



# Town of Sudbury

## Historical Commission

Flynn Building  
278 Old Sudbury Road  
Sudbury, MA 01776  
978-639-3387  
Fax: 978-639-3314

historical@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/historicalcommission

### MINUTES

JULY 20, 2021

### VIRTUAL MEETING

**Present:** Chair Chris Hagger, Vice-Chair Diana Warren, Jan Costa, Diana Cebra, Steve Greene, Taryn Trexler, Marjorie Katz, Others Present -Chris Durall – 14 Hayden Circle, Kathryn McGrath, 19 Pilgram’s Path

**Others Present:** Beth Perry, Planning and Community Development Coordinator; Adam Duchesneau, Planning and Community Development Director

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting of the Sudbury Historical Commission at 6:31 P.M. Mr. Hagger requested Commissioners roll call: Cebra-present, Hagger-present, Costa-present, Trexler-present, Greene-present, Warren-present, Katz-present

#### **Musicians of the Old Post Road Video**

Present: Suzanne Stumpf and Daniel Ryan, Artistic Directors of the Musicians of the Old Post Road – 107 Concord Road, Wayland, MA

Mr. Hagger confirmed that Susan and Daniel Ryan were seeking access to the Hosmer House to produce a video. Mr. Hagger received confirmation from Town Manager Hayes that an application process was required in consideration of the request. He noted that the application was submitted and being reviewed by the Town Manager’s office.

Ms. Stumpf detailed that the Musicians of the Old Post Road are collaborating with the Sudbury Historical Society to present a video focused on 18<sup>th</sup> century historical sites in Sudbury, along with brief educational talks given by Sudbury Historical Society members and performances given by the ensemble of 18<sup>th</sup> century music performed at these historical sites. She stated that the second-floor ballroom at the Hosmer House is of particular interest, as well as the Hearse House, Revolutionary Cemetery, The Town Pound, the Loring Parsonage, the Pub Room at the Wayside Inn, and the First Parish, which has hosted the Musicians of the Old Post Road concerts for some thirty decades.

Mr. Ryan provided detail about the video process, which would involve small video cameras and small microphones, creating very low impact with few people performing (two to three). Ms. Stumpf stated that the proposed event would take place from August 20<sup>th</sup> to August 24<sup>th</sup> at the Hosmer House.

Mr. Hagger confirmed that the Hosmer House had been closed to the public since early 2020, and will be undoing a major roof replacement project in the fall. He noted that the Hosmer House had not been cleaned and the Town was anticipating such cleaning after the roof replacement.

Mr. Hagger stated that at least one SHC member would have to be present during the times planned for the event, should the Commission approve the request. He added that SHC members Steve Greene and Dina Debra were also members of the Sudbury Historical Society.

Mr. Hagger commented that he had attended some of the MOPR concerts in the past, and would be most beneficial to the Town from a historical standpoint.

Ms. Cebra said she agreed to be available on August 23<sup>rd</sup> for the opening, and hoped that the program could be taped in the ballroom at Hosmer Hall.

Ms. Trexler suggested that the performance was a great idea.

Mr. Greene thought it was a great idea and volunteered to help with Ms. Cebra.

Ms. Warren endorsed the plan.

Ms. Costa was in favor of the performance.

Ms. Warren noted this was a good program and would help educate the public about the Hosmer House and the other historical assets in Town. Ms. Warren commented about the lack of disability access at the Hosmer House regarding access to the second floor, and asked if the first floor could be accessed instead.

Ms. Stumpf responded that the performers would not have difficulty accessing the second floor and thanked the Board for such concern.

Mr. Hagger commented about the fire limit regarding the number of people on the second floor being thirty.

Ms. Katz stated that she was in favor of the request as long as no one had problem accessing the second floor.

Ms. Stumpf confirmed that the musical video would be available by the end of January.

Mr. Hagger stated that the SHC was responsible for the Hosmer House and therefore a SHC member would be pleased to be involved with the presentation. Ms. Cebra confirmed that she would be pleased about providing such presentation at the event.

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Sudbury Historical Commission would allow access to the Musicians of the Old Post Road to film a video during the period of August 17<sup>th</sup> to August 24, and will be accompanied by two SHC Commissioners; one of whom has offered to speak about the history of the Hosmer House. Ms.

Costa seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

VOTED: That the Sudbury Historical Commission would allow access to the Musicians of the Old Post Road to film a video during the period of August 17<sup>th</sup> to August 24, and will be accompanied by two SHC Commissioners; one of whom has offered to speak about the history of the Hosmer House.

Mr. Hagger commented that Town approval was required as well.

Ms. Stumpf questioned if access to the Hosmer House earlier in August might be allowed to assess what might be needed before the performance. Ms. Cebra agreed to help with such access before the event.

#### **Approval of June 14, 2021 meeting minutes**

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Sudbury Historical Commission approve the meeting minutes of June 14, 2021, as presented. Mr. Green seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

VOTED: That the Sudbury Historical Commission approve the meeting minutes of June 14, 2021, as presented.

#### **Historic House Markers**

Ms. Katz confirmed that she revised the house markers program application in regard to the fee amount. She noted that three applicants were awaiting historic house marker signs. Ms. Warren confirmed that the Planning Director informed she and Ms. Katz, as well as the Historic District Commission that the \$25 fee could not be waived. She added that the Chair of the Historic District Commission suggested that the Sudbury Historical Society pay the associated \$25.00 newspaper notice fee. Ms. Warren stated she believed it was not appropriate for the Historical Commission to pay the fee and should not be endorsed, nor set precedent. Ms. Warren also stated that she was working on draft wording about the Historic House Marker program for the HC website that she would present at an upcoming SHC meeting.

Mr. Hagger agreed that it should not be the responsibility of the SHC to cover the fees for the newspaper public notice for the HDC hearings on Certificate of Appropriateness applications for approval of house marker signs. Ms. Katz agreed that the SHC should not assume the fee responsibility. Ms. Trexler agreed that the SHC should not pay for such fees, as long as the sign was in compliance. Ms. Cebra asked about the customary fees. Ms. Katz commented that the added \$75.00 fee was the amount charged by the sign maker, Mr. Leonard.

Mr. Hagger stated that the vote should wait until input is received from the Historic Districts Commission. Mr. Greene agreed with comments presented by Mr. Hagger.

Ms. Warren stated that the main concern of the Sudbury Historic Districts Commission was the location of the placement of house marker signs. She noted that the Chair of the Historic Districts Commission stated the Commission did not have funds to pay the \$25 hearing notice fee, so the applicant would have to assume the \$25 fee for the Certificate of Appropriateness until such time that an exemption can be formally established. Ms. Warren detailed that when comparing fees for house marker signs in other Towns, the Sudbury marker fee are on the low end.

Related discussion took place regarding the three pending requests for house markers. Commissioners agreed that no action would take place until the Historic District Commission addressed the topic at their August 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, and the SHC would continue the topic at the August 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ms. Warren commented that the \$25 fee was for the newspaper notice for the public hearing for the Certificate of Appropriateness application, not a fee for a Certificate of Appropriateness application.

### **Historic Preservation Plan**

In regards to the Planning Board being included in the Phase 1 scope of work with meetings involving the Preservation Plan consultant, Mr. Michael Steinitz, MA State Historic Preservation Officer.

Historic Commission stated in his communication to Mr. Hagger: “The intent of not meeting with the Planning Board and other municipal stakeholders until Phase 2 of the scope, is to allow the consultant to do their Phase 1 information-gathering homework in order to be well-prepared and informed before meeting with Town officials, not primarily engaged in historic preservation. Meeting with the Historical Commission, the Historic Districts Commission, the Community Preservation Committee, is part of the Phase 1 information-gathering process; as is becoming familiar with all the Town’s historical resources and relevant bylaws and regulations.” Mr. Hagger paraphrased that if the SHC wanted to have Planning Board participation in Phase 1, that would be in lieu of meeting with them in Phase 2.

Mr. Hagger stated that some members of the SHC (with Town CPC funds partially funding the Historic Preservation Plan project) sought to get the Planning Board involved in the process sooner, but the MHC indicated preference for keeping such involvement in Phase 2 of the Plan, after the consultant would have studied in Phase I the related historical resources information to share during Phase 2.

Ms. Warren stated that she had a lengthy discussion with Mr. Steinitz on July 9, 2021, and Mr. Steinitz conveyed a similar response regarding Planning Board involvement to occur in Phase 2, not Phase I. She detailed that the RFQ was approved by MHC for the scope of work, and on July 13, Planning Director Adam Duchesneau emailed the RFQ announcement to all of the consultants that were included on the Solicitation List that had also been approved by the MHC.

Ms. Warren added that the submission of RFQ bids closes on August 12, 2021, then the Selection Committee will evaluate the bids, choose the bid proposal consultant, and submit it to MHC for approval, and the consultant contract to be finalized by the 30<sup>th</sup> of August by the Town Manager.

### **Bruce Freeman Rail Trail**

Present: Environmental Planner Beth Suedmeyer, Rick Concord, Railroad Historian – Wayland Historical Commission, Kurt Jergensen, MaDOT.

Chris Hagger asked Ms. Suedmeyer to keep the SHC in the loop between BFRT update meetings, and referenced the Hop Brook modification action.

Ms. Suedmeyer provided her “BRFT Project Design Update for the Sudbury Historical Commission,” PowerPoint presentation dated July 20, 2021, which included:

- MassDOT comments on the 75% submission received (under review, comment resolution thru August)
- SHC Input incorporated with Trail Plans and Artifacts, Inventory Updates (several resources added), Bridge design, Archaeological survey (to be coordinated by MassDOT)
- Next Steps – SHC feedback for MassDOT, Final compilation of inventory, final decisions on disposition of minor artifacts
- Coordination on interpretation materials/Sign content
- Potential development of additional historic resource material (booklet or online content)

Ms. Suedmeyer presented the “Summary of Proposed Historical Artifacts and Treatment list,” and referred to one sole pole/post discovered between Morse Road and Pantry Brook. Ms. Suedmeyer provided information regarding several utility posts that are in a state of disrepair and deemed unsafe.

Mr. Hagger asked who would be making the final determination on the posts. Ms. Suedmeyer responded that project engineers would make that determination, and further discussion regarding that phase could be considered. Discussion regarding the telegraph poles took place. Mr. Hagger mentioned the possible retaining of some of the poles. Mr. Jergensen indicated that the utility poles might be excessively rotted, and the decision between MassDOT engineers and Fuss & O’Neill engineers would be finalized. Mr. Jergensen said SHC members could be onsite when that decision is finalized. Mr. Hagger was in agreement.

Ms. Warren commented – while acknowledging this is a Programmatic Agreement 106 - about the Section 106 scoping process and identification of resources, and assessment of the condition of the resources. She stressed that assessment of condition would be helpful to know. However, Mr. Jergensen stated that in his opinion it did not matter what the condition of the resources are in because under Section 106 the railroad line is not NR eligible. He added that he was willing to be convinced otherwise and listen to any further comment/s.

In regard to inclusion of special SHC review of utility pole determination, Ms. Trexler stated that she did not need to again review engineers’ assessment of the pole’s safety and repair. Ms. Warren agreed with

Ms. Trexler, stressing SHC did not have the expertise to assess the safety or structural integrity of such poles. Ms. Warren strongly recommended that any removed poles be documented.

Mr. Greene asked if the telegraph poles mentioned dated back to pre-telephone times. Mr. Jergensen responded that the addition of telephone lines on the poles was not entirely clear. Mr. Greene suggested that a couple of the poles be retained and enhanced/supported with interpretative signage along the trail.

Ms. Suedmeyer responded that some of the posts are in better shape with clearer visibility. Mr. Jergensen commented that such suggestion would be possible with the use of pressure-treated stabilization supports, and he could dedicate time to this aspect as well as the archeological survey involvement. Commissioners were in support, and asked that Mr. Jergensen report back to the Commission.

Ms. Suedmeyer proceeded with detailed historic inventory photographs and description. Mr. Conard provided comment on various identified rail features, such as metal signs near the MCRT junction behind 39 Union Avenue, and offered to provide added research regarding the metal signs. The Commissioners discussed all features as presented.

Ms. Warren commented that she would like reconsideration of the treatment of the cattle crossing RR feature to bypass it, and suggested a re-examine of the possibility of acquiring an easement within the cattle crossing area to facilitate a bypass. Mr. Conard suggested that if an easement were not possible, a break in the fencing with walkway off the trail might allow for view of the cattle crossings from the side.

Ms. Suedmeyer agreed with Mr. Conard and suggested the Commissioners could take a tour to review the cattle crossing aspect.

Ms. Warren asked about the status of the Section 106 adverse effect determination and if a determination had been submitted to MHC. Mr. Jergensen responded in the negative, adding that no related action had been taken since the last SHC meeting. He noted that an official/intensive locational survey would be conducted before the determination would be submitted to the MHC. Ms. Warren requested that the Commission receive a copy of the completed intensive locational survey. Mr. Jergensen agreed that such survey would be submitted to the Commission.

### **Section 106 – Eversource**

Ms. Warren stated there were no updates to report since the last meeting. She noted that she had been repeatedly reaching out to the MHC, and has not received any response.

Mr. Hagger opined about starting to draft comments for the Army Corps of Engineers. Ms. Warren pondered what comments could be made due to the fact that HC letters had already been sent to MHC and the Army Corps of Engineers concerning the last communication from the Army Corps, and the Army Corps understood where the Commission stood since the SHC had provided comments, yet the HC had not received a response yet from the Army Corps.

**DCR – MCRT Response Letter**

Ms. Warren provided edits to the MCRT (MA Central Rail Trail) Response letter drafted by Commissioners Costa, Greene, and Trexler.

Ms. Trexler reviewed the purpose of the MCRT letter, which is to provide guidance to DCR regarding their plan for the MCRT along the Ma Central Trail Right of Way. She noted that DCR indicated they were awaiting comments from SHC. She noted this aspect was separate from the Section 106 process, and specific Eversource project comments were not included.

Ms. Katz indicated her support for Ms. Warren's drafted letter.

Ms. Costa stated that the Commissioners adopted a congenial approach with DCR in the letter, and sought to engage DCR in discussion. She acknowledged that Ms. Trexler included very pertinent aspects of the Master Plan in this letter.

Ms. Trexler acknowledged there was opportunity to combine the best aspects of both of the draft letters.

Mr. Hagger supported the suggestion presented by Ms. Trexler.

Ms. Warren stated that part of the intent of the drafted letter included:

- That the SHC indicate that all the railroad features are to be retained
- Which particular features to be emphasized/highlighted by SHC
- The Lease agreement that DCR entered into with the MBTA in 2010, long before an Eversource project was contemplated, where DCR and the MBTA have the right to remove all railroad infrastructure; thus Commissioner's efforts will be in vain if DCR does not provide information regarding their intentions as well as the MBTA regarding the removal, if any, and disposal of the railroad infrastructure
- This is not concerning Section 106 (preservation, rehabilitation), but retention, and protection

Commissioners reviewed the edited letter to Mr. Paul Jahnige of DCR which included all proposed edits. Commissioners provided edits as the Board reviewed the letter.

Mr. Hagger recommended that the MBTA-DCR Lease Agreement section within the letter be addressed more in detail in a separate letter, but that mention of the issue be included in the letter. Ms. Trexler agreed that the MBTA-DCR Lease questions be more fully addressed separately. Ms. Katz stated that the Lease Agreement should be included in the edited letter, and sent as soon as possible.

Mr. Hagger stated that two separate letters would be sent, and Ms. Warren would review the separate MBTA-DCR Lease Agreement letter.

### **Contractor Oversight and Invoice Draft Policy**

Mr. Hagger reviewed the intent of the Invoice Policy that he drafted, to address the concerns of Town Manager and a Select Board member regarding the Commissions Invoice Approval process, regarding the Preservation Contractor and invoice approvals.

Mr. Hagger stated that further discussion could be included at the next SHC meeting.

### **Sudbury Historic Property Survey**

Ms. Trexler noted that Commissioner comments/edits would be due by August 10. Ms. Trexler mentioned that editing would not be addressing content, but rather typographical type errors, formatting.

### **Maynard Wheeler Gravestone**

Mr. Greene confirmed that the Maynard Wheeler Gravestone needed to be positioned appropriately according to historical guidelines. He noted that the replacement stone was placed at the DPW property in 1977, and is now at the Hearse House in three pieces.

Mr. Greene and Elin Neiterman, member of the Sudbury Historical Society conducted a talk regarding three historical gravestones, including the Maynard Wheeler gravestone. He added that Mara Conde, a gravestone restorer provided informative comments about treatment and guidelines for the gravestones, and the Maynard Wheeler Gravestone must be repaired and placed next to the newer stone.

Ms. Conde noted that restoration of the stone could be completed for \$700.00. Ms. Warren suggested making application to CPC for the restoration.

### **Hosmer House**

Mr. Hagger stated that he and Diana Cebra provided a full tour of the Hosmer House was given to Town Manager Hayes, and a meeting with Town Manager Hayes and Facilities Director Bill Barletta is scheduled for July 30 in order to review work to be done in preparation of the roof replacement, and cleaning after the roof is replaced.

Ms. Cebra addressed Hosmer House holiday opening in regard to project completion, volunteer staffing available to man the House as well. She stated that there is a great public interest with the opening of the Hosmer House. Mr. Greene spoke of the unknown factors associated with COVID.

Ms. Cebra noted that water has been seeping into the basement of the Hosmer House. Mr. Greene offered to help clean the basement.

### **Section Tool House Visit**



Mr. Greene suggested scheduling a tour for the Commission. Mr. Hagger suggested having several showings of three people for safety reasons.

#### **Cemetery Headstone Cleaning**

Ms. Katz provided update and noted that only several sections of the cemetery would be conducting headstone cleaning at this time. She added that Elaine Jones prepared an RFQ for the remaining work to be done in the Wadsworth Cemetery.

#### **SHC Sites and Invasive Weed Control**

Ms. Cebra contacted Lori Capone of the Conservation Commission. She stated that stonewalls are being invaded by invasive weed throughout Town, and suggested that contractors be considered, or volunteers to assist with weed removal. Ms. Capone suggested that the Commission ask CPC. Ms. Warren mentioned that this project would not be a one-time project, and maybe could include the \$700.00 gravestone restoration.

#### **SHC Chair Selection**

Mr. Hagger asked if any other Commissioner would be interested in the Chair position. Mr. Greene motioned that Chris Hagger be appointed Chair of the Sudbury Historical Commission in the current calendar year. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

#### **SHC Vice Chair Selection**

Ms. Warren stated that she would be honored to continue her role as SHC Vice Chair. No other Commissioners expressed interest in the Vice Chair position. Mr. Hagger motioned that Diana Warren be appointed Vice Chair of the Sudbury Historical Commission in the current calendar year. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

#### **SHC Finance Reports/SHC FY 22 Budget**

Mr. Hagger noted that SHC was given their budget for FY 22, which is \$7,800.00 which includes \$2,265.00 for recording services and general expenses for \$5,535.00.

Ms. Costa said she is awaiting the monthly financial year-to-date reports. Ms. Costa stated that the \$2,265.00 provided for recording services and was underbudget. She noted that the Hosmer House cleaning fee has to be included in the FY 22 Budget.

#### **Meeting Recorder Authorization for FY 22**

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Sudbury Historical Commission authorize up to \$1,450.00 for recording expense in FY 22. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

#### **Alternate SHC Appointments**

Mr. Hagger noted that Kathryn McGrath had been present at this meeting for the duration. Ms. McGrath noted that she was interviewed by Town Manager Hayes.

Mr. Hagger acknowledged that Nick Pernice has gotten very busy and may be delayed with joining the Commission as an alternate member. Mr. Hagger introduced Chris Durall who is interested in becoming an alternate SHC member.

Mr. Hagger noted that up to seven alternate positions can be appointed to the SHC.

Mr. Durall asked if there was a minimum requirement for attending meetings. Mr. Hagger responded not.

#### **Date for Next Meeting**

August 17, 2021 at 6:30 P.M. Ms. Trexler and Ms. Katz stated they would not be attending the next meeting on August 17, 2021.

#### **Motion to Adjourn**

At 10:50 P.M., Mr. Hagger motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Costa seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Costa-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Trexler-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye.