

MINUTES

175th MEETING

**NEW YORK STATE BOARD FOR HISTORIC
PRESERVATION**

21 March 2019

**Peebles Island State Park
Waterford, New York**

The following were present:

SRB Members

Doug Perrelli, Chair
Jennifer Lemak
Erika Krieger
Paul Stewart
Wint Aldrich
Chuck Vandrei
Kristin Herron
Lucy Waletzky

Absent

Wayne Goodman
Jay DiLorenzo

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Erik Kulleseid, Commissioner
Daniel Mackay, Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation
Michael Lynch, Director, Division for Historic Preservation
Christopher Flagg, Director, Historic Site Bureau
Julian Adams, Director, Community Preservation Services
John Bonafide, Director, Technical Services Bureau
Kathleen LaFrank, board secretary

Staff

Virginia Bartos
Jennifer Betsworth
Jennifer Walkowski
Bill Krattinger
Greg Smith
Tyler Wilcox
Michele Phillips
Cordell Reaves
Chelsea Towers
Olivia Brazee
Linda Mackey
Dan Bagrow
James Finelli
Kathy Howe
Nancy Herter
Erin Czernecki
Matt Shepherd
Sloane Bullough
Christina Vagvolgyi
Mike Schifferli
Marie Sarchiapone

Guests

Kerry Traynor, Aldrich and Ray Manufacturing Building
 Chris Cirillo, East Harlem Historic District
 Georgette Grier-Key, SANS Historic District
 Guest for Alku + Alku Toinen
 Penny Watson, Winged Foot Golf Club
 Mary Ellen Hern

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Chair Doug Perrelli.

Order of Business

Following the roll call, Michael Lynch reminded the board members that since only eight members were present for today's meeting and seven was a quorum of the full board, that it would require seven votes to pass or reject any item on the agenda. After this announcement, the minutes of the 174nd meeting of the State Board for Historic Preservation were reviewed.

Motion to Approve: Paul Stewart

Second: Erika Krieger

Vote: Approved, 8 in favor

NOMINATION REVIEWS**Board Members Introduction**

Each member first introduced him or herself and provided a bit of background information to the board, staff, and guests.

Aldrich and Ray Manufacturing Building**Buffalo, Erie County****SHPO Presentation: Kathleen LaFrank**

National Register Coordinator Kathleen LaFrank gave a summary of proposal, using photos and Sanborn maps, to illustrate the staff recommendation that the building did not meet the criteria: The building proposed for nomination is the Aldrich and Ray Manufacturing Building, located at 1491 Niagara Street, Buffalo, in a commercial and industrial corridor largely defined by properties from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Aldrich and Ray Company was an important manufacturer of copper and brass products in Buffalo during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The company was founded in 1879 by Schuyler Aldrich. In its early years, it operated at two different locations, at 14-20 Perry and 74

Washington. In 1884 Isaac A. Aldrich entered the firm, and in 1886 George A. Ray was admitted as a partner. The company moved to 1491 Niagara Street in 1888 and, shortly thereafter, Aldrich and Ray built its first manufacturing facility on the current site. This is an 1889 Sanborn map showing that original four-story factory – You should also note the two-story police station, which is on the right side of the image. Less than a year later, in 1893, the factory was destroyed by fire. After the original factory was destroyed, the company purchased the adjacent site to the north, the location of the police station, which had either been destroyed or seriously damaged in the same fire.

This is from an 1894 atlas and, according to the nomination, this is inconsistent with the timeline because it appears to show the site as it was before the fire. It shows the original four-story factory and the 2-story police station in 1894; however, we know that they burned in 1893. So, we agree with the nomination author that this map must actually show the site in 1893 – it may have been prepared before the fire and not updated before the atlas went to press. This rendering shows that by 1900 Aldrich and Ray had constructed a U-shaped building more than twice the size of the original. While no photos of the completed building have been found, this rendering suggests that the newly expanded factory embodied a consistent, unified design and that the new building may have incorporated a portion of the front wall of the former police station. If you look at the left side of the first floor, under the sign that says “office,” you can see that the first floor windows on the north side are different. The new building was three stories tall and thirteen bays wide. Two wings, eleven and nineteen bays deep, extended back from the main block on either side of a drive-through from Niagara Street. The rendering is supported by the 1900 Sanborn map, which shows the same configuration and also shows the offices in the northwestern quadrant, while the rest of the building was laid out for manufacturing and storage spaces. A fourth floor was added to the south wing in 1904. (again, there is no historic photo, but maps confirm)

The Aldrich and Ray Company and its successor firm, the George A. Ray Manufacturing Company, occupied the U-shaped building until 1953. You can see in this 1950 Sanborn that the George A. Ray Company still occupied most, but not all of the building; and a series of Sanborns indicate that the building remained entirely intact to its construction period. The same U-shaped configuration remained as built until 1954, when a one-story gantry crane wing was added at the southeast corner by a subsequent company, the Fedders-Quigan Company. The maps show that until well into the mid twentieth century all of Aldrich and Ray and its successor company’s functions were carried out in the U-shaped complex and the building retained its architectural integrity as a typical late nineteenth century industrial factory.

In 1976, while under the ownership of the S.A. Day Company, the entire north half of the building was destroyed by fire, leaving only the south wing of the former Aldrich and Ray Company building and the 1954 addition added by a later company. This image shows all four floors of the interior as they are today.

SHPO Opinion

In our opinion, the fragment that remains, which is about half of the historic Aldrich and Ray Factory, does not retain sufficient integrity to illustrate either a typical late nineteenth century manufacturing complex or the operation of the Aldrich and Ray Company during the period of

significance. At no time during the Aldrich and Ray Company's history or during the building's historic period of industrial use (1894-1954) did it ever resemble what exists today. What exists today represents the building's history only from 1976 - the date of the fire.

Now, how did we make that evaluation? Well, there are two parts to establishing eligibility: First, a building must represent a significant theme. In this case, that theme is industry. We feel that the draft nomination has more than enough information to support the claim that Aldrich and Ray was a significant local industry. So it meets test one.

But, the second test is that a building must have enough integrity to illustrate that significant theme – in this case, can the building illustrate the industrial history of the Aldrich and Ray company? The National Register gives us seven measures for judging integrity [they are: location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association] and it requires that a building must meet four of the seven measures to be eligible. Those four should be the ones that are most important to illustrating the significant theme [in this case, industry], and two of them *must be* feeling and association. When we establish the relevant integrity measures, we also look at the relative rarity of the building type. If something is the only surviving example of its type, for example, the only factory left in a small village where that industry was the major employer for that village, then we are allowed to be a little more lenient when we look at its integrity. However, if there are many examples of a certain type of resource, then we are required to be stricter about the integrity required as we look at multiple examples. Unfortunately, late nineteenth century industrial buildings with typical mill construction are not particularly rare in Buffalo; thus, we are limited to a relatively strict reading of the integrity criteria for this resource. The other very important consideration is period of significance: In order to meet the eligibility criteria, a property must retain the character it had during the period of significance.

So, if we go through the seven integrity measures for this proposal, we can all agree that the building retains integrity of location and setting. So that means we have two of the four we need.

The next three are related, and they are integrity of design, materials and workmanship. Workmanship is more about craftsmanship or design innovation, and it isn't really relevant to a building like this one. But design and materials are. *Design* is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a building. If you look at the rendering, you can see that the surviving wing has only half of its original design, half of the form, half of the space, half of the plan, half of the structure, and, by extension, half of the materials as the original. And if we look at functional integrity, which would be the spaces needed to represent the history of a manufacturing building, crucial parts of the building in which manufacturing functions occurred are gone, as is the office, which is arguably one of a business's most important spaces. The part of the building that remains is half of the factory that was designed, constructed and used by Aldrich and Ray. We believe that it is essentially a fragment of the original factory and that it does not retain integrity of design or materials.

So what about feeling and association? For the building to be eligible, it must retain integrity of both feeling and association. Association is the direct link between the building and its historic theme during the period of significance. Since the building did not achieve its current appearance until 1976, long after Aldrich and Ray and its successor firm stopped using the

building, we believe that the building does not retain its significant association with the Aldrich and Ray Manufacturing Company during the period of significance. Feeling is a much more subjective measure, but it refers to the property's expression of the historic sense of the period. With only half of what existed remaining, without the company offices, without the drive through and yard, we believe that the fragment lacks the feeling of the twentieth century factory that operated on this site for 80 years.

So, what about the draft nomination itself?

The draft nomination argues for significance under criterion A in the area of "Industrial History." As I noted, the draft meets this test very well; we agree that it contains more than enough information to support the claim that Aldrich and Ray was a significant local industry.

However, the nomination does not try to make the case that the surviving fragment is intact enough to represent the history of the Aldrich and Ray Company. Instead, the nomination presents the argument that the building fragment alone is significant because only the south wing was constructed for the Aldrich and Ray Manufacturing Company. The draft states that the north wing, the part of the building that was destroyed by fire in 1976, was not an important part of the building because it was adapted from the earlier police station. We do not believe that this is a valid argument.

The Sanborn maps confirm that after the 1893 fire, an expansive U-shaped factory was constructed that housed all aspects of the company's offices and manufacturing functions throughout the rest of its existence. Whether or not the newly expanded U-shaped factory incorporated a portion of the former police station is irrelevant. The Sanborn maps prove that the entire building as developed (either adapted and/or constructed) after the fire is what was used by the company and what represented the company's history and development over the period of significance. In addition, the north wing was the location of the company's offices, a vital part of its operation. We do not believe an argument can be made that supports the significance of the surviving wing alone as an industrial building when it was clearly a part of a large, integrated design scheme for a factory that incorporated all aspects of the manufacturing process.

Summary

The board's task is to determine whether, in your judgment, the building is 1. Associated with a significance theme and, if the answer is yes, 2. Does it retain enough integrity to the period of significance to illustrate that theme using the seven integrity criteria?

Consultant Presentation: Kerry Traynor, Consultant

Kerry Traynor, who wrote the nomination draft, made a presentation based on the draft nomination, arguing that what survived was significant under criterion A in a local context because of the industrial history of the Niagara Street corridor. She also said that several other resources in Buffalo, notably the Ziegele-Phoenix Refrigeration House and Office and the FN Burt Warehouse 3, had been listed on the National Register even though portions of them had been demolished. She also said that what was shown in the rendering was not accurate and that it did not depict what had been built; she argued that only the six bays shown on the right side of the rendering could be verified as have been built.

Discussion:

Doug Perrelli asked Kerry to clarify if she meant to say that what was built was not what was shown in the rendering and she said that yes, she believed that there was something wrong with the rendering. She felt that the police station had survived and that the new construction was connected to it in some form but that there were window openings on the upper floors and that the drive through could not have been where it was shown in the rendering. She asked why the police station windows would have been retained if the company sought to unify the factory? Her argument was based on her belief that what was constructed for the company was only what survived the fire and that that piece alone could be evaluated as significant.

Paul Stewart asked what the building gains from National Register listing, and Kerry explained that the building owner would like to restore the building using the tax credits.

Doug asked Jennifer Walkowski if she would like to add anything, and Jennifer noted that that the SHPO had listed a number of buildings along Niagara Street and that staff had studied Niagara Street carefully to determine if there were district potential; however, there was just too much loss and too much infill and the street just did not rise to the level of National Register eligibility based on its lack of integrity. She also clarified a few points about the buildings Kerry had cited as examples of buildings that had suffered loss and been listed. She explained that the Ziegele-Phoenix Refrigeration House and Office was listed not as a fragment of a brewery complex but as a rare surviving building that documented the entire refrigeration process and that it included the company's main office, while the FN Burt Factory C was in itself an intact example of a reinforced concrete daylight factory. Each was different from the example presented today because each had enough integrity to represent a context, while the SHPO believes that the resource proposed is a fragment of a building and a fragment of a factory.

Kristin Herron spoke of the need for evidence if the rendering could not be relied upon to provide evidence of what *was* built? She felt that the rendering was now irrelevant if it did not document what was built and asked what physical evidence we had of what the building looked like. She also wondered if there was a different image or argument that would make the case stronger.

Kath said that the Sanborn map provided definitive evidence of what was built and asked Jennifer to explain it to the board. Jennifer concurred that the rendering may or may not be absolutely accurate in its details; however, Sanborn maps were made for fire insurance purposes and they relied on precise accuracy. She pointed out the details of the building as built that were noted on the Sanborn map and explained that multiple Sanborns between 1900 and 1960 documented that the U-shaped building had been built as we described it and that there could be little argument that the building as it existed was half of the Aldrich and Ray factory.

Kristin then asked if there were a different argument that might make the case for the building – from those who don't think it's eligible? Kath explained that when we get a proposed tax credit project, we do everything we can to try find a way to support it, to find a way to say that it is eligible, and that this had gone through multiple reviews by multiple staff. She explained that staff had tried to find a way to make the case that there was enough of the building to represent

the history of Aldrich and Ray, but that there was absolutely no way to say it had the requisite amount of integrity to be eligible.

Wint Aldrich felt that this was a good opportunity to remind the board members that they (and the staff) represented the National Park Service and that the board - especially when it came to tax credits – had an interest in maintaining New York’s excellent reputation. He said that because much of what the board does seems routine and gets approved, the members should pay careful attention to cases like this and make sure that they were not on shaky ground. He felt that it was excellent to have such a thorough discussion, but that he was inclined to listen carefully to the thoughtful and careful analysis and recommendation of staff.

Kristin said that the Sanborn map had impacted her thinking and she now believed that U shape was critical to integrity.

Motion to **reject**: Wint Aldrich

Second: Lucy Waletzky

Vote: 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Commissioner’s Report

Commissioner Kulleseid introduced himself to the board members and staff by explaining that his first real job was as a lifeguard at Harriman State Park in 1982. He described briefly his background in land conservation and said that he felt both fortunate and intimidated to be following in the footsteps of former Commissioner Rose Harvey. He explained that the turnabout during her tenure had been extraordinary. He talked about ensuring the best possible visitor experience in our parks and how important it was to promote the fact that we were about to hit 5 billion dollars in tax credits, that the credit was being used in 56 of 62 counties, and that New York was number one in use of the credits for the fourth straight year. He expressed interest in promoting credits in the communities that were gateways to our parks and thanked the board for playing a critical role in qualifying properties for credits.

The commissioner also mentioned that DHP was preparing to launch a statewide survey of our parks and landscapes to assist in planning our stewardship of these parks. He thanked the board, Deputy Commissioner Daniel Mackay, Director Michael Lynch, and the staff because their passion and commitment have made New York number one in National Register nominations, number one in tax credit dollars, number one in LGBT nominated sites, and commended the newest project to address civil rights in upstate New York through the African American Civil Rights survey. He concluded by commending the bureau’s archeological team, in particular Nancy Herter, for its efforts on behalf of the recently uncovered burials discovered in the village of Lake George.

Report of Staff Visit to the Netherlands

Cordell Reaves and Michele Phillips, both staff of the Historic Sites Bureau, gave brief, yet informative, reports on their ongoing cultural exchange with the Netherlands and its value to our interpretative programs. Each had the opportunity to visit the Netherlands within the past year as part of this program.

NOMINATION REVIEWS Continued

Sag Harbor Hills, Azurest and Ninevah Beach Subdivisions Historic District, Sag Harbor, Suffolk County

Presented by: Jennifer Betsworth

After Jennifer's presentation, Georgette Grier-Key, executive directive of the Eastville Historical Society, the nomination sponsor, explained that it was a pleasure for her to be here and that she was both humbled and emotional. She thanked Deputy Commissioner Daniel Mackay and the staff, especially Julian Adams and Jennifer Betsworth, and the board, especially Jennifer Lemak, saying that she had called upon them for help many times because it was important to make sure that she could see herself and her ancestors in the built environment of Long Island. She noted that it was one thing to see evidence on paper but that it was another to see it reflected in the built environment, and that the more that these historic places disappear, the more that she felt that her story will disappear. She was also grateful that this district reflected a story that was not about slavery but about civil rights, ownership, and the American Dream, and that the people of her community had fought against odds to achieve the American Dream and that that story of achievement was equally important.

Kristin Herron commented that it was a wonderful nomination but asked why people were objecting. Jennifer said that a few were concerned that a locally designated historic district might follow; however, she noted that she had many letters of support and complimented the sponsor for an extraordinary effort to educate the public about the goals and meaning of the nomination.

Doug Perrilli asked Jennifer to say a word about criterion consideration G and how the period of significance was chosen. Jennifer explained that the fifty-year cutoff was 1969; however, we had decided to extend it to 1977 because there were tangible changes to the community that could be associated with events that occurred in that year and that this necessitated justifying exceptional significance under criterion consideration G. Those events had to do with road paving and municipal water, both of which made the community less insular and more accessible to outsiders and precipitated changes to the social and physical fabric of the community.

Wint Aldrich said that this was a wonderful moving story and a marvelously put together nomination. He added that it couldn't have been better stated than by our visitor, who came at such a great distance to speak with real emotion. He added that this is close to the heights of what we do here.

Daniel Mackay noted that this nomination was further proof of the continuing diversification of the National Register list in New York State and the efforts and commitment by staff to seek out, embrace, and encourage these types of nominations. This is where we want the NR program to go, not just in New York but nationally. He noted that he was glad that staff was committed to that goal and thanked them for those efforts, calling it a proud moment for both sides.

Motion to approve: Kristin Herron

Second: Paul Stewart

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Alku and Alku Toinen, New York New York County

Presented by: Jennifer Betsworth

Discussion:

Wint Aldrich questioned why the coops were not recommended for national significance if they were the first in the country? Jennifer said that we definitely had the documentation to prove that they were the first in New York State but that in order to document national significance, we would have to develop a context for coops in the entire nation and discuss other examples. We would have also needed definitive proof, noting that an absolute, such as “first” or the “only,” is always more difficult to prove.

Doug Perrelli asked if the nomination could be amended once it’s listed and Jennifer replied that it absolutely could. She noted that the group was eager to apply for tax credits now and did not want to do additional research at the moment. Kath LaFrank added that it was fairly easy to add another area or layer of significance once a property is listed; they had only to submit additional pages justifying the new area or level of significance and need not return to the board unless the boundary was being expanded or reduced.

Motion to approve: Chuck Vandrei

Second: Kristin Herron

Vote: Recommended, 7 in favor, 0 opposed

East Harlem Historic District, New York, New York County

Presented by: Jennifer Betsworth

Discussion:

After the presentation, the board heard from Chris Cerillo, representing Landmark East Harlem, the nomination sponsor, which came together about four years ago, as the neighborhood was gearing up for major planning and rezoning. The organization was formed to ensure preservation of the neighborhood, noting that East Harlem has been affected by successive waves of redevelopment, including public housing, urban renewal, and market rate housing. With the city’s latest development schemes, including the 2017 rezoning and the new Second Avenue subway, concerned citizens wanted to make sure that central node of East Harlem had National

Register protections while allowing small homeowners to take advantage of the homeowners tax credit. Mr. Cerillo thanked and complimented Jennifer Betsworth for her excellent job at the public meeting, helping to address everyone's concerns and to answer their questions about the tax credits.

Wint Aldrich noted that his daughter and her family lived in a contributing building in the district but noted that they were merely renters.

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Jennifer Lemak

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Winged Foot Golf Club, Mamaroneck, Westchester County

Presented by: Bill Krattinger

Discussion:

Penny Watson, nomination author, thanked the board and noted that the Wingfoot management was very aware of the course's history and was hoping to pursue NHL designation in time for the course's centennial. She mentioned that there were only five or six courses that combine a course designed by Tillinghast with a clubhouse designed by Clifford C. Wendehack and, of them, Winged Foot is the most intact and the most significant.

Bill told the board that he, Kath LaFrank, and Michael Lynch had had an extensive discussion with Jim Gabbert of NPS about the evolution and restoration of golf courses and the fact that Winged Foot had been so heavily restored to bring back the Tillinghast design (in the process removing the alterations by Robert Trent Jones) was not an issue to the NPS.

Wint Aldrich asked how many golf courses in New York were listed? Various staff replied that we did not know exactly, naming Bethpage, Shinecock Hills, one in central New York, and some in districts, including several around Otsego Lake in the Glimmerglass district. The only other one by Tillinghast was Bethpage. We noted that Jones designed four important courses in our state parks in the Central New York Region, but they were not listed. Kristin Herron noted that the holes were so thoroughly described but noted that there were not enough photos to accompany the descriptions and asked that more be added. Doug Perrelli asked about the restoration of original plan materials; however, Penny Watson thought that was not as great a concern as the architectural design of the holes themselves.

Motion to approve: Erika Krieger

Second: Kristin Herron

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Jacob and Caroline Hawkins House, Hamptonburgh Orange County

Presented by: Bill Krattinger

Discussion: none

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Lucy Waletzky

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Waterloo High School, Waterloo, Seneca County

Presented by: Virginia Bartos

Discussion:

Doug Perrelli asked if the windows were updated in 1973 and Virginia said that they were.

Motion to approve: Doug Perrelli

Second: Chuck Vandrei

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Whedon-Schumacher House, Syracuse, Onondaga County

Presented by: Virginia Bartos

Discussion:

Doug Perrelli asked for an explanation of why the interior architectural elements were put into storage and where they were. Virginia explained that a previous owner had begun to restore the house but had gotten in over his head and that the elements were stored in the house itself.

Motion to approve: Erika Krieger

Second: Doug Perrelli

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

After the vote, Daniel Mackay commented that we were happy to be developing a more active and positive relationship with land bank in Syracuse, complimenting land bank staff for reaching out to us with National Register and tax credit proposals.

Buffalo Public School #51 (PS 51), Buffalo, Erie County

Presented by: Jennifer Walkowski

Discussion:

Doug Perrelli asked Jennifer to explain how the school related to a multiple property nomination. Jennifer explained that it was part of the Black Rock neighborhood multiple property submission and that it met the requirements as an example of public architecture within that MPDF.

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Chuck Vandrei

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Seneca Plumbing and Heating Company Building, Buffalo, Erie County

Presented by: Jennifer Walkowski

Discussion: none

Motion to approve: Paul Stewart

Second: Erika Krieger

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

First Presbyterian Church of Lewiston and Lewiston Village Cemetery, Lewiston, Niagara County

Presented by: Jennifer Walkowski

Discussion: none

Motion to approve: Lucy Waletzky

Second: Kristin Herrin

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

George Washington Hotel, New York, New York County

Presented by: Jennifer Betsworth

Discussion:

Doug Perrilli asked Jennifer to explain why the period of significance was only 1930-35?

Jennifer explained that the period was chosen to cover the years when the hotel was owned and operated by its original owners and best represented an “apartment hotel.” Kristin Herron commented on the artwork commissioned from Bard College students and noted that the hotel now had an artist in residence program.

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Kristin Herron

Vote: Recommended, 7 in favor, 0 opposed

St. Luke's Hospital, New York New York County

Presented by: Jennifer Betsworth

Discussion: none

Motion to Approve: Lucy Waletzky

Second: Paul Stewart

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Stanley H. Lowndes House, Northport, Suffolk County

Presented by: Jennifer Betsworth

Discussion: none

Motion to Approve: Kristin Herron

Second: Jennifer Lemak

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Camp Hill School, Pomona, Rockland County

Presented by: Bill Krattinger

Discussion:

Doug Perrelli asked Bill if the significance was in any way derived from its proximity to the Burgess Meredith property? Bill reported that no, there was no relationship!

Motion to approve: Doug Perrelli

Second: Lucy

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Pig Knoll School, Pomona. Rockland County

Presented by: Bill Krattinger

Discussion: none

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Erika Krieger

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Church of St. Gabriel the Archangel, Paul Smiths, Franklin County

Presented by: Kathleen LaFrank

Discussion: none

Daniel Mackay asked Kath about the preservation emergency she referred to in her presentation, and Kath explained that the sponsor wished to apply for grant funds since there were essentially no windows in the building.

Motion to approve: Chuck Vandrei

Second: Kristin Herron

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

McNaught Family Farm, Bovina Center Vicinity, Delaware County

Presented by: Kathleen LaFrank

Discussion:

Daniel Mackay asked Kath to explain the catalyst for the nomination, and Kath explained that the homeowner had been waiting several years and had finally hired a consultant. Daniel asked about the homeowner's tax credit. Kath replied that she had explained it to him but that he had already done most of the work.

Doug Perrilli asked how the photo came into existence? Kath explained that it was an archival photo from the 1940s. Doug also asked if he was correct that the unevaluated archeological resources would be counted, and Kath explained that they would not, since there was no professional archeological investigation. She explained that the last time she counted archeological resources on a farm she had had a map from 1912 locating the buildings then standing and providing dimensions, but here they were just guessing and she was not sure how many of the ruins NPS would let her count as contributing.

Wint Aldrich asked about counting the enclosure wall, and Kath said that it could be counted but not around the whole 200 acres. Wint complimented consultant Jessie Ravage for her marvelous job in family research and making connections to connecting to the Scots in Delaware county to the lowland clearances in Scotland.

Motion to approve: Wint Aldrich

Second: Lucy Waletzky

Vote: Recommended, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

Doug Perrilli complimented everyone on the maps.

BOARD BUSINESS

Deputy Commissioner's Report

Daniel Mackay noted that the board had approved 17 of 18 nominations, including 864, across 14 communities, in 13 counties. He noted that this would have a big impact on the state in both urban and rural areas and appreciated everyone's work to prepare for the meeting and participate. He noted several additional items:

The Division of the Budget has approved seven new critical fills, which will bring six new staff to the division, including two to the National Register unit. He also noted that May 4th was "I Love NY Parks Day."

Daniel also informed the board that significant changes have been proposed to the National Register program that reflect the thinking of the current administration. Many believe that these changes contradict the National Historic Preservation Act and the 2016 amendments to the act, which were the supposed catalyst for the changes. The proposed changes are of great concern because they would grant federal agencies the ability to block listing of resources that they own on federal land and because they would interfere with the ability of the Department of the Interior to make determinations of eligibility for federally owned resources. The proposed changes would also affect the way objections to National Register listing are calculated, giving large landowners a weighted impact in blocking nominations. The requirement to count the land area belonging to those who objected would also be extremely burdensome to SHPO staffs. He thanked NR staff (especially Kath) for her vigorous challenge to what had been put forward to date regarding these changes and said it had been noted by NCSHPO, NPS and other state staffs. He promised to share the division's comments with the board members, with advocacy groups, and with New York's congressional delegation. He speculated that lawsuits would follow from several states.

Chair's Report

The board discussed the invitation to meet at Planting Fields on September 5th but was unable to reach a consensus. While most members supported the idea, the timing (the week of Labor Day) was not ideal and so few of the members were in attendance that it was hard to know if a quorum for that date on Long Island could be obtained. The decision was deferred until more members could be contacted. The board also discussed the upcoming JCOPE training in June. At least five members will take the training after the June meeting: Lucy Waletzky, Wint Aldrich, Wayne Goodman, Erika Krieger, and Doug Perrelli.

The meeting of the New York State Board for Historic Preservation was adjourned at 3:05 pm on a motion by Erika Krieger, seconded by Doug Perrelli, and approved by the board, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.