



**South End Landmark District Commission
Public Hearing Minutes**

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room
Boston, MA, 02201

AUGUST 6, 2019

Commissioners Present: John Amodeo, John Freeman, Catherine Hunt, Diana Parcon, Peter Sanborn

Staff Present: Nicholas Armata, Senior Preservation Planner; Mary Cirbus, Preservation Planner

5:42 Commissioner Freeman called the public hearing to order.

I. VIOLATIONS

VIO # VIO.19.041 275 Shawmut Avenue

Applicant: Socrates Abreu

Proposed Work: (Continued from 06/04/2019 & 07/02/2019). Ratification of unapproved commercial exhaust at rear of structure that rises above the gutter line.

The applicant did not show.

II. DESIGN REVIEW

APP # 19.1170 SE 4-18 Clarendon Street & 70-80 Warren Avenue

Applicant: Jennifer Campbell; JCH Consulting, Inc.

Proposed Work: Rebuild large sections of masonry facades

Staff explained that applicant had received permission to start work due to the urgent nature of the wall repairs.

The applicant explained that a survey had been completed of the building and that emergency repairs had to be conducted several years ago due to bricks falling out. She explained that all repairs will be completed in kind. All of the gables will have to be rebuilt. Areas under the windows will also have to be rebuilt with new brick.

Applicant showed pictures showing the existing conditions and areas of failing stone. She explained that the building was redeveloped in the late 1980s-early 1990s and masonry was not installed soundly.

Some roof repairs will be required.

The Warren building used to be a fire station and a fire here in the 1980s damaged some



of the granite and that will need to be replaced. Repairs made in kind. Spalled brick due to fire. Roof on Warren building will be repaired in kind.

Wall facing Warren Street on 4-18 Clarendon will need to be almost completely rebuilt, aside from on ection of the parapet which was rebuilt 2 years ago. Two chimneys were struck by lightning and rebuilt. Applicant explained that some sections of wall have already been removed. Detailed brick bands and panels will be reinstalled. Thin mortar joints will be maintained.

Commissioner Freeman worried that joints will be too big. A mockup has already been installed.

The windows are remaining but trim and caulking will be redone.

Applicant is preservation and exterior envelope consultant.

The Commissioners discussed. The Commissioners asked how the individual bricks and stones are recorded and documented for an accurate rebuild. Applicant explained that all has been measured and documented. The rebuild will be conducted in sections to maintain the existing lines. Commissioner Freeman asked that drawings be provided to staff. Applicant agreed.

Commissioner Freeman also asked about other areas being redone. Applicant responded that some areas of brownstone (with rosette) also need replacement but that they will be replaced with cast stone. Freeman asked that staff approve the mockup.

Commissioner Freeman warned of bad reconstructions in the South End and advised that staff be included on all sample and mockup approvals. He would like us to get biweekly updates and if staff has any concerns then a subcommittee should be formed.

No structural engineer for the project except for one small section at the roof. Butterfly ties (stainless steel) will be used throughout the wall.

Commissioner Hunt expressed concern that there is no structural engineer or architect involved. Applicant explained that she has done several projects in the South End and this is the first meeting she's ever had to attend of the Commission. Engineer drawing at the top of the building is done by Mike Pretzer & Associates.

Commissioner Freeman asked staff to confirm if much of the façade had been rebuilt. Applicant confirmed that Clarendon Street side had been rebuilt. Bay material is pine with no flashing behind it. Two rubber roofs are in deteriorated conditions.

Commissioner Freeman advised that in the future Commission should be involved from the very beginning of the process. Freeman asked that the survey of the building be provided to staff.



COMMISSIONER HUNT motioned to **APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISIO** that staff must review and approve materials and mockups at every step of the process. **COMMISSIONER FREEMAN** added the proviso that staff review color matches and receive updates at their discretion; and that any and all materials, mockups, and color selections be approved by staff. **COMMISSIONER PARCON** seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.1240 SE 720 Harrison Avenue

Applicant: Philip Down; MEPT Doctor's Building Owner LLC

Proposed Work: At the parking structure fronting Harrison Avenue and Sharon Street, install landscaping and a fence.

Paul Montney
Matt Scheller
Brian Scheller

Applicant explained that the building was recently sold to the state of Massachusetts and that existing utilities need to be disconnected. An emergency generator needs to be installed on Harrison Avenue. Fencing will cover the generator. Exhaust stack will run up the side of the building. Headhouse stack will be there as well. Applicant also noted that this property is located in the protection area just outside of the district but facing the district.

Incorporating wood fence and plantings. 8 foot fence around the edge. Surrounding is 8 ft. Arborvites and Carpinus.

Large tree on plan is existing and they are working around it. Spacing on arborvitae are 7-8 feet apart.

Cedar fence around the enclosure. Technical specifications are included for the generator

JA wants to know height of generator compared to fence. Fence is 8 feet high, generator is 12 feet and has stack off the top.

JF says landscaping is very important.

CH questioned location of fence? Is it along Harrison. Yes. She confirmed that plantings are in front of the fence.

JF asked if fence is being relocated. No. Smaller shrubs going around the sign (4-5 ft). Ground material is mulch.



PS-bed is raised 40" from sidewalk, is generator on top of bed or will it be excavated? Generator will be more or less on the same plane. PS asked if possible to get it lower. Applicant said they will have to investigate. PS notes that retaining wall is deteriorating—when it needs to be replaced will it affect integrity of the installation? No.

JA commented that the 8 ft fence is adequate but noted responsibility of landscaping to hide the screen. 6 arborvitae are not adequate because diameter is too small and there will be big gaps. He suggests doubling the number of arborvitae to 12. Carpinus on the other side should also be doubled—from 6-12; there should be 6 arborvitae around the side instead of 4. Screening has to be effective; should not be able to see mechanicals. Planting needs to pick up the slack.

Plant species well chosen.

COMMISSIONER AMODEO motioned to approve with proviso of adding 8 more arborvitae as discussed. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN added the proviso that applicants should submit revised landscaping plans to staff. COMMISSIONER HUNT seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.1354 SE 435 Columbus Avenue

Applicant: Tim Anastasia

Proposed Work: (Continued from 07/02/2019). At the front façade commercial storefront, replace non-historic storefront window with entryway.

Revised plan with architect. Trim replaced in kind. Door will be custom made to match door at 435. Added sidelight.

JF noted that the design is much improved and JA agreed.

JF asked for clarifications on the material of the bulkheads. They are transom windows for the storefront below. Concrete piers. Applicant noted that nothing on the storefront is historic.

JA asked how door sits in plan. Applicant noted that door is slightly recessed (few inches from door jamb).

JF asked about lighting. Applicant noted that sign will probably be replaced but that's for another meeting.

NA asked about the stained glass at the transom. It is paper behind stained glass so numbers can be read. Stained glass transom to remain. JF asked about replicating on new entry. Applicant noted that he could match transom but it doesn't look very old and would be expensive. JA noted that there would be three separate transoms and asked if applicant could keep existing transom at 435A. Applicant said he can and add address to



the door. This will help create a unified look across the façade.

PS asked about longer door (for ADA accessibility) so does not have threshold that existing door has. Glass panels are now longer and do commissioners think that panels should be kept in proportion to what is existing? PS thinks that proportions at the top should be the same as existing. JF thinks that cross rail should be low to fit with other doors in the SE. JA concurs.

JA wonders about the sidelight...should sidelight be improved by raising the bottom be solid to match the panel of the door. Sidelight on one side means that the sidelight shouldn't go all the way to the ground. Might look better if it stops at the cross rail of the door and changing the size of the panels.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN motioned to APPROVE the application with the proviso... COMMISSIONER HUNT seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS)

APP # 19.1377 SE 715-725 Tremont Street

Applicant: Concord House Associates; Marci Booth

Proposed Work: At the front entrance install canopy.

Applicant representatives were consultant Randi Lathrop and Claudia Grossman, property manager, Concord Houses.

Applicant noted that there are multiple canopies being installed at the Tremont Street elevation. Bronze baked enamel canopies over main entrances, office for both offices,

JF asked if the color of the canopy matches the door and applicant confirmed that it does.

JF also asked about drainage. RL noted that the main doorway canopy has slats so that water will come through. This canopy is less about shelter and more to bring presence to the doorway.

JA asked if all canopies were louvered and RL confirmed that they are. The canopies are not meant for shelter, but more to make the building look better.

JF asked if signage will be attached to the canopies and applicant noted that the only signage was previously approved (brushed steel lettering, mounted on the building).

CH commented that the rendering appeared that the canopy extended past the existing opening. Applicant noted that it was a bad rendering and that the canopy would only extend over the doorway and walkway. JA said that the canopy cannot exceed the width of the walkway. If canopies are modified then the applicants should resubmit to staff.



JA commented that the work is better for the neighborhood and better for the district.

COMMISSIONER HUNT motioned to APPROVE the application, with the provisos that the width of the canopy match the width of the sidewalk and that the applicant resubmit drawings to staff showing this correction. COMMISSIONER PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.1435 SE 818-840 Harrison Avenue: Maintain Double Acorn Light

APP # 19.1436 SE 57 Newland Street: Single Acorn Light, to Double

APP # 19.1437 SE 640 Harrison Avenue: Single Acorn Light, to Double

APP # 19.1438 SE E. Newton Street: Single Acorn Light, to Double

APP # 19.1441 SE 312-314 Shawmut Avenue: Single Acorn Light, to Double

Applicant (All Applications): David Hoogasian; Extenet Systems

Proposed Work: Install cell phone tower and equipment on existing acorn light pole

Dave Hoogasian; Matthew Prico

Applicant clarified that the whole light poles will be replaced, not just a modifications of the existing poles. Antennas placed at the top and utilities are placed under ground. All designs are in accordance with the agreement with the city of Boston. All single acorns are replaced with double acorns, in accordance with the agreement with the city. Existing signage, etc, all get transferred to the new poles.

Shrouds at the top house radio equipment. Whip antenna is attached at the top. Each proposed new pole is identical.

JA asked to see side by side comparison with existing double. JF asked if the glass globes are going to be changed. CH emphasized that the existing and proposed globes have different styles. Applicant said that it is the drafting. CH wants to see one installed.

(Nick pulled it up on Google Maps) JA noted the first time cell phone companies wanted to install these on lightpoles the original design had a large box at the base of the pole and this was not approvable in the district. Other LDs in the city had the company redesign the pole so that the antenna was at the top and to get rid of the base and while initially installed everyone quickly realized it was a mistake and not in keeping with the district. (including with the acorn globes).

JA asked if the poles were not being placed in exactly the same spot. Applicant said sometimes they have to be shifted for ADA compliance.



Antenna base is there so that the antenna can be free and clear of the globes so that the globes do not interfere with the reception. JF asked if these lights are gas lights. Commission said they're all electric. JF remembers acorn light replacements in the SE previously and there was concern over distribution of the light, shadow, etc. JA asked if same light distribution pattern will be replaced. Applicant responded that light distribution should be roughly the same. JF asked if going from single to double will impact the light distribution. Applicant noted that street side is brighter while building side is dimmer. Nick said that applicant would not necessarily know this.

Nick called out that the random replacement of single to double light poles are arbitrary and the aesthetic will look off if a random double light is placed in the middle of a line of single acorn lights. Nick suggested we go through them all on google maps.

640 is on a corner. 57 Newland is on a corner. 312-314 Shawmut is also on a corner. The top of the existing pole is 14 feet, new pole will be 18 feet. JA noted that existing single acorn lights are not 14 feet tall so its also going from short to tall, which will interrupt the pattern more.

JA asked if mounting antennas to buildings would be an option. 818-840 Harrison is located within the BMC campus. JF asked if using the box at the base is an option than the antenna at the top. CH wants to know why we can't mount these on buildings because they're less offensive if we can't see them.

Applicant said that putting the antennas on the roof is not possible because they help fill in the gaps between the buildings. Single acorn lights are also not possible.

JA noted that other arguments made by LDs for having technology mounted on the pole is to accommodate for outdated equipment that could be removed. But poles are still too thick to fit in with the slender poles in the South End. JF noted that technology changes every two years. JA asked SELDC is mandated to approve something. Nick said they have the ability to say no.

PS wants to know nature of agreement with the city. Who owns the polls? The city does. If someone knocks something over or outdated equipment needs to be removed then it is up to the service provider. JA wants applicant to submit copy of the city agreement to staff.

Commission goes through the rest of the locations.

PS wants to know if anntennas can be mounted on traffic lights. No, not part of approved designs with the city.

Nick said he's seen options in NYC where whips come out from the side of the existing acorn lights. Applicant says that this is not part of the approved design.



Nick said the best option to for SELDC to have a meeting with Streets to know what the options are as he doesn't feel its acceptable.

COMMISSIONER HUNT motioned to continue the application pending the receipt of more information regarding approvable options. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS). JA also noted that this would be an excellent topic for a chairs' meeting for the districts (since there hasn't been one in awhile).

APP # 20.038 SE 1 Taylor Street

Applicant: Don Morton

Proposed Work: At the rear el facing a public way, remove and replace existing roof deck.

Arch Horst, Black River Architects, and Don Morton, building owner, were the project representatives.

The application is necessitated to repair the roof, which is leaking. The deck and railing were approved when the building was renovated in the late 1980s. The existing deck is not getting bigger or higher, essentially removing the deck, repairing the roof, and replacing the deck. The deck will be 36".

JF asked about the existing double fascia. Applicant explained that the roof is flush with the doorway out; the roof slightly slopes. Deck is set at height that is flush with the doorway out. What you see is slightly sloping roof. Existing thickness is present at the roof, but currently hidden by the lattice. Gutter will remain. JF asked if new double fascia will be above the gutter. Yes, it will.

JF asked Commissioners about the drying porch slats. JA confirmed that they were horizontal slats with flat boards. Applicant confirmed they have consulted with staff on the design.

COMMISSIONER HUNT motioned to APPROVE the application as submitted, COMMISSIONER PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.043 SE 24 Union Park

Applicant: Dartagnan Brown

Proposed Work: Remove rear chimney (*See Additional Items in Administrative Review*).

Marc Van Brocklin, project representative.

MVB explained that there is an existing chimney at the rear of the building and does not



have any decorative caps. The owners are removing all working fireplaces from the building and there is no need to keep the chimney. It is visible from oblique angles.

They were approved to install a new dormer that will further obscure the chimney. JA inquired about the schedule for dormer installation. MVB thinks the goal will be to be installed by December 1.

JA asked why chimney needs to be removed. MVB said it doesn't need to be removed, it would be one more watertight concern for the owners. New dormer and roof resloping will require some "watertight gymnastics" to ensure that the envelope is properly sealed.

JF notes that chimneys are significant features of buildings and that they need compelling reasons why it should be removed. A matter of convenience is not a good enough reason. It is about consistency.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN motioned to DENY the application without prejudice, COMMISSIONER HUNT seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.054 SE 30-34 East Concord Street

Applicant: Marcus Springer; Springer Architects

Proposed Work: At penthouse, replace existing roof decks in kind.

Marcus Springer, project representative.

Applicant explained that they received approval from SELDC to replace the existing penthouse roof and redo penthouse cladding was approved in May 2018 and this work necessitates removal of existing decks and replacing them. The owners of one deck (facing onto E. Concord Street) want to extend their deck. Extending the deck to the edge of the penthouse will match the size of the existing decks.

Existing decks facing the cemetery will be replaced in kind.

Black powder coated metal. Surface fixed to the deck.

CH asked when decks were installed. Applicant thinks in the 1980s. One deck was extended in 2004 and was approved by a subcommittee (JA was part of the subcommittee). Applicant explained that they wanted to extend the deck to reach the side of the penthouse so that the decks are all even in size. Applicant said that the decks are visible.

The deck has 36" railings and in bad shape. New railings will be 42" high. A mockup was installed. A gutter will also be installed at the roof. JA asked to see photograph of existing double-decks.



Nick commented that from our perspective the deck is very visible. JA noted that just because it is the same building does not mean that the decks are the same. It is dependent upon the location.

Applicant confirmed again that they are looking to rebuilt two existing decks and extend one deck to the edge of the existing penthouse. JA said that if the deck is removed from the building we have to treat it as a new deck that was never there. We review as if new deck and would we approve new deck in that location.

Nick said that staff has made several site visits to this property as several previous owners have tried to extend the decks at the penthouse. PS asked if rail was being raised and if base of new deck will be raised at all, and the dimension of the existing deck. Applicant explained that the railings will be raised for code, the base is staying the same, and the existing deck is current 9'6 x 12'6.

CH concerned about "more robust" railings. CH cannot tell from photographs what is visible/ not visible. Should a subcommittee be formed? NA said that staff has been out several times with several different architects. An advisory came in a few months ago.

JF said that because a subcommittee approved the previous decks, there is a good chance that those decks can be reapproved, but not necessarily the case with the new deck. He said we could either Deny or set up a subcommittee.

Applicant asked if they could replace the existing deck in kind. JA said that the deck on the left was not approved by SELDC so they cannot just reapprove it. NA said the existing deck is not visible.

JA said they cannot approve making a non-visible deck more visible. Applicant said that if they cannot extend the deck, they would ask to replace the decks in kind.

JF noted that the decks on the right could be reapproved because they were approved by a committee in 2004. NA also noted that it would be an improvement because they're taking away lattice work, etc.

JA said there is no reason to approve extending the deck at this time, but can approve the decks on the right.

PS asked for clarification about the approval of the deck on the E. Concord elevation. Sally Murphy (owner of another unit on the penthouse) said that the decks predated the conversion of the building in '87. NA couldn't find anything about the deck.

Railing elements: JA thinks robustness is not good, as it might make the railings more visible. It would also remove recalling to fire escapes, which is how the SELDC rationalizes the existence of these roof decks. JA said the posts should be simple and slender. Pickets should not be more than 5/8". Top rail need not be more than a flat bar.



Does not need moldings or ornamentals. Pickets should not extend beyond the top rail. Post should not extend above the rail. These simple designs help the railings call less attention to themselves.

JA said that the existing decks can be replaced as long as they are not visible. Jefferson Poole (owner) clarified that in the existing conditions, all three decks can be seen by Washington Street. Their railing is about 40". Current deck visible at 57 Harrison. Extended deck visible from viewshed on E. Concord Street.

NA would classify the existing deck as not visible.

JF said they can approve replacing the decks as is but a subcommittee can go out to determine if an extension is at all possible. The owners confirmed that they would like a subcommittee to come out to the site and determine if an extension of the deck is possible. JA warned that they will not get the full extension they asked for but MAY get some extension.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN motioned to APPROVE rebuilding the existing decks in their current configuration but with materials that represent more typical measurements of deck railings of this district (5/8" to 2"); and the formation of a subcommittee consisting of COMMISSIONER HUNT and COMMISSIONER SANBORN to determine a deck extension is possible; and that there will be no dividers between the existing decks. COMMISSIONER PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.055 SE 31 Worcester Street

Applicant: Marcus Springer; Springer Architects

Proposed Work: At the rear yard facing a public way, rebuild privacy wall and install new door to rear yard (*See additional items under administrative review*).

NA noted that applicant is here to review the proposed bluestone cap at the top of the garden wall. All other work is under Administrative Review.

Applicant explained that the wall will be restored. There is a fake granite (parged concrete) but actual granite at the base of the house. Applicant showed areas of failing brick, and area where wall was built up by 8 bricks. Mortar lines get bigger past the door. Applicant said they'd like to match those mortar lines along the wall but subtly get it bigger when they feather in bricks to the other wall.

The base will be granite. NA said that the cap does not go all the way across the wall, so the Commissioners need to comment on this material. The interior of the wall will also be concrete (for stability) and the brick will be used to face the concrete wall.



JA said that bluestone is not typical for garden walls. Maybe a brick cap, which is unusual in New England but not in the South End. JA asked materials that SELDC has approved in the past (medical center on W. Concord Street). PS said that his wall has a brownstone cap.

After looking at several examples on Google Maps, JA thinks that the cap should be a brownstone material. JA said he only sees bluestone in the SE on the pavement surrounding the coal chute. The Commissioners determined that brownstone is the most appropriate material.

CH motioned APPROVAL with the proviso that the bluestone cap be replaced with a brownstone cap. DP seconded.

COMMISSIONER HUNT motioned to APPROVE the application as submitted, with the proviso that the wall cap be brownstone instead of bluestone.

COMMISSIONER PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.056 SE 531 Massachusetts Avenue

Applicant: Beth McDougal; McDougal Architects

Proposed Work: At the front and rear facades, add two skylights

Applicant explained that the skylights will be installed on the flat parts of the roof. The skylights are located on the front and rear section of the roof. Applicant explained that the dark color of the finish will blend in with the rest of the roof.

The roof deck was previously approved.

Staff considers them minimally visible from the rear. JF has no problem with the skylights from the front.

COMMISSIONER HUNT motioned to APPROVE the application as submitted, with the proviso that the finish is bronze or black (or dark color). COMMISSIONER FREEMAN seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.057 SE 95 Berkeley Street

Applicant: Patricia Carroll

Proposed Work: At roof install additional mechanical equipment with screening.

Megan Kennedy and Stan Kaminsky (?)

Applicant explained that the roof plan is challenging to the proposed installation because of existing penthouse and mechanical equipment. The proposed location is at the front



elevation at Berkeley Street, and is already pushed back as far as it can go due to clearance requirements.

CH noted that this building is a twin of a building on Harral.

Applicant went through sight lines and it is visible.

The proposed screen is a three-sided louvered metal screen.

JA asked for confirmation that that the louvers face up to minimize visibility.

Applicant explained that the mechanical equipment is required to cool the interior of the building. JF noted that our rules require that the skyline be maintained; any construction that would severely impact the skyline will not be allowed. SELDC has some flexibility but not much and sky profile is very distinctive. It is taller than the pedimented parapets.

JA says that they're changing the profile of the parapet and essentially changing the profile of the building by it almost touching the parapet.

JF asked if it can be moved. Applicant explained that the mechanical equipment may be moved to the back of the building with some interior reworking, but that clearances will not allow for the placement of a mechanical screen in that location. JA noted that sometimes mechanical equipment could be unscreened if the screen is more egregious.

Applicant looked at possible viewsheds from the new location at the back of the roof; the secondary location is not visible from Berkeley Street. The structure is 10 feet tall. It cannot be seen from Chandler Street either. It can be seen, however, from the Mass Pike. JA said we do not review that view.

JF said we approve the new location without a screen. If it is not visible it does not need a screen. JF said that if it is visible a violation will be issued.

NA said we do not need a mockup.

JF motioned to approve the application with the proviso that the unit be relocated to an alternate location towards the back of the roof (if viewed from Berkeley Street). CH seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.1340 SE 320 Shawmut Avenue #2

Applicant: Laura Newport

Proposed Work: At the front façade level two, replace three, original, 2 over 2 wood windows (with curved sashes) with three, wood, 2 over 2 windows (with curved sashes).

Laura Newport, owner of unit, representative.



Applicant explained that they have been renovating the unit and that some windows have already been replaced.

She explained that the windows are damaged and very difficult to open.

JF explained that we need to have a window restoration company come in to look at the windows and assess whether or not they can be replaced JB Sash and Pella, who both commented that the windows cannot be replaced, are new window companies and cannot submit letters. He explained that we cannot approve the windows at this hearing. He also explained that a thin profiled storm window can be installed so that the thermal energy is the same.

The pictures show that the windows are deteriorated but NA thinks that they can be replaced. SELDC will send website with window restoration contacts.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN made the motion to deny the application without prejudice. COMMISSIONER HUNT seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

III. Ratification of Meeting Minutes from 07/02/2019

COMMISSIONER HUNT motioned to APPROVE the minutes, COMMISSIONER PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

IV. Staff Updates

V. Adjourn – 8:54 PM

COMMISSIONER HUNT motioned to adjourn the hearing. COMMISSIONER PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).