

Transcript

January 16, 2025, 2:55PM

WG Weckesser, Grace 4:03
Like would you like to share your screen first?
Like to have it up or.
Do you want me to just?
Get started.
And then.

SG Socinski, Greg 4:15
No, I can share it.
Just one second here.

WG Weckesser, Grace 4:17
OK, cool.

SG Socinski, Greg 4:22
You do.
See that?

WG Weckesser, Grace 4:34
Yep, I can see it.

SG Socinski, Greg 4:35
Great.

WG Weckesser, Grace 4:42
Alright, cool.
We ready to admit?

SB Sewell, Brian 4:46
Sounds good.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 4:47
Yeah.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 4:48
Oh, OK.

J **Jesse** 5:03
Yeah. So it was a time.

AM **Abbey Miller** 5:07
So then.

J **Jesse** 5:11
Yeah.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 5:25
Hi everyone.
Just waiting for a few more people to roll in before we kick off our meeting.

MH **Mariel Hess** 5:26
Repl.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 5:32
Can everyone hear me to give a thumbs up? If you can hear me, that'd be great.
Cool.

DT **Deborah Thomas** 5:40
Cool.

WS **Wesley Sis** 5:41
Can hear you.

J **Jeanette** 5:49
I.

J **Jesse** 5:49
The pistol.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 5:53

All right, I'm just gonna mute all the attendees for now.

Just so so that we can restrict from some feedback from happening while we're presenting.

Alright, I think 2 minutes is enough time to get some people in and we can have more.

Fill in as we get going.

Thanks everyone for joining us today for our municipal Energy Resilience Program webinar in partnership with the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation.

I'm Grace Wickeser, the Merck coordinator, and I'm joined today with Brian Sewell, our state energy program manager.

Meg Fuller, our Merck grants administrator.

Doug wells.

Sorry, I'm getting some feedback so I'm gonna mute Doug Wells who is our MRP project manager and Greg who's our Vermont Historic Preservation resource specialist with the Vermont Division of Historic Preservation.

We're very excited to have you all here.

Today we're hosting this webinar to provide an in depth look at the historical review process that many MERP awarded buildings will have to go through.

And we're going to address some outstanding questions and concerns that people may have.

You have their project process and rule out be as easy and effective as possible.

This webinar is going to be recorded and made available on our website along with the PDF of the slide show itself.

And As for the procedure of the webinar, please leave yourself muted as we get through the first kind of beginning 40 minute portion of the presentation and for any questions that.

R **Ripton** 8:24
About just a second.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 8:24

Excuse me.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 8:29

Arise while you're viewing.

Please leave them in the chat function of this.

And within that chat function you have the availability to thumbs up a comment, a chat that someone has made.

And so if you can do that as you know, your questions overlap so that we can see which question has the most traction.

So we know the priority order to address questions at the end of this because we are holding an open Q&A session at the end of our webinar.

Please do that.

So again, just try our best to leave yourself muted during the first chunk of our webinar.

And we will do our best to get to all of the outstanding questions by the end.

So again thanks you all.

Thank you all for being here.

And with that, I think I can send it off to Greg.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 9:28

I just everybody can see my screen. Is that correct?

So just like to introduce myself.

My name is Craig Cazinski.

I'm an architectural historian with the Division of Historic Preservation.

I thank you for attending this today.

We have a lot to go over in the next hour.

I'd like to leave some time for questions, but it's just a quick agenda of the webinar today.

The Division of Historic Preservation was formed in 1975, which means we're 50 years old.

Officially historic this year, this is our current staff do many things around the state revolving around historic resources, including owning and running the state's historic sites.

My team's function, who we're led by Scott Dillon.

Senior Review coordinator is regulatory review meeting that any projects that receive public funding need public permitting or approval.

Subject to our review, I've highlighted the main contacts for the Merck projects here in red.

And Polly Allen will be conducting the the reviews for the Merck projects.

We are also hiring currently for another review position, so there may be an unknown name in the future that is your reviewer and Lindsay Pacheco is a great resource. She is our administrative coordinator.

SW **Susan Wright (Guest)** 11:00

This is right up Nancy's alley. It's historical preservation.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 11:05

OK, if people could mute, that would be great.

As Lindsey will send all.

All direct inquiries to the correct reviewer.

We conduct.

We conduct as a regulatory review team almost 3000 reviews a year from 4 regulatory pathways.

Section 1.

06 of the National Store Preservation Act involving federally funded permitting.

Fairly funded or permitted undertaking undertaking is just a fancy word for a project 22 vs a Chapter 14, which is essentially the state version of that.

Regulation, we also see projects that need Act 250 permitting or section 248 of Title 30 under the Public Utility Commission.

22 VSA is highlighted here.

That's the regular, relevant to regulatory pathway for these merg projects.

So what is 22 VSA? It states a state agency, Department, Division or Commission must consult the Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation before demolishing or transferring any property.

Of historical architecture, archaeological or cultural significance, including any property listed on the State Register of Historic Places.

It is the responsibility of the state agency involved to initiate consultation with the division and fulfill the requirements of 22 VSA chapter 14, so since building and

General Services BGS we've all been working with is providing funds for the alterations of buildings. These projects are subject.

To review under 22 VSA.

Preparation of all these projects receiving funds we have drafted what's called the Memorandum of Agreement.

A memorandum of agreement, or MOA, is a legally binding document that is negotiated amongst involved parties and commits them to carry out the undertaking in accordance with relevant regulations.

This one is between BGS, the Vermont Division of Historic Preservation, or Bdhp, and the Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

It's designed to streamline the regulatory review process by creating clear guidelines for review and exemptions based on expected scope of works.

This moa is up on the website.

So it may be worthwhile to familiarize yourself with that.

But the following elements are the most germane to our offices review.

Section 106 is, or excuse me, section one is definitions, but the most important for for MERP is historic property resource, which means any building structure, object, district, area or site that is significant in the history, architecture, archaeology or culture of the state. Its communities are the.

Nation includes any resource that is 50 years of age or older that retains sufficient integrity.

I'll come back to this shortly, but as part of the MOA.

Do have certain projects that are exempt from review if your project meets all the following requirements is exempt from review under this agreement.

Project does not involve any property that is listed or eligible for the State Register of Historic Places.

Project consists of rehabilitation or alteration of buildings or structures. Less than 50 years old.

Project does not involve ground disturbance, so if your building meets this 3 criteria. Review from our office is not needed.

Furthermore, certain activities, even if the building is historic, are exempt, which are listed in Appendix A of the MOA, which we will cover in some detail later.

Project review responsibilities. All projects to be reviewed by vdhp require submittal. Of a Merck project review form.

Which is Appendix B of the MOA.

If the submitted documentation is sufficient, vdhp shall complete the review in 30 days.

Additional information is needed to complete the review.

We will notify the municipality within 15 days that more information is needed upon repeat. Upon receipt of submission. Sufficient documentation, we will complete the review within 30 days.

So expect a 30 day.

Day review at minimum, assuming sufficient documentation and no issues of the project, but consultation with our office to resolve an issue can cause the review to take a little longer.

And three C, you know, we may request municipalities arrange for outside review, but we're really trying to keep this to a minimum on the smart projects.

So how do we find out if our building is listed?

This section's a little didactic, but I'm just going to kind of run through the resources we have online to help applicants figure this out.

AA **Adam Lougee, ACRPC** 16:10

Can I ask a question?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 16:10

First one.

If you could put it in the chat, that would be great.

Just 'cause I'm trying to get through this.

AA **Adam Lougee, ACRPC** 16:16

OK.

Sure.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 16:18

A little.

A little quickly.

So we have time at the end.

The Online Resource Center is our main repository of information. We call it the ORC. It's less scary and more informative than the Tolkien variety of work, but this is where we keep all our files on historic resources.

In Vermont, this can be found on our website, but the direct link is posted on the screen.

This takes a little getting used to, so I'm gonna do a little crash course here.

Simply typing your building into the search field and clicking search probably won't get the results you're looking for.

Definitely won't get the results you're looking for, but we have different drop down menus indicated by the red arrow.

That's town.

So you click the arrow and a list of all the towns in the state of Vermont pop up so we can click our town.

I click Charlotte Charlotte, my hometown.

Right below the town Drowdown menu is file type.

Here you want to look for state register.

Which has all obviously all the listings in the state register around the state. If you don't find your building, the state registered National Register and Historic Survey were also yield similar results.

So if we click that and click search, it should give us a little drop down menu at the bottom here.

Charlotte only has one file in here, but sometimes have more.

But you can see project name is state registered for store places and then all the way to the right is view scan document. If you click this.

It opens apdf should look something like this.

These are actual paper files that have been scanned and are now online.

Line.

Most of many of these are from the 70s.

Most are from the 80s, some from the early 90s.

So even as a resident of the town and an architecture nerd, you know, for example, I don't know what the Casey residence is, so I usually.

Scroll down and find the map.

This is how I search for things. I usually cross reference with Google Maps but you will all be more familiar with each town than I am.

So you'll probably be able to navigate it a little easier.

Keep in mind your building may be in a historic district here.

It's indicated by the red outlines.

This kind of varies from town to town.

Building I'm looking for just for example, happen to know is on Prindle Road which is not far from Spear St. indicated by the Red Arrow.

There it's #14. So if I Scroll down.

The survey numbers are in the right hand, upper right hand corner of the files indicated by the red arrow.

There I can find my building confirm its listing on the state register.

This is the second page of the survey form just gives description and significance, sometimes with a little helpful map and nearly all listings come with a picture as well. You'll notice this building was surveyed in 1976.

So I went to check on this building earlier this week and this is what it looks like now. So I like to use this House as an example to indicate how state register listings can change. Not everything listed in the state register currently is still eligible for listing in the state register.

Not all buildings eligible for the State Register of Historic Places are listed in the State register.

We're always adding and removing things and not all buildings that have been surveyed under historic sites and surveys have been listed in the State Register does not mean a building is not eligible for the state register.

We're constantly updating the register.

Time goes on. Generally speaking, if the building is currently listed and has not changed drastically since it's listing, it is still eligible.

Again, if you don't find your building in the state register, check National Register Historic surveys. If you find your building listed in the National Register.

A listing in the National Register is a de facto listing in the state register and any building over 50 years of age may be eligible for the state register. That does not mean it is, but we like to check and if you're unsure, please reach out and check.

In with us.

We're here to help.

Another way, usually quicker but less informative, is to use the Vermont Planning Atlas linked here.

Go to this website.

This is what you should see.

Says all types of maps, but it also does include historic resources. The upper left hand corner. There's a drop down menu. You can select historic resources.

Little plus symbol in the corner.

She hasn't dropped another drop down menu.

Click National State register boxes.

It's tough to see here, but the map did change.

There's all these little blue blobs, so if we zoom in on Charlotte here.

The blue bombs, not not the ponds and lakes. Not the greatest colour. They pick for this one. But the weird shaped ones are state register historic districts around the state and these districts are complete over the whole state on this map.

So you can also alternatively you can search in the upper right hand box indicated by the arrow your address and find it that way.

So I've selected the Baptist Corners Historic District.

Which this little box pops up to indicate that zoom in.

On the district and you can find your building within this Polygon and if you click on a parcel you know it will indicate that it's in there.

You can also change the map from road to aerial down in the left hand corner.

So find out you're building this historic building 50 years.

How do you submit to us?

Everything will need a Mart project review form. This is up on the BGS Mark website. Right alongside the moa, this is a fillable pdf that can be filled out in Adobe attached to an e-mail.

And sent to A/C.

C.d.projectreview@vermont.gov.

We find it much easier on our end to use the fillable PDF if you find it easier to print it out and scan it back in, that's fine, but we do prefer the PDF.

So like I said earlier, I've created a example project here in my own town, the old Charlotte Town Hall.

So this is the full form.

They'll be signed to return to you as a sign off from our office.

Our assessment will be on the second page, on the right under to be completed, HP.

Sections one and two are fairly self-explanatory.

Attention should be paid for as well, which indicates the listing of the building, its age and whether there is ground disturbance.

Let's go over a few elements specifically here.

The box for the short description is short.

Frankly, too short.

So if you need more room, you can attach an additional document either word file or

PDF covering the project in a little bit more detail.

Five here is perhaps the most important at this stage.

If you're submitting your project at this point without like a very defined scope of work, for example.

Like you know, you in your grant agreement, you know you're putting a heat pump somewhere, but you're not sure where.

And because you haven't engaged a contractor or designer or whatever, then this review will be preliminary or conceptual, and we'll provide comments so that you can put parameters into an RFP that will meet our standards.

So if you're sending the MERP energy assessments, we can provide comments on those.

But those comments are preliminary, and once the project is fully designed, you can resubmit for a final documentation.

Review, which is, as I said, only for projects that really have a have been fully designed with a defined scope.

I assume most of the projects at this point are in the preliminary stages, so we should that that should be indicated on the form and then for six. Please also submit as appropriate.

We'll always need a project location map.

This seems unnecessary, but oftentimes a street address does not line up exactly with the location of the building.

So visual map representation is needed as part of the submission.

This can really be any map as long as.

It is attached to the e-mail and it accurately pinpoints the building.

Site map site map is not always necessary, but if there is ground disturbance as part of the project, it should be included.

It can also be helpful in indicating where aspects of the projects on the exterior of the building are located.

In relation to it, I've included this handdrawn map of my example project because I just wanted to illustrate. This doesn't need to be like some fancy computers on map as long as it communicates the necessary information.

For example here.

It indicates in the location of the heat pump on the building area of electrical service trenching, etc.

Has the roads.

It communicates the information effectively.

The exempt list.

This is also part of the project review form.

It is fillable and should be checked according to the project.

This shows what activities are included.

Samples of what can be designed as exempt to what cannot be designed as exempt and will require consultation for an example.

Under mechanical electrical plumbing systems.

You know, description says repair, replacement and installation of MEP systems, provided that such work does not.

Of ground disturbance alter or permanently change the appearance of the interior exterior of the building affecting character defining features of the building.

And moving to the next column, scopes that can be designed to be, for example, air source heat pumps where exterior equipment is not located on the front of the building.

So if you have heat pumps as part of your grant agreement, if you design the system so that they're on the reel to build them, that will be exempt and then moving on under things that cannot be designed to be exempt.

Down towards the bottom, air source heat pumps where exterior equipment is located on the front of the building.

Well, if you look in your hip hop on the front, that is not exempt and would require consultation with our office.

So, you know, I think the best use of this is really using this exempt list at this point to design projects to really minimize the amount of review necessary and it would behoove you all to familiarize yourself with the exemplars and check if VIS a vis your grant.

Agreement and your scope of work.

So my example project we've received our submission to Accd project review at vermont.gov and it includes the Merck Project review form with the included exempt list project location map and award document including a project narrative photos site map.

I've designed this fo submission to be good, but not a perfect example.

But this submission is is really is really well done and.

Has a nice packet of information, as you'll see, so I'll just read it here.

Old Charlottetown Hall, a town on building now housing the Charlotte Historical

Society, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing building to the Charlotte Center Historic District.

We suspect it might be listed on the State register, but are unsure the building currently functions as a small museum and is open and frequently during the warmer months. The town is interested in utilizing the building more fully, holding more frequent events there, but the heating system lack.

Of insulation, drafting doors and windows make it uncomfortable for occupation during the winter.

Cramp from BGS to address some of these issues?

Scope of work is as follows.

One install cold climate heat pump to assist with heating in the shoulder seasons and allow air conditioning during the summer as well.

Two spray foam, the attic and basement to air seal and provide insulation.

It's recommended that we spray the underside of the roof sheeting in the attic directly on the stone foundation seals in the basement 3 plan to keep the original windows, but would like to weather ship them.

As a single as well as a single front door currently have old plexi glass storms that don't do much, so we'd like to have new custom storms made and installed.

It will sit inside the existing exterior window casing.

We have a local Carpenter who is making them for us.

Four, there is heat in the building, but it hasn't been used in years.

The boiler looks like it's from the 70s, so we plan to replace it with a new high efficiency boiler.

Boiler is located in the basement.

We will use the existing piping that's currently in place.

Five, the building has a very old 50 amp electrical service and we would like to upgrade to 100 amp service.

The electrical pole is very close to the building, but the line runs underground so will be needed.

So so it will need to be excavated from pole to build.

On the next page in my FO submission, we have photos.

Indicating direction. Since looking N looking West of all sides of the building, east and South.

It's nice looking building.

I love this building.

And then it has details photos with some relevant information on the project.

The the corner where the proposed location of the heat pump will be placed.

Examples of the windows.

Information indicating all 8 Windows will be receiving new storms.

Just a detail of the existing storm window and.

Information indicating that new storms will sit in the same opening photo of the existing basement door that will be removed will be used to remove the old boiler.

Install new boiler.

Electrical service will remain in the same spot.

Pole is just out of frame to the right and then the sitemap that I showed earlier is included.

Showing location of the heat pump entrance area for the new electrical service.

So I get this submission and what do I think about it?

Well, I'll just go through 1 by 1.

Cold climate heat pump I would look at this and I would think the location of the heat pump is prominently placed at the main intersection and it's quite visible from the road public right of way.

He pumps located at the rear of the building.

Our exempt with this lot is fairly exposed on all side as shown in the photos. So we would try to come up with the best location.

So this later but.

Likely it's on the opposite corner. We would also request photos where the heat pump cassette will be placed on the interior.

So I would probably respond back in saying, you know, can we can we work to get this heat pump on the other side of the building where it's not on the main Rd.

At a prominent intersection and is kind of on the most backside of the building, although this building is fairly exposed.

Next thing, weatherstripping, doors and windows and new wood storms. I would say this is great preservation work can be designed to be exempt for the exempt list under Windows because the scope is limited to whether shipping, replacement or installation of.

New storms, which is indicated right here in the description and then under scope that can be designed to be exact. Any of these activities.

In the first paragraph. So this would be exempt aspects of the project would be exempt.

Boiler replacement I would say this is except.

Under mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems.

Things that can be designed to be exempt is boiler replacement. If you're taking an old boiler, putting a new one that is exempt.

New electrical service.

These are not exempt, but in this case you know there's also ground disturbance here.

So we want to have an archaeologist look at it for this project, given that the trenching occurs in a previously existed Trent, it is likely to not be an issue because there will be no new ground disturbance.

I will likely ask for photos of the existing exterior service and interior panel, but in this case the.

Anels in the basement is not being moved, so it will not be an issue.

And.

The proposed path saw this on the site plan and it wasn't mentioned in the scope of work in the project narrative, so I would reach out to.

Just get some clarification on this.

Wondering if this is part of the the actual Merck scope for work.

Is this a separate project since it wasn't mentioned in the?

Wasn't mentioned in the project narrative.

I would seek clarification on this aspect of the project.

And lastly.

Spray foam insulation or as I like to call it, the elephant in the room.

Spray foam insulation.

Not just as an air sealing method can never be designed to be exempt and will always require.

Consultation syndicated under insulation using spray foam for insulation, not just air sealing.

Spray foam and addix is not recommended, especially to the underside of the roof.

Decked, we always suggest spot air sealing with canned foam blown in cellulose insulation.

Spray foam on the underside of roof decking in attics will conceal any roofs and potentially won't be noticed until major damage is done.

Basements are trickier, but can be done if a release layer, Tyvek or something similar is applied to the stone foundation prior to application.

This makes the application reversible.

With spray foam, there's always issues with water and moisture management.

Spray foam is applied without proper exterior water management drainage around the building. Water cannot get into the foundation.

Stacked and with stacks on foundations can do some real damage through.

Cycles and this sort of damage may not manifest for some years, so it can kind of be a slow moving disaster.

If damage does manifest, the release layer will allow you to remove the spray foam easily.

Which we recommend.

For a relatively new product whose long term effects might not be currently known.

Spray foam's a huge point of contention in the HP world.

Applying its foundations without a release layer obviously is not reversible.

And reversible work is an important tenant of work being done on historic buildings and, you know, Simply put, I we shouldn't be investing in our town owned historic buildings in ways that.

May damage the building and make for far more costly repairs down the road.

For basement installation, you know you might find out 10 years from now that.

Water and grass has has seriously damaged your foundation and that could be a much bigger project.

Then a town might want to take on, frankly.

So just.

To I pulled this out of the National Park Service preservation brief on improving energy efficiency in historic buildings.

Addressing some of the issues surrounding spray foam, just read the last one. The long term effects of adding either open or closed cell. Spray foams to insulate historic masonry walls as well as performance of these products has not been adequately documented.

Use of foam insulation in buildings with poor quality masonry or uncontrolled rising damp problems should be avoided.

I think it's important here.

To remember that we have an opportunity to really do right by these buildings with with these Murph grants, it would be great to use them as examples.

Of ways to up their energy efficiency while also adhering to the preservation standards set forth by the Secretary of the Interior.

And just some resources I just mentioned the Secretary of Interior standards for treatment of historic properties.

You know, this is kind of our Bible for working on historic buildings.

It's a great resource.

For the rehabilitation, preservation of historic buildings.

And should be referenced.

It's got a ton of information there, but.

Should be referenced as you're planning your projects. More specifically, the National Park Service also has preservation briefs, which are specific kind of technical guidance documents covering a variety of issues. Some of the ones I've listed here that are germane to these Mer projects.

Preservation brief 3.

Proving energy efficiency in historic buildings.

Nine, the repair of historic windows.

24 heating, venting, ventilating and cooling, historic buildings problems and recommended approaches. 32 making historic properties accessible.

We also on our website linked here.

We have resources for historic building efficiency and sustainability and preservation.

Trust of Vermont?

Also.

And from a web page on installation and historic buildings which can be used as a starting point for planning your projects. And again I'll just mention all submissions should come through our accd.projectsreview@vermont.gov e-mail address.

And with that, I'll say thanks for attending and this was helpful in setting expectations for our review. And I'd like to open it up to questions now.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 39:21

Thanks Greg.

That was fantastic.

I'm just gonna start out by reading some of the emphasized questions in the chat first.

So.

One of the ones that's being emphasized by many is is the building of wheelchair accessible ramp to the front door considered a ground disturbance.

So if you're installing an an ADA compliant ramp to a front door, is that ground disturbance?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 39:52

Yes, that is ground disturbance. Yeah.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 39:53

Yes.

Another question.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 39:58

Umm.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 39:59

Is going back to the statute.

Why has it been interpreted to follow the funding as opposed to the ownership of the building in question?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 40:13

That's a great question.

We ownership is also an aspect, like if any state agency alters a building.

It's also subject to our review, so it's it's kind of both.

But since it's, you know it's public money that's being provided to.

Applicants.

You know, that's part of the review.

That's, but it's included under the regulations, so.

Hope that answers that question.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 40:45

OK.

Next question is would an aerial photo be considered a site map?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 40:53

Yes, an aerial photo could could be considered a site map.

I would say.

If it's just an aerial photo with no additional information on it, doesn't do a whole lot. It should be, you know, changes to the site should be indicated on the site map. But an aerial photo absolutely can be used as the basis for site map.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 41:19

OK.

Another question is.

Our town office is a building within a National Register district, but is not itself listed other than in the district inventory.

How does this affect our application?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 41:33

Yep.

That is considered a historic building, so it's listed as well.

Assuming it's listed as a contributing building within the National Historic District.

Which, if it's an old building, it likely is.

That can be found in the National Register listing itself.

So since it's listed on the National Register, it's de facto listed on the state register.

So that is considered a historic building.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 42:07

OK.

Let me see. Go in order here.

As we are thinking about design, curious about what the sensitivities are as it relates to an electrical surface upgrade per say.

And this might also kind of be tied in with the question of how is ground disturbance defined? You know, as these things kind of one makes the other.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 42:33

Yeah. Yeah. In the MOA, there is a definition of ground disturbance.

It is digging down more than six inches.

And over an area of 100 square feet or more, so a 10 by 10.

A 10 by 10 square.

So it's, you know, what's a what's considered ground disturbance is pretty broad.

So if you're for example, if you're, you know, trenching across.

And then tire.

Parcel you know, 30-40 feet down, two or three feet. You know, that would be considered ground disturbance and would need to be looked at.

I don't suspect.

I mean the ground disturbance thing sounds scary.

I don't suspect many of these projects are going to have a lot of issues with ground disturbance, but we do like to look at them all projects.

Look how disturbance by one of archaeologists.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 43:37

OK.

Next question, should all buildings that are 50 plus years old just complete the VDHP review form?

Is there any scenario where a building less than 50 years old may need to go through the review process?

Example only 30 year old building, but it involves ground disturbance.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 43:58

Yes, if it falls ground disturbance. Yes, it will have to go through the review process.

And if it's over 50 years, it will have to go through.

The review I will say, like I said, answering the last question, the ground disturbance of these probably isn't going to be.

An issue for most of them.

And so the review will be probably limited to a quick sign off.

No guarantees.

And if the building's over 50 years.

We will.

We will look at it and make an assessment as to whether it is eligible for the State register of historic Places.

If we decide it's not, you get your sign off and go on your way.

If it is, then you know they'll be a little bit more consultation required.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 44:52

OK, now I think I'm going to try to group some of the questions that we have at the bottom together because they're overlapping a little bit.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 45:02

OK.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 45:03

So if the activities are determined to be non exempt, will vdht prohibit the work moving forward?

And.

I guess based on that, when should this review be submitted?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 45:15

We.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 45:17

Before or after engineering design.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 45:20

Well, I I would say that it's twofold.

I mean I I think it would behoove people to submit it early before design and we can provide comments, preliminary comments and suggestions to to keep it in kind of the exempt category or the non adverse category.

So you know when you do go, when you do get your project designed, you know you can go to whoever you have designing at your contractor or whatever and have these parameters that they need kind of need to work in.

That will.

That will won't adverse effect to the to the building.

What's the second part of your question, grace?

Or the first part rather.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 46:03

When should the review be submitted?

Before, after engineering design and then also kind of answering another person's question, are they to file twice, like once for preliminary plans and then afterwards when they know exactly what they're going out to bid for?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 46:21

Yeah, so if we.

Yeah. So if we do a preliminary comment the, the the project once designed will have to come back in for final documentation review.

You know, if you followed all our our suggestions.

The final document review will just kind of be confirming that it's designed as suggested and won't have an impact on the building, so it should be relatively a quick sign off.

And it just popped into my head.

Will we not be permitting?

Work certain types of work on these buildings.

Yes and no. I guess the answer.

We're always, you know, we wanna keep everything up to the secretaries of interior standards.

But we we also will work with applicants to minimize the effects on their historic buildings.

O you know, we want to work with you to find a hay medium to where these projects like won't have an adverse effect on the buildings or to minimize that effect.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 47:41

OK.

Next question is can you lose your historic classification if you are only doing 88 access outside work?

Or does ADA compliance override historic compliance?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 47:57

Yeah, that's a good question.

Yes, it kinda does.

You know, if we.

We're. I'm not going to sit here and say you can't put a ramp on the front of your building.

But we would like to like, as I mentioned earlier, we would like to work with you to come up with a design that minimizes the impact on on the building itself, but.

But Ada is important and.

You know, making buildings accessible, especially town on buildings that are a public function accessible to all. You know, it kind of does. Trump historic preservation concerns.

But you know, we would want to have provide input on how to make those changes. The least impactful to the historic buildings is possible.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 48:54

OK.

Our town office isn't listed in any of the registries and we think it was built in 1974, but can't find the records just based the date on recollections.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 49:05

Mm hmm.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 49:09

Is it considered historic?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 49:11

It's something we'd look at.

That's one of those ones that's like just, you know, it's kind of funny if this if these.

These grants were coming in two years ago we it would be completely exempt because it's under 50 years.

It's 51 years now.

Especially now that we're in January.

So we would take a look at it.

There's there's no saying whether it's historic or not without looking at the building.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 49:44

OK.

So I I guess for for cases like that it would be encouraged that they fill out a review, but once once reviewed, it could be said like.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 49:51

Correct.

Yeah, we we would we would send.

You know, we would do some research into the building.

You know, this one says that there's been many modifications. It probably doesn't retain integrity.

It's had too many modifications over the years that are laid that are, you know, later than its original build date of 1974.

So we we would fill out that that section basically saying not eligible, no historic properties affected you get our sign off and then.

The project can proceed without our involvement.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 50:33
OK.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 50:40
A.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 50:43
So asking about a funding for window replacement that is HP compliant.
Do does Vermont Division of Historic preservation have resources that qualify with this, or would someone generally defer to NPS guidelines?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 51:02
Yeah. Generally we use MP's guidelines as kind of our our standard for work done on historic buildings.
Yeah, we don't have like, we don't have state specific.
State level guidelines.
You know, we use the NPS guidelines.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 51:28
And this is a general question. If the activities are determined to be non exempt bdhp, will they prohibit work from moving forward?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 51:31
Mm hmm.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 51:36

No, I can say that that's not true.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 51:39

Yeah.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 51:42

Bgs and bdhp?

Absolutely does not want to prohibit anything from happening that will take the route of working together to come to the best compromise possible for the project to move forward.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 51:48

Correct.

Yeah, that's correct.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 52:01

And just a reminder to everyone, as I'm filing through questions to thumbs up, ones that align with what your your own question might be. So I can decide on a priority order to answer these questions as to not have to repeat ourselves.

OK.

So we have a question about.

If a building has front a frontage on two roads are both sides of the building that are adjacent to the road considered front?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 52:48

That's a good question.

They're obviously both very visible.

Usually buildings have a formal front.

So more attention would be paid to kind of the formal front, if that makes sense rather than like kind of the side elevation.

If that's the situation, I would.

Recommend locating stuff on the other two sides because you know those aren't Rd. frontage.

But yeah, it's sort of a tricky situation in a case by case basis because.
Two sides may be seen, but one one facade might be more important, so to speak.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 53:36

K.

If the Merck funded work is part of a larger rehabilitation, how do you approach the review?

I guess this question is more like maybe for like a network of buildings or something.
I don't know if Litha or Lisa. If you want to maybe.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 53:50

Yeah.

Yeah, Lisa.

Lisa, could you pop on and?

Unpack that a little bit.

LP **Lyssa Papazian (Guest)** 54:08

Hi, I apologize.

I my sound was off for the 1st 15 minutes and you may have covered this, but we so we have a \$2,000,000 rehabilitation of a historic town hall.

Merck is part of that.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 54:22

Mm hmm.

LP **Lyssa Papazian (Guest)** 54:25

There's specific items that Merck will be covering Merck, but I do you look at just the Merck work or you know if it's.

There are plenty of other things to look at.

Are you looking at the whole project?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 54:40

Yeah. So is what are the other funding sources?

I'm just curious.

And what's the timeline for them?

LP **Lyssa Papazian (Guest)** 54:45
We don't know them all yet.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 54:46
OK.

Yeah. So in that case, if it's like if it's, you know, if you had a bunch of funding in hand and it was all packaged as one review.

Then we would kind of look at it all.

But.

In this case, I think we just look at the Merck and decide its impacts and then sounds like the other aspects of the project will be coming in for a review anyway, so.

LP **Lyssa Papazian (Guest)** 55:14
Probably.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 55:15
Yeah. OK.

Look forward to working with you on that, yeah.

LP **Lyssa Papazian (Guest)** 55:17
OK. But but, but this has to go in as a preliminary now you think?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 55:21
Yeah, for the scope specific to to Merp, yeah.

LP **Lyssa Papazian (Guest)** 55:27
Thank you.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 55:28
Yep.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 55:34
OK.
Another question being emphasized.

Curious about the staff capacity for the number of reviews requested?
Concerned about how this will impact municipalities timelines?

SG **Socinski, Greg** 55:47

Yeah. We are also concerned about that.

And yeah, perhaps this is maybe the worst time.

Or the best time to mention that my wife is 39 weeks pregnant, so I will be out for the bit as well.

But we do have staff members that are are not part of the project review team who can take on.

Take on some of the capacity.

Caitlin Corkins, who does our tax credits and grants program, and Elizabeth Peebles, the state architectural historian.

Who used to be part of the Roject review team and Laura Trishman or Shippo can also.

Can also pick up some of the slack, so it's definitely something we're concerned about.

I mean, we are hiring.

Right now, you know we have a job posting out and some applicants, so we should be getting more people.

In the office to to help out with these.

And like I said, we're just gonna do our best.

The timeline, you know, if we get something.

And it's not sufficient.

We have a 15 day window to reach back out to you.

That means we'll be looking at all of these within 15 days.

So.

If a project is good and we've looked at in 15 days, we'll probably just send it back.

So it could.

It could be less than 30 days for some easy reviews.

Umm.

It will get tricky when you know when there's projects that are are have potential to adversely affect buildings, and there's gonna be some consultation involved, but.

Just.

You know we, we I have gone through and looked at a lot of these projects prior to.

Prior to them coming in so you know there is some familiarity and we have some background information on a lot of them, so.

So that that should assist us.

In in getting them out quickly.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 58:03

OK, sounds good.

Next question to confirm to confirm any building, regardless of its age, needs an application to be submitted. If there's going to be ground disturbance.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 58:16

Yeah, unless it falls under.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 58:17

Yes.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 58:18

Yeah, unless it falls under the.

You know, less than six inches is over a area of 100 square feet, which?

I don't know how many of those are.

Yeah. If it has ground disturbance, then it will be need. It will need to be reviewed.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 58:37

And just to combine some questions.

Our building is over 50 years old, but it had a major renovation, major renovation in the 90s.

It's not in the village Historic District, but it falls in their designated downtown.

How should that?

How does that qualify for review and?

1970s town garage would need to be looked at if it's over 50 years old, yes.

I guess we're talking about buildings that I've been renovated younger than 50 years ago.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 59:14

Yeah, I'll take. Yeah. So town garage older than 50 years old.

Yes, we'd like to look at it. I'm not.

Confident that any town crotches are really going to be considered historic.

You know, so probably be a quick sign off the first part of the question, a building that's over 50 years old, had major renovations in the 90s. It's unrecognizable now.

You know, the question says it was not included in the village Historic District.

So if it's non, I assume that means it's non contributing to like to National Register District or a state register district.

That building itself would not be considered historic, but since it's in a historic district.

You know, there might be impacts to the broader historic district.

I don't really think many of these Mer projects are going to have impacts to a broader historic district. You know, they're not big additions on historic buildings or things of the like.

So you know, you could.

You could reach out to our office prior to submitting anything and and just kind of unpack that that specific case a little bit more. And we can we can work through it beforehand.

Just to let you know if you know if it's exempt fully or not.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 1:00:41

Great. That sounds good.

I think I'm going to adjust this question that I'm about to ask.

We've approved scope of works from BGS and signed grant agreements.

You know, with those scopes that were concluded, but now we need to make changes based on this review.

How do we do that submitting?

A narrative with the request of that scope of work change should be submitted to bgs.murp@vermont.gov.

That's the e-mail address that.

All the awardees have kind of been receiving materials and notifications from.

I also just want to say that our frequently asked questions FAQ document will be updated.

To address with you know, a written statement for the, the answers for many questions that have been asked about HP and also amending scopes and stuff like that, I'll be sure once that is posted.

I have the the new revised FAQ document to alert all grant awardees of that so.
Again, just with a scope amendment.

A narrative of explaining the amendment being requested should be submitted to
bgs.merck@vermont.gov.

So next question are wastewater facilities, town garages and fire department garages
unless explicitly.

Historically designated exempt.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 1:02:22

It's case by case basis, but you know wastewater facilities are.

Generally exempt.

You know, and and any town garages, you know, especially ones that are just barely
over 50 years old would probably be considered nonhistoric.

But you know, if it hits that 50 year age, it should be sent in. Likely it will be a quick
sign off as as a non eligible resource non historic resource.

And fire Department garage is kind of the same thing. You know, there are plenty of
historic fire department garages around the state.

So we'd like to look at them on a case by case basis.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 1:03:12

Adding links for applicable websites, yes to to repeat.

This slide show itself a PDF of this slide show, with resources hyperlinked within. It
will be posted to our merch website along with a recording of this webinar.

I think for the most part, I've navigated the questions in the chat.

Thank you, Brian, for saying that this was helpful.

We appreciate that.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 1:03:42

Yes, thanks.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 1:03:47

We're just meeting our one minute away from wrapping up, Mark. If anyone has any
quick things to add.

We can address them very fast.

Thanks for the round of applause.

But with that, again, keep posted from emails from us and notifications from us about website updates, FAQ updates.

And yeah, again with any I guess more Merc related questions rather than vdhp questions, direct them to your regional Planning Commission.

And with that, I'll get to work on getting this recording and getting this all posted.

Thanks, Greg, and thanks everybody. Yeah.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 1:04:42

Thanks Chris.

Yeah. And I'll just say before we go.

Yeah, if you have any historic building related questions.

Need advice.

Guidance, don't feel. Feel free to reach out.

WG **Weckesser, Grace** 1:04:56

Take care everybody. Thank you.

SG **Socinski, Greg** 1:04:56

Thank you.

Bye bye.

□ **Weckesser, Grace** stopped transcription