT history. It is an arc of history.

Amanda Davis, also of the NYC LGBT History Project, said that what really struck her about Greenwich Village was the incredible number of LGBTQ spaces within this neighborhood spanning over the course of decades. The density of these spaces available to the community and not just bars but sites of activism, organizations, residences, the arts, and more is impressive. When you look at neighborhoods across the United States and elsewhere, it is really rare to find these things all happening at one time and for such a long period and it speaks to Greenwich Village as a beacon worldwide for LGBTQ people. She said it was wonderful to work on this project and then said that what Ken didn't mention about his thesis is when he worked on it in the early '90s he was discouraged by his professors. He was told not to write it or questioned why he would choose to write about this. She said that perhaps it is just her being younger, but she thinks that it is crazy to not think of the LGBTQ community's influence and existence in this neighborhood for so long and so it's really thrilling to be here today to be part of this. She thanked New York State for continuing to lead the way in being a wonderful partner in this effort.

Motion to approve: Molly Garfinkel  
Second: Gretchen Sorin



Abstentions: 0

**Vote: Recommended 10 in favor, 0 opposed**

### **New Business**

Doug said that the upcoming SRB meeting dates are set (September 12<sup>th</sup> and December 5<sup>th</sup>, both in the Capital region). There was no other new business to report.

### **Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made by Tom Maggs and seconded by Fabiana Chiu-Rinaldi. The motion was carried by unanimous consent and the meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

-Minutes prepared and submitted by Board Secretary Kathy Howe.

DRAFT