

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION**  
**December 13, 2023**

The Commission meeting was held remotely in a Zoom meeting starting at 1:00 PM

Chairman Rosenberry called the meeting to order at 1:06 pm. On behalf of Secretary Galvin, he welcomed the Commissioners. Chairman Rosenberry next addressed the visitors, thanking them for attending. For those individuals who may not have attended commission meetings in the past, Chairman Rosenberry explained the structure of the meeting and when in the process the visitors could address the commission. Chairman Rosenberry then took attendance to determine that a quorum was met.

The Chairman turned to the first item on the agenda, the approval of the November 8, 2023 meeting minutes. He called for a MOTION TO ACCEPT the minutes. A MOTION was made by Commissioner McDowell and SECONDED by Commissioner DeWitt. Hearing no questions, or comments from the commission, the Chairman called the motion. The motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then turned to the next item on the agenda, the National Register nominations, and called for any recusals. Hearing none, he turned the meeting over to Ben Haley, National Register Director. Mr. Haley presented the nominations with presentation slides. A copy of the slides is on file with these minutes.

The first nomination presented was for the **Lenox Street Apartments Historic District** in **Boston**. The applicant is the Beacon Communities LLC with VHB, preservation consultants who prepared the nomination. The nomination is being pursued as part of federal rehabilitation tax credit project.

The Lenox Street Apartments Historic District covers just under seven acres in Boston's Roxbury neighborhood. It is bounded by Lenox Street to the east, Kendall Street to the north and west, and Shawmut Avenue to the south.

The housing development, constructed in 1939, consists of twelve three-story residential blocks arranged in lines parallel with Shawmut Avenue and one former power house that was converted into management offices and a community center.

Each building has its own street address, but all 13 buildings sit on two parcels. Each building is also designated with a number 1-13.

The Lenox Street Apartments Historic District is eligible for the National Register under Criteria A and C at the local level.

Under Criterion A, the district's areas of significance are Community Planning and Development and Ethnic Heritage for associations with the Black community.

The district is significant under Community Planning and Development as a planned residential complex specifically designed as part of an effort to develop low-cost, modern housing in the Lower Roxbury neighborhood of Boston.

The complex was authorized under the National Housing Act of 1937, which sought to address the housing crisis caused by the Great Depression. It was one of the first four urban neighborhood clearing and public housing projects in the city of Boston and the only one still intact.

The property is significant under Ethnic Heritage because it was the first public housing complex in Boston intended exclusively for Black residents. It was intentionally sited in a predominantly Black neighborhood and it reflects the racial segregation policies that had been widely adopted by the Boston Housing Authority following its establishment in 1935.

The district meets Criterion C in the areas of Architecture and Landscape Architecture as an intact example of a planned residential development that reflects a series of important urban planning and housing design theories that emerged in the US during the 1930s.

The historic district's period of significance extends from 1939, when construction commenced, through to 50 years ago, reflecting its continued use as low-income housing to the present.

***Early Development in Lower Roxbury*** Roxbury, which had been a separate city, was annexed to Boston in 1868. During the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the northernmost area of Roxbury, known as Lower Roxbury, in which the Lenox Street Apartments would be located, emerged as one of the city's most affordable and convenient neighborhoods for working-class and low-income residents.

By the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Irish, French-Canadian, and Jewish residents of the neighborhood were joined by a growing number of Boston's Black community.

Black Bostonians began migrating to Lower Roxbury from the north side of Beacon Hill in the 1890s, likely attracted by employment opportunities available at nearby sites such as the Boston & Providence Railroad yards on the west side of Columbus Avenue.

A large portion of the Black community became concentrated in “a narrow geographic strip bounded by Columbus Avenue, Washington Street, Dartmouth/West Dedham Streets, and New Dudley Street,” which now contains the Lenox Street Apartments.

The neighborhood remained multi-racial through 1920, but by 1930, census records confirm the smaller area immediately around the Lenox Street Apartments site was exclusively Black.

***Public Works and the BHA*** The federal government became involved in the housing industry in 1933 when the National Industrial Recovery Act established the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration (PWA). The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) was created one year later. These policies were intended to address the nationwide housing crisis that developed during the Great Depression (1929–1940).

In developing its public housing projects, the federal government largely left their management to local entities. In Boston this entity was the Boston Housing Authority, established by the city in 1935 for the purpose of clearing substandard or blighted areas, providing housing for low-income families, and engaging in housing redevelopment projects.

The authority began a program of public housing for low-income families in 1937 under the auspices of the 1937 Wagner-Steagall Act, in which the United States Housing Authority facilitated housing developments by making long-term loans to local public authorities. In Boston, housing developed under the Wagner-Steagall Act was generally intended to reflect and enforce the racial demographics of the neighborhood in which it was located rather than encourage integration.

Although the characteristics of an ideal public housing site could be found in many nonwhite Boston neighborhoods, low-income housing under the Wagner-Steagall Act in minority-dominated districts was minimal. In total, Boston’s housing projects under the act had 93 percent white occupancy, even though the city’s nonwhite residents were more likely to have the city’s lowest incomes, occupy substandard housing, and use more than a third of their income for rent.

The Lenox Street Apartments appear to have been a sort of test case for the BHA in developing and managing housing for non-white, low-income residents.

### **Criteria A:**

The major streets in what became the site of the Lenox Street Apartments were densely built out with two- to four-story row houses and the occasional apartment building. Initially constructed for middle-class families, most of the former single-family dwellings in the neighborhood had been subdivided into flats and tenements.

The BHA intended to “upgrade” the housing stock in the neighborhood while allowing the community to remain in areas nearest to the railway yards and industries, and other places of employment. BHA managed Lenox and the later Camden Street Development, listed in the National Register in 2022, as a single entity on the Lenox Street site.

### ***Civil Rights***

Civil rights activists had advocated for racial integration in public housing as early as 1937, when the NAACP attempted to mandate open occupancy in complexes funded by the Wagner-Steagall Act. However, most of this legislation was ineffective due to subjective interpretations, inconsistent enforcement, and exceptions that tended to exclude Black home seekers.

Attempts to pass federal open occupancy laws failed until 1962, when President Kennedy issued an executive order intended to prevent discrimination through federal housing agencies. That year, Melnea Cass, president of the Boston chapter of the NAACP, cited the Lenox Street Apartments and the Camden Street Development in a complaint against the BHA that was filed with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination.

Through the complaint, the NAACP argued for an end to the BHA’s policy of segregation and advocated for better racial integration in the city’s public housing. At the time the complaint was filed, the Lenox Street Apartments had no white residents.

While the changes that came from the NAACP lawsuit were substantial, the BHA complexes were still highly segregated in the late 1960s.

In 1979 a Boston Housing Court judge placed the BHA in a receivership, asserting that extremely poor conditions at its properties were causing “incalculable human

suffering.” The receivership ended in 1984 and in the 1990s the BHA began to work with private companies on the redevelopment and management of their properties.

In 2015, Beacon Communities LLC was designated the developer for Lenox Street Apartments. The rehabilitation of the complex was completed earlier this year.

### **Criterion C: Architecture**

The Lenox Street Apartments Historic District embodies the distinct characteristics of public housing developments of the 1930s and early 1940s, including simple rectangular forms, flat roofs, and minimal architectural decoration executed with International Style influences and traditional American materials.

In the 1930s, public housing advocates such as Catherine Bauer and Henry Wright espoused the idea that well-designed housing projects could solve the social problem of poverty and “better the behavior as well as the condition of [their] inhabitants.” They championed the design concepts behind complexes that were being built in Europe, which were founded in modernist philosophies such as the German Bauhaus and *Zeilenbau* movements.

The streamlined Bauhaus designs formed a break with historical references and were intended to create orderly housing for a new era, without the congestion and alleys of the existing tenements.

In the *Zeilenbau*, which means “arranging in rows,” philosophy, housing was arranged in parallel rows along an east-west orientation. It comprised two-to-four-story apartment buildings in superblocs – large tracts of land set off from the previous street grid without an internal road system. This plan was intended to maximize light and air within the complex while promoting a community spirit.

In the United States, the minimalist building designs adopted for public housing most closely resemble the International Style. The style was formally introduced on a large scale to the United States by way of a seminal exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1932. Public housing complexes built after 1937 with funding from USHA were usually built in the International Style as the agency found the “no-frills” architecture suited to its cost restrictions. As a result, flat roofs, uniform fenestration, and little or no exterior ornamentation became defining features such public housing complexes.

### **The Buildings and Grounds**

The complex was designed by Boston-based architecture firm Maginnis & Walsh. The decision-making process behind the selection of Maginnis & Walsh for the complex is undocumented in BHA records. Rather than producing a development that was representative of their typical work, which primarily included revival-style buildings, the firm designed a complex that exemplified the architectural and social ideals behind the emerging public housing movement in the United States and exhibits key characteristics of public housing design influenced by the International Style.

The typical base-design of a residential block is three stories tall and consists of 12-by-3-bay main blocks and offset, 6-by-2-bay wings. The form was either elongated or truncated to fit the next building onto the site.

All the buildings have elevations of variegated red brick, and they each feature evenly spaced bands of dark, projecting soldier course brick.

Each building has a recessed, street-facing main entrance at both corner intersections of its main block and offset wings.

Fenestration consists of regularly spaced, stacked, four-over-four, double-hung aluminum clad wood windows with aluminum sills, most of which are in paired configurations.

Each building retains its original plan ranging from 12 to 40 residential units depending on the size of the building.

The design of the regularly spaced buildings, arranged in parallel rows among interior courtyards and paved parking lots, creates a park-like setting. The buildings' rear elevations face larger grassed courts that are embellished by mature trees, shrubs, and concrete pathways.

Like with the buildings, the minimalist approaches to site plan and layout also proved economical. While the east/west axis layout of the *Zeilenbau* may not have been incorporated into many public housing developments, excluding interior streets saved on construction costs. It also allowed for more of the community green space that was integral to the European precedents, and which also had an American precedent in the New England village green.

The Lenox Street Apartment grounds were designed by Olmsted Brothers. Lenox Street was one of the firm's earlier public housing projects. Some of the firm's

other public housing projects completed between 1939 and 1954 are similar to Lenox Street.

There are two intermediary interior courts along the axis. The one to the south contains a paved and landscaped seating area and the north end features an oval-shaped play area with a play structure and water splash pad. The paved, landscaped area around the court contains bench seating.

The most significant alteration to the landscape was when the paved areas between the front elevations of the buildings became parking areas, sometime between the late 1970s and mid-1990s.

The general shape of the site plan—two central courtyards and central axis—remain intact.

## **Rehabilitation**

The property underwent a state and federal tax advantaged rehabilitation that was completed to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards in 2023.

The scope of the project included repair and cleaning of the exterior masonry, replacement of all windows and exterior doors with reference to historic plans, alterations to the interior stairs to meet safety and accessibility code requirements, and the replacement and installation of various mechanical systems.

New amenities and flooring were installed in the units. Other features within the units, including original window casings and linen closet shelving, were retained and repaired where necessary.

Minor landscape improvements were also part of the project.

The next nomination presented was for the **Uphams Corner Historic District in Boston**. The applicant is the Dorchester Bay EDC with Epsilon Associates, preservation consultant. The nomination is being pursued as part of a federal rehabilitation tax credit project. A public meeting was held and hosted by BLC on November 29, 2023.

The Uphams Corner Historic District is a collection of 35 resources located in the heart of the Uphams Corner section of Dorchester, Boston’s largest neighborhood. This includes 24 contributing buildings and seven resources previously listed in the National Register: four buildings, two structures, and one site. Within the district’s boundaries are four noncontributing buildings and two vacant lots.

The district is centered at Columbia Square, formed by the intersection of Columbia Road and Dudley and Stoughton streets, which extend west and east, respectively. Columbia Road is a major north–south corridor with four lanes of traffic and street parking, divided by a concrete median. The vast majority of resources within the district are located along Columbia Road, south of Annabel Street and north of Bird Street.

### **Criterion A – Community Planning & Development**

The Uphams Corner Historic District is significant under Criterion A in the category of Community Planning & Development for its association with city-wide and neighborhood-specific municipal improvements that prompted and supported Uphams Corner’s role as an important urban center outside of downtown. Boston’s annexation of Dorchester in 1870 brought municipal public health and public works programs to the formerly independent and largely rural town, promoting development. Uphams Corner was equipped with comprehensive sanitation and utility services in the 1880s. The municipal project that affected the appearance and layout of Uphams Corner most drastically was the straightening and widening of Columbia Road in 1897, undertaken by the Boston Metropolitan Park Commission. Columbia Road was one of 50 roads to be wholly or partially completed in 1897, including both surface and sewer work. It was, however, considered one the most important projects completed by the Metropolitan Park Commission in the late 1890s along with Commonwealth Avenue, Huntington Avenue, and Columbus Avenue.

The significance of these main corridors branching out of downtown Boston and South Boston into the recently annexed sections of the city was bolstered by their connection to the Olmsted Park System. Commonly referred to as the Emerald Necklace, this chain of parks is linked by continuous parkways established as part of the municipal program in the late 1890s. The laying out of Columbia Road was the final link the “necklace” envisioned by Frederick Law Olmsted and called the Dorchester way. It was intended to connect Franklin Park and Marine Park but it was never completed.

Recognizing the positive implications of the Columbia Road project, the City constructed the Dorchester Municipal Building in 1902. Serving as the southern anchor of the district, this building housed ward committee meeting rooms, a gymnasium with public showers, and the Uphams Corner branch of the Boston Public Library. It is significant as one of Boston’s earliest municipal buildings, the majority of which were constructed in the 1910s and 1920s. The siting of the municipal building in Uphams Corner helped to sustain the momentum for



continued development into the next decade and beyond. A decade later, the City funded improvements at the Dorchester North Burying Ground, indicative of the cemetery's longstanding local importance. Built as part of a municipal initiative of the City Beautiful and city planning movements, the Comfort Station was constructed in 1912 on land originally part of the cemetery. As part of the same municipal effort in 1912, the Dorchester North Burying Ground Gateway was installed, and the stone walls enclosing the cemetery were replaced. The last notable City investment in the Uphams Corner Historic District was the construction of the Boston Engine House #21 in 1925.

### **Criterion A – Commerce**

Beginning with the establishment of Amos Upham's market in 1804, Uphams Corner has historically been anchored by commerce. Retail has always been an important and dominating form of commerce in the district. Offices, banks, entertainment, and automobile-related resources are also found across the district. As a collection, these resources tell of Uphams Corner's rich commercial diversity and local significance as a prominent business district outside of downtown Boston. Uphams Corner is the only major business district in the northern half of Dorchester and is considered *the* marketplace in Dorchester. The district has thus played an important role in local commerce for the residents of various surrounding residential areas. The district features numerous commercial buildings constructed between 1880 and 1950 that vary in scale and use, both original and altered. This includes notable, grand buildings that served as catalysts for the area's rapid development at the turn of the century, as well as less prominent and smaller-scale examples that are representative of the business opportunities afforded locally as the neighborhood continued to grow into the mid-20th-century.

The 1897 municipal project that expanded and improved Columbia Road prompted the development of larger commercial buildings at the heart of Uphams Corner, which not only transformed it into a more modern and grand-scale commercial hub, but also secured its position as an important and diverse business district outside of downtown Boston. The construction of two noteworthy examples began in 1901. Rising four stories and designed in the popular Classical Revival style, the S. B. Pierce Building was a grand addition to Uphams Corner in both its massing and aesthetics. It contained ground-level commercial space with offices and meeting spaces above. Telling of the diverse range of goods and services available in Uphams Corner, tenants throughout the period of significance included various retailers, finance-related businesses, beauty salons, and music and dance instructors. On the south side of Dudley opposite the S. B. Pierce Building, the Columbia Square Building was built in 1901–1902. It replaced the single-story

brick shop constructed in 1884 to replace Amos Upham's store. It was locally notable as the first building in Dorchester with electric light. Among known early ground-level commercial tenants was the Dorchester Savings Bank, which was located in the building into the 1920s, a bowling alley, a restaurant, and candy and stationery shop. The upper floors housed offices and dedicated space for a Masonic lodge.

### **Criterion C – Architecture**

The Uphams Corner Historic District is significant under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as a diverse collection of resources that embody the characteristics distinctive to the various resource types and eras of the period of significance. A number of resources in the district are independently architecturally significant, but as a collection they form Dorchester's premier business and institutional district, featuring the greatest number of prominent and architecturally ornate buildings, which are supported by more modest and smaller-scale examples. Construction dates for the buildings in the district run from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, and thus a range of architectural styles are represented. These include Gothic Revival, Panel Brick, Renaissance Revival, Romanesque Revival, Classical Revival, which is the most common style, Colonial Revival, Mission Revival, and Art Deco.

### **Integrity & Level of Significance**

Although some buildings have experienced less sympathetic modifications, the district as a whole retains integrity. The period of significance begins in 1879 with the construction of the oldest extant building and ends in 1950 with the construction of the last contributing resource within the district. The Uphams Corner Historic District nomination was prepared in support of the certified historic rehabilitation of the S. B. Pierce Building at 592-598 Columbia Road. The project was completed in 2022, met the Secretary's Standards, and recently received a preservation achievement award from the Boston Preservation Alliance and a Thomas Menino Legacy Award from Preservation Massachusetts.

The next nomination presented was for the **Bradford Durfee Textile School in Fall River**. The applicant is 64 Durfee LLC with Ryan LLC, preservation consultant. The nomination is being pursued as part of federal rehabilitation tax credit project.

A pioneering vocational institution, the Bradford Durfee Textile School opened in 1904 to train students for Fall River's booming manufacturing industry. By the

early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Fall River was the foremost producer of cotton textiles in the United States.

Located at 64 Durfee Street, is in a developed city neighborhood and occupies a full city block.

To the school's east is the Romanesque Revival Armory, while visible in the distance to the school's west is the Charles M. Braga Jr. Memorial Bridge, which spans the Taunton River.

The land for the Bradford Durfee Textile School was donated to City of Fall River by a niece of Bradford Durfee, on the condition that the school be named after her uncle who was a leading local manufacturer. The Durfees were one of the founding families of Fall River.

The Textile School's campus was developed in essentially two phases; the first phase occurred during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and included the main Durfee Building, which opened in 1904, the Textile Building, originally referred to as the Weaving Annex, opened in 1909, along with the Power House and the Dye House, which both opened in 1912. The Coombs Science Hall was constructed in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. Two of the campus structures were built as freestanding buildings—the Durfee Building and the Dye House—while the other three were additions.

The school is significant at both the state and local levels under Criterion A in the area of Education as one of three textile vocational schools established in Massachusetts at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and the only textile vocational school in Fall River.

The school's period of significance extends from 1904, the date the Durfee building opened for classes, until 1964, the year the school merged with the New Bedford Institute of Technology and relocated to a new campus in North Dartmouth – ultimately forming part of the University of Massachusetts system.

In addition to Criterion A, the Durfee Textile School is significant at the local level under Criterion C in the area of Architecture. The well preserved campus is unique in Fall River as a school combining characteristics of both education and industrial mill buildings into one complex to serve its purpose as a vocational institution. The school's resources also exemplify the Classical Revival and Moderne architectural styles as applied to institutional buildings.

Prolific Fall River architect Joseph Darling designed the school's flagship Durfee building shown here. A three-story-plus-basement Classical Revival structure, the Durfee Building is finished with granite on its lower stories and buff brick on the upper stories. Among its Classical Revival features are its symmetrical composition, arched entrances, Palladian windows, Ionic pilasters and ornamented roof cornice. The building also possesses distinctive splayed lintels with keystones ornamenting its windows.

The school focused on textile manufacturing with classes in subjects such as weaving, chemistry and dyeing, mechanical drawing, and mill calculations. The majority of students worked in the mills by day and participated in the school's evening program. The day classes offered manufacturing training to students before they began work in the textile industry, while the evening classes provided working students greater knowledge, often in one particular area of the field. Early on the school catered only to male students, however, the first woman graduated in 1912 and women students increased slowly thereafter.

The Durfee Building's southern section included administrative offices and lecture space, however, its northern area (seen here on the blue drawing's right side), functioned as the "mill wing." Historic interior views show the mill equipment in place within the Durfee Building. The school had the most up-to-date cotton textile machinery for its students.

### **Textile Building**

After construction of the Durfee Building, the school proved so successful that, within a few years, a large addition was necessary, which was built to the north. The four-story, buff-brick-and-granite Textile Building offered students additional space and equipment for learning, including many different types of looms.

The architect of the Textile Building was William T. Henry. Born in Fall River, Henry designed many of the city's mills. Aspects of the school building echo features found in industrial mill architecture including the brick walls, heavy timber framing, and large window openings.

### **Power House & Dye House**

This western view of the school shows the rear elevations of the Durfee and Textile buildings. The low red-brick Power House extends west from the Durfee Building's northwest ell and the school's tall smokestack is visible at its corner.

The one-story Dye House – shown here in the right foreground - is constructed of coursed, rough-faced granite and possesses a distinctive saw-tooth roof.

The textile industry throughout New England began a steady decline following World War I. As a result of the declining need for vocational textile education, the Durfee School responded by expanding its educational goals. In the mid-1940s, the school's name was changed to the Bradford Durfee Technical Institute. Soon the school transitioned from high school- to college-level training and began to offer Bachelor of Science degrees.

In 1952, the last building, the Coombs Science Hall, was added. Classes within this building maintained a focus on science, and its architectural design was distinctly different than that of the rest of the campus.

Designed by noted Fall River architects Samuel Dubitsky and Edward Corbett, Coombs Hall is one of only a few Moderne-style buildings in Fall River. Characteristics of this style evident here include the flat roof, bands of horizontally oriented windows, the use of glass block and the bold flat stone surround at the buildings main entrance.

Preserved and key to the Coombs building interior is its tall, metal school lockers running along either side of this wide corridor ornamented with vibrant yellow-hued tile – also visible in the right image.

In recent years, the school was rehabilitated using State and Federal Historic Tax Credits. All work met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Preserved historic features within the rehabilitated residential units include the wood floors, brick walls, and expansive windows.

Today, the Bradford Durfee Textile School functions as a mixed-use residential and commercial development with a focus on the arts. There are residential units in all three of the main buildings (Durfee, Textile, and Coombs) with commercial space in the Durfee building and the Coombs Hall. The Coombs Building also now includes a theater.

Now serving the community in new ways, the Bradford Durfee Textile School's architecture serves as an important record of Fall River's pioneering role in vocational education designed to meet the needs of the city's leading early 20<sup>th</sup>-century textile industry.

The next nomination presented was for the **U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven in Tisbury**. The applicant is Martha's Vineyard Museum with Eric Dray, preservation consultant.

U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven, 151 Lagoon Pond Road, Tisbury, Dukes County. The U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven is sited on a 4.5-acre elevated parcel south of the village of Vineyard Haven in Tisbury. The surrounding area consists primarily of 20<sup>th</sup>-century dwellings.

The parcel slopes down gently from south to north and then drops down a steep terraced slope, installed in 1896, to Lagoon Pond Road and Lagoon Pond. The marine hospital is sited toward the rear (south) portion of the parcel, facing north toward Lagoon Pond and the Vineyard Haven harbor. Much of the parcel was cleared in around 2015, restoring the original open character of the grounds.

The U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven is a two-story, wood-frame, Classical Revival-style building. The building's form consists of a central block flanked to the east and west by pavilion wings. The main block has a hip roof, with gable roofs on the north and south elevations. The east and west pavilion wings have hip roofs that are stepped down from the central block.

The first story of the 1895 building on all elevations is clad in wood clapboards, and the second story elevations are clad in wood shingles. The elevations are trimmed with a skirt board above the foundation and substantial corner boards. A broad, molded belt course divides the first and second story. Above this belt course are seven courses of flared shingles that are capped by a narrow, molded belt course that incorporates the sills of the second story windows. The field of the pediment of the north and south elevations is clad in wood shingles with a wave-like pattern. The roof is clad in gray slate shingles. The central block has a projecting molded box cornice, and the east and west pavilion ward wings have projecting roof eaves with exposed rafter tails. Four tall, corbelled, red brick chimneys rise from the corners of the central block.

The first floor of the Marine Hospital is symmetrical in layout. A centered corridor runs between the north and south entrances and connects to a wide corridor leading to the east and west pavilion wards. The central block of the first floor was divided by these corridors into four rooms, with two additional rooms near the entrance to each ward. While there is no documentation of the precise use of each room, according to accounts at the time of construction, these rooms served as

administrative and service support rooms for the wards including offices, an operating room, dispensary, steward's quarters, and bathrooms. The second floor is accessed from a broad wood staircase off-centered along the east-west corridor. The second floor is similar in layout, although the central four rooms are subdivided further. The pavilion wards on both stories are duplicates in design and arrangements with equal capacity for patients - six per ward.

Representative of a utilitarian function, the first and second floors have simple finishes and trim details.

A wood-framed ward building that had been built on the site in 1885 was moved and connected to the rear of the 1895 hospital and repurposed as a dining hall and kitchen. That building was removed in 1936 and replaced in 1938 with a two-story brick addition. The 1938 addition was removed during the 2018 Rehabilitation. The 1938 addition had been connected to the 1895 hospital building by a "gasket" that made minimal contact with the hospital building.

Due to the minimal connection the 1938 addition had to the original building, the south elevation of the 1895 hospital building was able to remain largely unchanged during the 2018 Rehabilitation, with only a small "patch" to conceal the former second floor connection. A new entrance, and glass-enclosed entrance porch were added on the south elevation following removal of the 1938 addition.

As part of the 2018 Rehabilitation, a one-story, flat-roofed addition with basement was built adjoining the west elevation of the Marine Hospital. The addition is contemporary in design in order to distinguish it from the 1895 building, and to comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The physical connection is minimized by a transparent connector.

The U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven meets National Register Criterion A as a building with national significance in the area of Maritime History. Of the 33 U.S. Marine Hospitals built or adaptively reused by the Marine Hospital Service from the establishment of the Marine Hospital Fund in 1789 to 1912 when the Marine Hospital Service evolved and expanded into the Public Health Service, only 13 are extant. Of these, the U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven was one of the last to be built before the Service expanded its role into public health in 1912.

The U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven also meets National Register Criterion A as a building with national significance in the area Health/Medicine.

Starting in the 1870s, the Marine Hospital Service transitioned from building “block”-plan hospitals to “pavilion”-plan hospitals in a belief that pavilion hospitals provided better ventilation and light to combat patients spreading and contracting infectious diseases.

Florence Nightingale is widely credited with popularizing the idea of pavilion plan hospitals. The high mortality rates for hospital patients during the Crimean War (1853-1856), at one point reaching 60%, inspired her and others to research existing hospitals throughout Europe to determine best patient care practices. She identified ventilation, light, and warmth as critical elements, and determined that the pavilion plan was the preferred design to accomplish these goals. She wrote extensively about the pavilion plan design in her widely read *Notes on Hospitals*.

The concept of pavilion hospitals was first recommended by the U.S. federal government following the outbreak of the Civil War, and pavilion hospitals were built during the war in both the North and the South.

The transition to pavilion hospitals occurred for the U.S. Marine Hospital Service following the passage of an Act in 1870 that centralized and reorganized the Marine Hospital Service.

The pavilion hospitals began to be built by the Marine Hospital Service following recommendations from its first Supervising Surgeon, John Woodworth, M.D. In 1872, Woodworth initiated the publication of annual reports of the Marine Hospital Service. In the *First Annual Report of the Supervising Surgeon of the Marine Hospital Service*, Woodworth called for the construction of pavilion hospitals.

Of the eight pavilion marine hospitals built by the Marine Hospital Service throughout the United States between 1872 and 1912, the U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven is the only extant example. The period of significance selected for U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven begins with its construction in 1895 and ends with the establishment of the Public Health Service in 1912.

The U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven meets Criterion C as a building of national significance as the only extant example of the eight “pavilion” plan U.S. Marine Hospitals built by the Marine Hospital Service.

It was designed by Willoughby James Edbrooke, Supervising Architect of the United States Treasury from 1891 to 1892, and modified by Edbrooke’s successor at the Treasury, Jeremiah O’Rourke.



The two-story hospital was designed to achieve the sanitary goals of pavilion hospitals. Most notably, the hospital was of wood-frame construction, and had four wards for six patients with each ward separated from the others, and each ward designed with large windows on three sides for ventilation and access to a deck or balcony.

After 1912, US Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven operated as a general hospital until it was closed in 1952.

Vacant until 1959, it was operated from 1959 to 2008 by the St. Pierre family as a summer camp. The family made no changes to the hospital's interior.

In 2011, Martha's Vineyard Museum purchased the property with plans to restore and rehabilitate the marine hospital building to house the museum's collections. That work was completed and the Museum opened in 2018.

This concluded the presentation of the March National Register nominations. Chairman Rosenberry thanked Mr. Haley and noted that Commissioner Friary had joined the meeting. As there were no recusals, he proceeded with the voting.

Chairman Rosenberry called for a MOTION TO ACCEPT the MHC staff recommendation that the nomination for the **Lenox Street Apartments Historic District** in **Boston** be forwarded to the National Park Service for final review. A MOTION was made by Commissioner DeWitt and SECONDED by Commissioner Ceccacci. The Chairman called for questions or comments from the commission. Hearing none, he called for questions or comments from the public. Hearing none, he moved the motion. The motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry called for a MOTION TO ACCEPT the MHC staff recommendation that the nomination for the **Uphams Corner Historic District** in **Boston** be forwarded to the National Park Service for final review. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sullivan and SECONDED by Commissioner DeWitt. The Chairman called for questions or comments from the commission. Hearing none, he called for questions or comments from the public. Susan Chu, from the Dorchester Bay Economic Development Corporation, thanked MHC staff for shepherding the nomination through the National Register process. Mr. Rosenberry thanked her for her comments. Hearing no other comments, he moved the motion. The motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry called for a MOTION TO ACCEPT the MHC staff recommendation that the nomination for the **Bradford Durfee Textile in Fall River in Fall River** be forwarded to the National Park Service for final review. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Ceccacci and SECONDED by Commissioner DeWitt. The Chairman called for questions or comments from the commission. Hearing none, he called for questions or comments from the public. Hearing none, he moved the motion. The motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry called for a MOTION TO ACCEPT the MHC staff recommendation that the nomination for the **U.S. Marine Hospital at Vineyard Haven in Tisbury** be forwarded to the National Park Service for final review. A MOTION was made by Commissioner McDowell and SECONDED by Commissioner Wilson. The Chairman called for questions or comments from the commission. Hearing none, he called for questions or comments from the public. Hearing none, he moved the motion. The motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

This concluded the National Register portion of the agenda.

Chairman Rosenberry then turned to the next item on the agenda, the Local Historic District Preliminary Study Reports, first calling for any recusals. Hearing none, he turned the meeting over to Jennifer Doherty, Local Government Programs Coordinator. Ms. Doherty presented the study reports with a PowerPoint presentation. A copy of the presentation is on file with these minutes.

Ms. Doherty first presented the **Blue Cross Blue Shield Building in Boston**. The City of Boston is proposing to landmark the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building. The petition for this landmark designation was accepted by the Boston Landmarks Commission on June 14, 2016.

The building is located at 133 Federal Street in the city's Financial District.

There are several designated properties in the immediate area. To the southeast across Federal Street is the United Shoe Machinery Company Building, listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1980 and designated a local landmark in 1983. Beyond that is the Richardson Block, which will be presented next, listed in the National Register in 1986 and part of the Gridley Street Historic District, listed in 2014. To the west is the Commercial Palace Historic District, determined eligible for listing in the National Register in 1985, but not formally listed. The

district also includes the Church Green Buildings Historic District, designated a local landmark in 1980 and listed in the National Register in 1999.

The Blue Cross Blue Shield Building is located in the Financial District among other late 20<sup>th</sup> century high-rise buildings. It is surrounded on two sides by the city's newest high-rise, the Winthrop Center project, discussed later.

Opened in 1960, the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building is a Brutalist concrete office building designed by Paul Rudolph, one of his earliest buildings and the oldest of three he designed in Boston. He received the commission for this building after completing the Jewett Arts Center at Wellesley College in 1958. The building is elevated above the street on a podium which houses basement service spaces. An open plaza is located to the south, integrated into the building's design. The double-height lobby and second floor are recessed behind Y-shaped columns that support the office floors above. Each branch of the Y extends up the building in a functional pier that holds the building's ductwork, allowing for thinner plates between floors. V-shaped sills and lintels between floors have alternating raised and recessed panels between them.

The building was in stark contrast to and an explicit reaction against many of the glass curtain wall office buildings of the International Style that were being constructed at the time. The concrete used has a large white quartz aggregate mixed in, giving the building a unique texture and creating a play of light during different times of the day.

The exterior of the building is largely unaltered aside from some changes to the plaza. The railing has been replaced, and benches around the perimeter have been removed. Glass pyramids serving as skylights into the basement cafeteria have been replaced by the round planters now in the plaza.

In contrast to the many other businesses fleeing Boston for new suburban locations during the postwar years, Blue Cross Blue Shield made the decision to invest in a brand new building in the city center. Many of the healthcare insurer's 800 employees were unmarried women who lived in the city, who needed access to public transportation and services.

The building's site included several brick structures that had been used to manufacture clothing in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, for office space. These were demolished to make way for Paul Rudolph's new building, opened in 1960.

A major figure of American mid-century architecture, Paul Rudolph studied under Walter Gropius at the Harvard Graduate School of Design where his classmates included I.M. Pei and Phillip Johnson. A proponent of reinforced concrete, his most famous work is probably the Art and Architecture Building at Yale, where he was also head of the Department of Architecture. In addition to the Jewett Arts Center at Wellesley and the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building, Rudolph's other notable commissions in Massachusetts include the Boston Government Services Center, the central campus complex of UMass Dartmouth, and the First Church in Boston's Back Bay.

In February, 2007, the previous owners of the building submitted an Article 85 application to the BLC requesting to demolish the building as part of the Winthrop Square redevelopment, an effort to build an 80-story tower on the site of a City-owned parking garage to the north and west of the Blue Cross Blue Shield building. After the BLC imposed a 90-day demolition delay, the owners chose not to demolish the building. The renamed Winthrop Center project was recently completed, albeit at a scaled-down 21 stories, offering office and residential space. Along with the nearby Millennium Tower, the buildings represent a new wave of redevelopment in the city's downtown core.

Because it was one of the earliest Brutalist buildings constructed as part of the "New Boston" postwar redevelopment, and its design by noted architect Paul Rudolph, BLC staff recommends that the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building be designated as a Boston Landmark.

MHC staff recommends acknowledging receipt of the Landmark Study Report for the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building and providing the following advisory recommendations and comments:

The Massachusetts Historical Commission concurs with the recommendations of the Boston Landmarks Commission staff.

Ms. Doherty then presented the **Richardson Block in Boston**. The City of Boston is also proposing to landmark the Richardson Block. The petition for further study was accepted by the BLC on June 8, 1987.

The Richardson Block is located a few blocks east of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building just discussed, also in the Financial District. Although a single, unified design, it is composed of nine separately-owned parcels filling the block bound by Pearl, Purchase, Gridley, and High streets.

The Richardson Block was individually listed in the National Register in 1986, and was listed as part of the larger Gridley Street Historic District in 2014. It is across the Rose Kennedy Greenway from the Russia Wharf Buildings, listed in the National Register in 1980, and the Fort Point Channel Historic District, listed in the National Register in 2004. A block to the north is the Federal Reserve Bank Building, designated a local landmark in 1978.

The Richardson Block is one of the few remaining late 19<sup>th</sup> century buildings in the Financial District, which was heavily redeveloped over the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Surrounding buildings still make use of brick and stone on their exteriors, but are significantly taller than the Richardson Block. The Rose Kennedy Greenway, the site of the former Central Artery, runs to the south of the Richardson Block. Across that are later 20<sup>th</sup> century office buildings of glass curtain wall construction.

Although it is nine separate parcels, the Richardson Block was conceived of and designed as a single building design, with the parcels sold off individually and the units constructed by their owner. The architect was William G. Preston, and most of the units were constructed between 1873 and 1876. The brick unit at 115-119 Pearl Street was designed by George W. Pope and constructed in 1885. For the most part four stories, aside from the 1885 addition, the building features a cast-iron storefront at street level, rising to a marble façade for the three stories above. The center building features the block's name as well as a pediment, highlighting it as the centerpiece of the larger, unified design. The sides and rear are of brick.

The building has been altered over the years, primarily with changes to the storefronts, utilitarian features such as fire escapes and fenestration alterations on the rear, and the addition of a glass penthouse to the end unit at 119 High Street.

The original, unified design of the Richardson Block was completed by William Gibbons Preston, while the single brick unit was designed by George W. Pope.

Preston was a prolific late 19<sup>th</sup> century architect. He attended Harvard, and along with H. H. Richardson was one of four Boston architects to study in Paris in the 1860s. He returned to Boston and established his own practice with initial major compositions in the 1860s such as the Museum of Natural History and MIT's original building, the Rogers Building, both in Back Bay. His future works were many and varied, including some of the earliest row house residences in the Back Bay, suburban summer houses in coastal communities, the Hotel DeSoto in Savannah, Georgia, public buildings such as the Lincoln Public Library and several

state hospital campuses across the Commonwealth. All told, he designed over 700 projects throughout the course of his career; 79 are entered in MACRIS.

Like Preston, Pope also designed a wide variety of building forms. A native of Maine, he was initially trained as a mason, and although he designed many buildings throughout his life, he was still primarily described as a mason or a builder. He was very active in the rebuilding of Boston's commercial core following the 1872 fire, with approximately 50 buildings designed or constructed by him in the area. He also worked closely with businessman and philanthropist Robert Treat Paine on three housing developments for the working class in Boston's outlying neighborhoods. Pope has over 100 entries in MACRIS, many of which are the row houses he designed for Robert Treat Paine.

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Boston had developed into a leather and shoe-making hub for the region and New England. Much of the industry moved into the Fort Hill area in the 1860s and 1870s. The neighborhood had previously been primarily residential, largely composed of tenements for new Irish immigrants.

However, much of the area was wiped out by the Great Fire of 1872, which destroyed 65 acres of land and buildings in the core of the city, including those along Pearl Street. The leather and shoe industry quickly rebuilt, and the Richardson Block was part of those efforts, with all but one of the units constructed in the years immediately following the fire. But by the 1880s the leather industry had shifted further to the south, to the Leather District around South Station, leaving the Richardson Block available for a variety of other commercial enterprises. Today, it is a mixed-use block featuring apartments, offices, restaurants, and stores.

The Boston Planning & Development Agency is in the process of adopting the new PLAN: Downtown, an urban plan that will cover much of the downtown area. It calls for special protection the city's historic and cultural landmarks, and the BLC seeks to protect the Richardson Block by designating it a landmark. The Richardson Block is also part of the area the Mayor has designated for a pilot program allowing the conversion of office to residential space, although at least two of the units in the Richardson Block already include residential space.

Because it is one of the few remaining late 19<sup>th</sup> century buildings in the downtown area, its Neo-Grec architecture executed in marble, and its design by architect William G. Preston, BLC staff recommends that the Richardson Block be designated as a Boston Landmark.

MHC staff recommends acknowledging receipt of the Landmark Study Report for the Richardson Block and providing the following advisory recommendations and comments:

The Massachusetts Historical Commission concurs with the recommendations of the Boston Landmarks Commission staff.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION TO ACCEPT the MHC staff recommendations on the Landmark Study Report for the **Blue Cross Blue Shield Building in Boston (Financial District)**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner DeWitt and SECONDED by Commissioner Wilson. The chairman called for questions or comments from the commission. The Chair recognized Commissioner DeWitt who said that the staff perhaps should have a conversation with BLC staff regarding the term Brutalist, which is quite inappropriate. This is not to say the building is not important – it is very important. But it belongs in the context of that time with people like Yamasaki and Ed Stone. A term that was used at that time was “architecture of delight” though this did not gain much traction. The use of the term Brutalist with regard to this building is really misleading regardless of other things that Rudolph later did. So hopefully staff could pass this along to BLC in hopes of correcting the record. The chair thanked Commissioner Dewitt for his remarks. The Chair called for any other questions or comments from the commission. Hearing none, he moved the motion. The Chair then called for questions or comments from the public. Hearing none, he moved the motion. The motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION TO ACCEPT the MHC staff recommendations on the Preliminary Study Report for the **Richardson Block in Boston (Financial District)**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner DeWitt and SECONDED by Commissioner Ceccacci. The chairman called for questions or comments from the commission. The Chair then called for questions or comments from the public. Hearing none, he moved the motion. The motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

This concluded the voting. Chairman Rosenberry then turned to the next item on the agenda, **FY23 Survey and Planning Grant Awards**, and recognized Michael Steinitz, Preservation Planning Division Director.

Chairman Rosenberry turned to the next item on the agenda, the presentation of the **FY24 Survey & Planning Grant applications**. The chairman first called for any

recusals. Hearing none, he turned the meeting over to the Director of the Preservation Planning Division, Michael Steinitz.

Mr. Steinitz noted that the commissioners had before them a spreadsheet with the subcommittee's recommendations. A copy of this spreadsheet is on file with these minutes. Mr. Steinitz next thanked the Survey and Planning Subcommittee commissioners DeWitt, McDowell and Wilson for meeting with staff before the commission meeting to review the applications for the FY24 grant round.

Each year MHC passes through a portion of its annual federal budget to eligible applicants through matching grants from its Survey and Planning grants program. Projects that receive grant funding include for example historic properties surveys, National Register nominations, communitywide preservation plans, and development of design guidelines, professional staff support, and other eligible projects.

MHC is required to pass through 10 percent of its annual federal funding to Certified Local Governments (CLGs), of which there are presently 29 in Massachusetts. For FY24 the 10 percent pass through requirement is anticipated to be about \$115,000. Where funding has been available the Survey and Planning grant program has also been open to qualified applicants who are not CLG's. MHC's budget circumstances for FY24 have allowed making the program available to both Certified Local Governments and other eligible applicants. Federal budget for FY24 has not been established, so there isn't a firm figure for the total available award amount. But for context, in FY23 MHC awarded grants to 14 projects for \$278,000.

The application process involves two steps: the submission or pre-applications in November, followed by the selection for an invitation for full applications in December. The full applications are due in February, with grant awards to be voted on by the Commission at its March 8th meeting.

For FY24, MHC received 24 pre-applications totaling \$452,500 in requests. These included 5 CLG pre-applications totaling \$141,500 and 19 non-CLG pre-applications totaling \$311,000. The pre-applications included 18 historic properties survey projects, 1 survey plan, 1 communitywide preservation plan, 1 pre-development project, 1 National Register nomination, 1 design guidelines project, and 1 request for acquisition funds. One project, the request for acquisition funds, is not eligible for funding under the grant program, which does not fund acquisitions.



Full applications that are invited today will be due on February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024. The Commission will vote on the actual grant awards at its March 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. Based on its review of the proposed projects, staff has made recommendations to the subcommittee on awards.

Mr. Steinitz then turned to Commissioner DeWitt who presented the subcommittee report and findings.

Commissioner DeWitt began by noting certain things of interest that were discussed by the subcommittee and staff. The pre-application from Worcester are related to documenting issues relating to historic redlining and how these affected the target neighborhoods then and now. The Salem pre-application relates to a planning study for a surviving Revolutionary-era fort, and there some questions on how this will build on the City's previous planning study which appears not to have been implemented. A number of non-CLG projects are not recommended for full applications, which relates to available MHC funding, but they were also excluded for a number of reasons, including because they did not have matching funds in place, or the project was too small, or the applicants had received an S&P grant the previous year. It was noted that there is still an ongoing shortage of consultants to undertake work on these projects, and outreach by MHC staff, for example, to consultants in nearby states, is ongoing. Also a number of applicants indicated that they were specifically applying because of concerns regarding the impacts of the MBTA Communities Zoning Act on historic neighborhoods which are close to transit nodes. So the subcommittee recommends inviting full-applications from the projects as indicated on the list that the Commission has before it. With that Commissioner DeWitt concluded his report.

Chairman Rosenberry thanked Commissioner DeWitt, Mr. Steinitz, and the members of the subcommittee, and then began the voting process for awarding CLG projects, calling for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$38,000 from the **Boston Landmarks Commission** for the **East Boston Survey Update Phase II**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner DeWitt and SECONDED by Commissioner Wilson. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$30,000 from the **Nantucket Historical Commission** for the **Historic Property Survey Downtown Nantucket**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Wilson and SECONDED by

Commissioner McDowell. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$17,500 from the **City of Newton** for the **Newton Architectural Survey ca. 1940-1975**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sullivan and SECONDED by Commissioner Ceccacci. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$31,000 from the **City of Salem** for the **Fort Lee Preservation and Management Plan**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sullivan and SECONDED by Commissioner Friary. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry next called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$20,000 from the **City of Worcester** for the **Historic Survey & Oral Histories on East Side**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner DeWitt and SECONDED by Commissioner Wilson. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry, turning to the Non-CLG projects, then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$20,000 from the **Abington Historical Commission** for the **Abington Historic Properties Survey Update**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner McDowell and SECONDED by Commissioner Friary. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$15,000 from the **Holliston Historical Commission** for the **Village Commercial District Historical Resources Inventory**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner DeWitt and SECONDED by Commissioner McDowell. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$15,000 from the **Ipswich Historical Commission** for the **Ipswich Survey Master Plan**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Wilson and SECONDED by Commissioner Ceccacci. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to accept the MHC staff recommendation to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$12,500 from the **Lunenburg Historical Commission** for the **Survey 2023 (pre-1833 houses)**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Sullivan and SECONDED by Commissioner Heidemann. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry next called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$15,000 from the **Manchester-by-the-Sea Historical Commission** for the **Survey and Inventory Update & Expansion**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Friary and SECONDED by Commissioner McDowell. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$10,000 from the **New Braintree Historical Commission** for the **New Braintree Town Center National Register Nomination**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Ceccacci and SECONDED by Commissioner Perille. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$15,000 from the **Westborough Historical Commission** for the **Westborough Form B Survey Campaign**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner DeWitt and SECONDED by Commissioner Ceccacci. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Rosenberry then called for a MOTION to invite a full application for a Survey and Planning grant in the amount of \$20,000 from the **Whitman Historic Commission** for the **Whitman Inventory of Historical Resources**. A MOTION was made by Commissioner McDowell and SECONDED by Commissioner Friary. There being no discussion, the motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

This concluded the voting. Chairman Rosenberry then turned to the next item on the agenda, the **Executive Director's Report**. He then recognized Brona Simon, Executive Director.

Ms. Simon began by noting that as part of the ongoing 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the American Revolution, events marking the 250th anniversary of the Boston Tea Party will take place on Saturday, December 16th. Many organizations involved in

this day of reenactments are coordinated through the non-profit group Revolution 250. They include the Old State House, the Old South Meetinghouse and the Boston Tea Party Ships and Museum. One of their activities over the past year has been to go to communities around the state to solicit tea to put in the crates for the reenactment, and especially to engage schoolkids in learning about the American Revolution and the role of Massachusetts in starting it off with this show of defiance over the royal government. Ms. Simon will forward a press release to the Commissioners regarding the Friday night preview event to which they have all been invited. Events will also be livestreamed. Ms. Simon noted that she serves on the state Revolution 250 Commission, representing Secretary Galvin, and she noted in reference to Commissioner DeWitt's comment on Revolutionary War era forts in Salem and Cambridge, that she was familiar with other contemporary fortifications at Dorchester Heights and Bunker Hill, both being places where archaeological investigations have revealed important remnants of the fortifications.

Ms. Simon then provided the Commissioners with an update on the schedule for Round 30 of the Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund grant program, indicating that the program has been authorized by the Executive Office of Administration & Finance to start the application process, and that application materials are available in hardcopy and on MHC's website, which also includes the schedule of workshops for people who are interested in applying for a grant. Applications for the MPPF program are due on March 15, 2024, and awards will be voted on at the June 12, 2024 Commission meeting.

Ms. Simon then reviewed the Commission Meeting Schedule for 2024 on the second Wednesday of every month except May, July, and August when there are no meetings. The dates of the 2024 meetings will be posted on MHC's website, and Ms. Simon will also email the schedule to the Commissioners.

Finally, Ms. Simon then offered a thank you and best wishes from the MHC staff to Commissioner Gina Perille, whose term is expiring this month, and who has let staff know this will be her last meeting.

Chairman Rosenberry then also thanked commissioner Perille on behalf of the Commission. Commissioner Perille in turn thanked the staff at MHC and her fellow commissioners, noting her appreciation at the opportunity to serve and that she has been consistently impressed with the work of the staff and their professionalism.

The Chairman then called for any new business. Hearing none, the chairman wished everyone a happy and healthy holiday season and New Year. He called for a motion to adjourn. A MOTION was made by Commissioner Perille and SECONDED by Commissioner DeWitt. The meeting adjourned at 2:34 pm.

Commissioners Present

John Rosenberry

Charles Sullivan

Dennis DeWitt

Michael McDowell

Gina Perille

Susan Ceccacci

Donald Friary

Mark Wilson

Ashley Stolba

Derek Heidemann

Staff Present

Brona Simon

Jennifer Doherty

Michael Steinitz

Ben Haley

Elizabeth Sherva

Joshua Dorin

Peter Stott

Paul Holtz

Nancy Alexson

Shari Perry-Wallace

Liz King

Robin Forham

A TRUE COPY ATTEST

Respectfully submitted,

Shirley Brown