



Historic District Commission

Minutes

The Provincetown Historic District Commission Public Meeting of Wednesday, September 1, 2021; Work Session at 3:30 PM, followed by Public Hearing in the Judge Welsh Room at Town Hall, 260 Commercial Street, Provincetown, MA 02657.

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, this meeting/hearing will be conducted **in person** and as a courtesy via remote means in accordance with applicable law. Please note that while an option for remote attendance and/or participation is being provided as a courtesy to the public, the meeting/hearing will not be suspended or terminated if technological problems interrupt the virtual broadcast, unless otherwise required by law.

Joining the Meeting: [Click here to join the meeting](#)

Microsoft Teams: Join on your computer or mobile app

Phone: Or call in (audio only) [\(833\) 579-7589](tel:8335797589) Phone Conference ID: 188 974 362#

To Participate during public comment:

- Teams: Raise hand to be called on to speak; or
- Phone: Speak name clearly to be called on to speak.

Please do not speak again until acknowledged by Chair or meeting moderator.

- Keep your phone muted at all times when not talking (*6 to mute & unmute your phone);
- Do not use speakerphone, Bluetooth devices (speakers or headphones); and
- Mute all background noises, including PTV, television or computer and use only phone audio.

Members present: Laurie Delmolino (LD), Chair, Historical Commission Rep.; John Dowd (JD), Vice Chair, PGB Rep.; Hersh Schwartz (HS), Clerk, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; Christopher Mathieson (CM), PAAM Rep.; Michela Murphy (MCM), Alternate.

Members by remote: Anthony Iannacci (AI), Alternate.

Staff present: Anne Howard (AH), Building Commissioner; Thaddeus Soulé (TS), Town Planner.

TS gave opening remarks at 3:30pm and called for LD to give quorum by roll call. LD issued roll-call and called the meeting to order.

Agenda item may be taken out of order and votes may be taken on any of the agenda items below.

3:30 PM Work Session

1. Determination as to whether the applications below involve any Exterior Architectural Features within the jurisdiction of the Commission; with Full Reviews to be placed on the September 15, 2021 Public Hearing agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

AH reported that there is to be no slider at 635 Commercial Street.

LD made a motion to consider the following as Administrative Review:

- i) 4 Carver St. – To replace 3 windows in kind.
- ii) 3 Allerton St. – To replace a deck in kind.
- iii) 25 Winthrop St., U5 – To replace 3 windows and a door.
- iv) 635 Commercial St. – To replace windows with a sliding door.
- v) 11 Pearl St. – To replace 16 windows and a door in kind.

MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

LD made a motion that the following be considered as Full Review:

- vi) 18 Pearl St. – To construct an addition and to replace an exterior stairway, a vinyl fence and several windows.
- vii) 133 Commercial St. – To flatten a roof and add a roof deck.
- viii) 5 Cottage St., U1 – To add an interior stairway and construct a shed dormer.
- ix) 457-459 Commercial St., U1 – To expand an existing dormer.
- x) 198 Commercial St. – To remove a first-floor addition and add a third floor addition, add a fourth floor equipment deck and a third floor balcony, and rebuild a side deck.
- xi) 20 Court St., U2 – To remove and replace an existing second floor deck.
- xii) 186 Bradford St. – To install a shed.
- xiii) 27 Standish St. – To install 3 sheds.

MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

- i) 4 Carver St. – To replace 3 windows in kind.
Glenn Rigoff presented; said windows are rotted and will be replaced in kind as 2/2, double-paned. HS asked per the size of the side window, to which Mr. Rigoff said is 32x48 and would also be replaced exactly as it.

LD made a motion to approve as presented with Anderson windows and wood trim.
MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, AI.

- ii) 3 Allerton St. – To replace a deck in kind.

No one presented.

LD made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, AI.

- iii) [25 Winthrop St., U5](#) – To replace 3 windows and a door.

Brad presented; explained that they could not get the exact units as replacements but would be in kind, including wood trim and Andersons; said the last item concerns a request to install a different, more historically appropriate door; two double-hungs to replace the Bay. LD replied that a Full Review would be required for this Bay replacement measure.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of September 15, 2021 with spec sheet and rendering. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, AI.

- iv) [635 Commercial St.](#) – To replace windows with a sliding door. *[Correction: not a slider.]*

Michael Castillo presented; said wood trim to be replaced with pine, not synthetic; spoke of need to replace white cedar shingles as the structure is broken and there are birds living in the wall. AH requested Mr. Castillo send along the appropriate photograph of the windows for filing. Wood windows, wood trim, same size openings, same molding details and same materials.

Mr. Castillo said the units will be Anderson 400 series, vinyl clad on outside, wood interior, same grid configuration of 6/2; exterior trim replaced with pine. HS offered that the packet is complete as is.

JD made a motion to approve as stipulated. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, CM, AI, JD. *[LD, recused.]*

- v) [11 Pearl St.](#) – To replace 16 windows and a door in kind.

Don DiRocco and Leif Hamnquist of Hammer Architects presented. MM recused herself from the hearing.

Mr. DiRocco noted the first part of the application previously approved as **HDC 20-117**; front entry door and side-lights also to be replaced; Norwood windows. LD expressed concern that the door and side-lights be exactly the same. Mr. DiRocco said the door is mahogany and side-lights to be true divided-lite; same measurements. HS requested a spec sheet for the door. JD made a pitch to return the two windows on the left on the first floor to their previous, un-separated position. Mr. DiRocco agreed.

LD made a motion to approve based on receipt of measurements and photos as requested. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; HS, JD, CM, LD.

2. Appointment of PMPM member to the Commission.

LD made a motion to roll the item to the end of the meeting. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; HS, JD, CM, MM, AI.

3. Any other business that shall properly come before the Commission.

4. Public Comments: On any matter not on the agenda below.

LD made a motion to move Any Other Business and Public Comments to the end of the meeting. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

4:00 PM Public Hearing: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

5. Full Hearings:

a) **HDC 21-14** (*request to continue to the meeting of September 1st*)

Application by Nancy Lockwood requesting to enclose a porch and add a second story with a roof deck on the structure located at **1 Holway Avenue, U1A**.

Nancy Lockwood presented.

LD reported that the HDC had not the necessary time-frame to review new plans, which AH said were uploaded on August 30th.

CM said he felt the project was going in the right direction. Ms. Lockwood commented that they brought the structure down to 9', made it a one-bedroom, removed the roof deck and spiral staircase; made changes per all HDC suggestions from the last meeting.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the hearing of September 15, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

b) **HDC 21-118** (*continued from the meeting of August 4th*)

Application by **G. Bruce Head, III** requesting to replace a fence on the property located at **4 Atwood Avenue**.

AH said that Dr. Head is traveling today ; she will field questions from the HDC and pass them along. CM questioned how productive the meeting would be based on the lack of visibility expected by the fence at 56 Commercial St. LD asked what might be the situation once the other fence comes down. JD and HS suggested the Board let it go.

LD made a motion to approve as printed on the Agenda. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

c) **HDC 21-138** (*postponed from the meeting of August 4th*)

Application by **Ted Smith**, on behalf of **Howard Burchman**, requesting to convert an existing guesthouse to 3 residential units, including reconfiguring an existing roof and various windows and doors, expanding a one-story appendage on the north elevation, adding a bay window on the south elevation, adding a second floor, and constructing a deck on top of an existing first-floor roof on the structure located at **12 Center Street**.

Ted Smith, Howard Burchman and Robin Reed, Esquire, presented. Mr. Smith addressed changes to the rear, including extending the entablature over the door to match the two windows; windows and dormers on second floor in the rear also reduced to line with those on the front; bump-out on far hard left is not visible from the street but will not be needed.

JD said the front of the house looks to have complied with all the HDC requests, to which the Board concurred.

Attorney Reid expressed the north elevation as not visible from a public way, west elevation which is visible from a public way and south elevation which, she said, is barely visible. Mr. Smith cited the existing structure as 12x18 but which will require a stair to qualify for the building code for a bedroom in the upgrade; said structure sits 85' back from the sidewalk.

No new letters.

William Krinsky of 143 Commercial St., Unit C, directly facing the small building, spoke about a new structure that will resemble a giant wall, out of proportion and blocking everything.

Chris Snow, Attorney representing the 12 Center St. abutters presented; said the standards today as applied should hold as those of a garage and not be converted into a separate condominium, and that the charge of the HDC is to preserve the status quo wherever possible or allow modest improvements without negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood; stated that while he does not criticize the ambition but rather the trend in Town for decades where that ambition leaves a wake of disaster to the year-round, long-term

population; cottage as proposed represents a 50% increase in air space, going from 12' to 18'; said they have no problem with a one-story but asked to put the brakes on the second story; shared a photo of the main existing building in making the case that the vegetation is to be ripped out for a new walk-way which will make the view of visibility from Center Street undeniable, with a second floor bump-out that, he said, will add a mass to his client's side.

Andrew Laing, abutter of the 348A Building, offered that this version of the cottage seems to fit better into the property, a better design solution.

LD asked per the current square footage of the cottage as exists verses proposed, to which Mr. Smith replied is 264, existing footprint; 793 as expanded.

Attorney Reid objected to the bump-out as highlighted by Attorney Snow and the accompanying façade as being visible from the street, added that she did not feel the HDC's mission is to maintain the status quo but to encourage the kind of growth to Town that comes with cultural sensitivity, to which JD countered that the Commission's duty is on behalf of the community in preserving the truly historic.

Mr. Krinsky repeated that the change to the west elevation is gigantic to his view.

HDC Deliberations

MM thanked the applicant for what she views as an improved proposal on the main structure and aesthetically pleasing, but addressed the HDC's purview as preservation; noted that the previous directive was to go up or out, but not both, and in that regard she cannot approve from today's presentation; stated a preference for the addition to go out, rather than up.

JD noted the HDC's history of having many cottages grow from one to a one and a half story by staying within the Guidelines, while this proposal, with double dormers and a roof deck and other features, appears a bit too pushy. HS agreed with MM and JD and said the bylaw per 1 ½ stories should be adhered to. CM agreed with the other Commissioners.

LD asked how the applicant will bypass the 25% ruling on Demolition delay, to which Mr. Smith replied was within the footprint to avoid demolition. LD spoke of the loss to the community when things are so blown up as expressed in this proposal; requested that in the next drawings not all of the soul is drained out of the little cottage.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of October 6, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

d) [HDC 21-144](#) (continued from the meeting of August 4th)

Application by **Joe McCarty**, on behalf of **GS PTown, LLC**, requesting to demolish and rebuild a structure in a larger footprint by expanding it 7' on the west elevation on the property located at **193 Bradford Street**.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of September 15, 2021 at the applicant's request. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, AI.

e) [HDC 21-164](#) (continued from the meeting of August 4th)

Application by **Jeffrey Burchard**, on behalf of **Christine Barker**, requesting to demolish a dilapidated structure and rebuild a new structure containing 31 hotel units, 4 condominiums, and a restaurant/bar, featuring 2 long and narrow volumes with gabled roof profiles facing to the north and south, an interior passageway between the structure linking the north and south ends, a flat area that sits in a valley formed by 2 parallel gables in the center of the roof, divided-lite windows on the outer facade, cedar shake cladding, pipe railings on the south, east, and west-facing sides, and wood picket railings on the north-facing stair on the property located at **227R Commercial Street**.

Jeffrey Burchard and Christine Barker presented. Mr. Burchard walked through the latest updates and changes, including the big window on the northeast corner and the shape of

the columns below with a slight taper on the top; muntins added, divided by three not four; third floor balconies trimmed back a bit but emphasizing the ability of those occupants to have an open-view relationship to the sea; tower alternatives explored.

Ms. Barker said they are generally happy with the final studies based on the HDC recommendations; spoke in favor of the open balcony views in terms of year round visitors and wedding guests.

HDC Deliberations

JD said he was happy enough with the changes – shingles, trim, balconies projecting out not seen as problematic; cohesive changes, concluded that the open balcony windows appear on the side view and as such are not considered the primary angle of visibility – can be a welcome asset to those occupying the rooms and an acceptable design charge.

MM agreed with JD per the overall concept changes and felt the development is becoming something people will be proud of to have in Town. CM thanked the applicant for all their hard work and thinks it will prove a spectacular project. HS concurred with the other Commissioners and felt it will prove a great addition.

JD made a motion to accept as presented based on the plans of September 1, 2021 with the condition that the windows on the second story balcony floor have muntins broken into patterns of three on the 2nd and 3rd floors; columns have options on the tops; tower structure is version featuring two windows and same color roof as main structure; open balcony version. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; JD, CM, HS, MM, AI.

f) [HDC 21-174](#) (*request to continue to the meeting of September 15th*)

Application by **Casey Clark**, on behalf of **Stephane L. Ginez Revocable Living Trust, Stephane L. Ginez, Trustee**, requesting to replace windows on all elevations and a door on the north elevation and to re-side with cedar shingles on the structure located at **8 Montello Street**.

LD made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of September 15, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, AI.

g) [HDC 21-178](#)

Application by **Kurt Raber**, on behalf of **Riley Brothers Realty, LLC**, requesting to improve an existing structure by removing and replacing a one-story wing on the rear elevation and replacing it with an addition housing a compliant stair to a three-bedroom residential unit on the second and third floors, and to continue the use of a second structure on the rear elevation to house a bicycle storage on the ground floor and two one-bedroom residential units on the upper level on the property located at **136 Bradford Street**.

Kurt Raber, Steve Riley and Lester J, Murphy, Jr., Attorney, presented.

Attorney Murphy reported that Zoning had turned down the proposal approved by the HDC so the applicant has gone back to the drawing board.

Mr. Raber went through the changes with the two buildings have been recalculated per scale; said program is basically the same as when the plan was approved previously; three overhead doors to allow customers to access bicycles; door to residential units accessed by door on south elevation; egress and outside decks for those tenants; back to two separate buildings based on the ZBA ruling.

JD said it looked pretty good considering what there was to work with; asked if the rear stairwell could relate more to the roof structure in front of it, to which Mr. Raber noted the stairs now only go up to the second floor. JD said the rear addition should relate to the front structure.

MM said she could see JD's point, but per a class she took, noted the importance of making a new addition signal a break; asked per stockade fence, which Mr. Raber said stays.

CM said he found the other version better, this one massive; asked per garage doors to which Mr. Raber said they would excavate out 3' of soil regarding septic system replacement. CM said he would like to compare the two plans, to which HS agreed. Further review followed after which it was determined that today's application represented a brand new proposal.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing to the meeting of September 15, 2021.

CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; CM, JD, HS, MM, LD.

LD announced a five minute recess.

h) [HDC 21-179](#)

Application by **Michael McAlister** requesting to re-frame an existing front door with black louvered shutters installed on each side and to install a small black and white fabric awning over that door on the structure located at **17 Conant Street, U1**.

Michael McAlister presented; said he liked the look of louvered shutters and felt they enhanced the front of the building.

JD said the 19th century late Greek Revival building with according impediment over the door stands correct as is, while shutters might be more correct if applied to all the windows; cloth awning doesn't seem to go stylistically while wrought iron is more appropriate for Spanish-style architecture as seen in California or Miami. LD concurred that the awning as presented is not historical. TS displayed examples of recommended door overhangs in Town. HS said she had no problem with the shutters. Mr. McAlister sought approval for shutters on the front door – and other units, later.

LD made a motion to approve shutters on the door and on the windows as needed with the condition that the units are functional and materials wood. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, HS, JD, CM, LD.

i) [HDC 21-180](#)

Application by **Bonnie Catena** requesting to add a window to the rear elevation of the structure located at **5 Brewster Street, U2**.

Bonnie Catena presented; confirmed the window is for the rear of the house. CM noted that there is visibility from a public way, minus the vegetation.

LD made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; MM, JD, HS, CM, LD.

j) [HDC 21-181](#)

Application by **Robert Henrique**, on behalf of the **Isaza Fullen Oz Fund 2020, LLC**, requesting to install a glass door and demolish a shed on the property located at **3 Soper Street**.

Robert Henrique presented. LD said the demolition for a shed requires a different application and that the rotted shed needs to be certified as such by a structural engineer. Mr. Henrique read into the record a proposal for the 6' glass door with side lights at the premises.

LD read a letter in objection from Ryan Murphy at 76 Commercial St. in not allowing the foundation to increase the overall shed height.

LD made a motion to approve with the condition that the shed not be demolished before an engineer's report is submitted verifying failure of the shed and that the total height of the rebuild not exceed the height of 13' as per the application. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; CM, JD, HS, MM, LD.

k) [HDC 21-184](#)

Application by **Steven Kane**, requesting to replace a wood deck, railings, exterior stairs and trim on the structure located at **139 Commercial Street, UA**.

Steven Kane presented; said the application is a continuation of ongoing work from the spring; cited previous approval from the HDC to replace rotting trim and deck; railings and wood stairs to be replaced as wood, in kind; requesting Azek or similar on the deck floor boards only; steel cabling instead of spindles.

MM said she was fine with everything except the cable rails which Mr. Kane concurred can be seen from Commercial St. LD said the standard is that cable not be approved from the street side to which CM and HS agreed.

LD made motion to approve the wood deck, trim and rails as needed; deck floor boards may be Azek or other composite; railing system remain wood captured balusters. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; CM, JD, HS, MM, LD.

l) **HDC 21-186**

Application by **Michael J. Goff** requesting to replace and relocate windows and doors on all facades; to add shed dormers on the east and west facades; to construct a second-floor covered addition, and expand an existing deck on the rear façade; to expand a rear roof deck, adding an integrated access stairway, and add a ground-level deck on a rear addition; and to replace trim, siding and roofing shingles, add a new gate, and repair existing foundations, adding flood vents, on the structure at the property located at **120 Commercial Street**.

This project was a previously approved as a Certificate of Appropriateness for **HDC 20-040**, however work on the project never commenced.

Michael Goff presented; reported no new changes, plans dated August 15, 2021.

LD made a motion to approve as presented. CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; CM, JD, HS, MM, LD.

m) **HDC 21-187**

Application by **Casey Clark**, on behalf of **Topknot Properties, LLC**, requesting to amend a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness (**HDC 20-051**) regarding the replacement of windows on the structure located at **225 Commercial Street**.

Casey Clark presented; said they installed snap-in grilles instead of the units as were approved previously because he had not initially received all the approved details from Jim. LD suggested a little lee-way might be afforded for a commercial building. JD noted that snap-on grilles can be removed and never put back in. Mr. Clark requested a postponement as the owner could not be on the call today.

No public comments or letters.

LD made a motion to continue the hearing of the meeting of September 15, 2021.

CM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; CM, JD, HS, MM, LD.

2. **Appointment of PMPM member to the Commission. [Continued]**

MM recapped from a previous report; that former HDC Commissioner and Pilgrim Monument and Provincetown Museum Rep. Thomas Biggert had received a letter from the Town on or around March 12, 2021 directing him to resign immediately from his post as he had exceeded his term limit. MM followed up with the Town, and in a letter to the Charter Compliance Commission as she felt the time-line did not make sense. The CCC responded that a commissioner must remain until another is appointed; however, she noted, Mr. Biggert was informed by Town Counsel that if he did not resign there would be some kind of public repercussion. Mr. Biggert, MM related, read his resignation letter aloud at the next HDC meeting after which she applied for the PMPM seat, but was told the PMPM would not appoint her as she had gone against the funicular installation project at the Bas Relief.

MM continued, stating she had waited for the PMPM to nominate someone within 30 days for the Select Board to approve. PMPM selected someone who, she said, did not live in Town and that when this person withdrew the PMPM put in a second nomination which came in past the 30 day mark. MM pointed out that this nomination was not valid after which the Select Board chose not to vote. The appointment then went to Town Moderator, Mary-Jo Avellar, who was told she cannot endorse MM for the PMPM Rep. as MM was not nominated by the PMPM. MM said she has repeatedly asked for the date that the PMPM was notified of the need for a new appointee and that, regarding the PMPM's position on her candidacy, it sets a bad precedent when an affiliate opts not to approve as its representation a long-standing Town Board volunteer merely because they do not vote the way the organization decides they should; that she has served the Board for nearly four years, marking her a legitimate candidate for the position of HDC representative to the PMPM.

Lester J. Murphy, Jr., Attorney, spoke on behalf of the PMPM and agreed with MM that Mr. Biggert's removal was unfairly handled, acknowledging Mr. Biggert's diligent record; stated that there has never been any discussion of MM's illegitimacy to the rep position based on her past voting record. MM interrupted to offer that it was one of the PMPM's own Board members who shared the information on the nature of her lack of support to the rep position by the PMPM Board and added that she is a benefactor of the PMPM.

Attorney Murphy continued in stating that the PMPM was not at fault when the Select Board failed to make any ruling on the two candidates proposed by the PMPM and said he hoped the HDC, which now has the issuing authority, will see clear to endorse as HDC Rep, either Executive Director of the PMPM, Dr. David Weidner, or HDC Board member, Anthony Iannacci – both of whom, he said, are candidates promoted by the PMPM.

LD reported that the HDC has been left waiting for a response on the notification dates; noted that the HDC is not a nominating entity as such and therefore cannot provide a choice of nominee; suggested that perhaps David Gardner, Assistant Town Manager, or Town Clerk, Emmett Cantanese can provide the corresponding dates of notification.

HS said she felt that the HDC should not be put in the position of voting in a representative to its Board and that the matter should revert back to the Select Board; that putting it back onto the Town Moderator is also wrong and that she would abstain if the HDC was put to a vote. JD concurred and cited favoritism and an unfair practice if the HDC is made to choose one of its members over another; that if this occurs again then strict seniority should prevail. CM agreed with JD and noted MM's long term of service to the Board as well as the lack of communication and direction from the Town on the promotion of representatives as the wrong way to incentivize volunteers in Town who are devoting their time in service to the Town.

AH asked if Dr. Weidner's letter need be read into the record at which point Attorney Murphy said it was not as the matter was to be continued.

53 Commercial Street

AH said there is a request for a site visit in regards to the shack. HS said she approved and CM and MM said they have been by the property before but without communication from the owner. Wed., September 15, 2021 at 2:30pm was selected as the meeting time on location.

CM left the meeting at 7:01pm.

TS said the HDC can choose not to vote again on decisions that have been approved during Public Hearing; and that this practice is in play by the Planning and Zoning Boards following a meet-up on the topic with Town Counsel.

6. Review and approval of Minutes:

HS made a motion to approve the HDC meeting minutes of July 7, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; MM, HS, AI, LD.

HS made a motion to approve the HDC meeting minutes of August 4, 2021. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 3-0-0; MM, HS, AI.

JD left the meeting at 7:06pm

7. Deliberations on Pending Decisions: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN

HS said there are four decisions to be written from last month; CM to write 133 Bradford St.; JD: 67 Bradford St. (picket fence at Brass Key); LD: 259 Commercial St.

LD said she would assign 9 Full Review preparations for the next meeting to Board members.

LD made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:15pm. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-0-0; MM, HS, AI, LD.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jody O'Neil