

**THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 24 JULY 2020
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

The members of the Historical Commission introduced themselves. Mr. Thomas, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him.

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	X		
Melissa Long (Division of Housing & Community Development)	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP	X		
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	X		
Labaron Lenard-Palmer (Dept. of Planning & Development)	X		
Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair	X		
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D. (Commerce Department)	X		
Betty Turner, MA, Vice Chair	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq.	X		

Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Commissioners, staff, applicants, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Maggy White, Esq., Law Department
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:

James Engler, Chief of Staff, Mayor Kenney

Margot Berg
George Bochetto
Rich Cedrone
Carol Delaney
Vincent Fumo
Jody Della Barba
Francis Recchuiti
Russell Kolins
Robert Petrone
James Jordan
Christopher Binetti
Michael A. Santo
Anthony Delvecchio
Vince Borelli
Truby Chiaviello
Mario De Lorenzo
Joseph Mirarchi
Bennet Levin
Christine Flowers
Toni Kolumbus
Penny Bach
Joseph Rollo
Joseph Scelsa
Pasquale Colavita
Oscar Beisert
Jeffrey Bussmann
Patrick Grossi
Susan Davis
Mabel Negrete
Mary Foster
Jess (no last name)
Maurizio Lo Piccolo
Pasquale F. Nestico
John Doe
Akilah Abdul-Rahman
Rue Landau, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations
Francesca
Frank Ferriolo
Caitlin Borrelli
Dom Sabatini
Jeanne D'Angelo
Celeste Morello
Vanette Jordan-Lumogo
Gregory F. Gentile
Angelo Colavita
Manuel Dominguez
Darrell Davis
Sara Lepori
J.M. Duffin
Ashley Mang
Ellen Denofa

Patricia A. Kaisinger
Paul Chrystie
John Avicoli
Gregory Montanaro
Kim T. Nguyen
Jim Matour
Barbara Ann Zippi-Och
Donald S. Sabatini
Tom Campanaro
Scott Kreilick
Anthony DePascale
Fred Santarelli
Gloria Endres
Eleanor Sharpe
James Fratantoni
Asley Hahn
John Chillem
Sandra Lavini
Frankie Quiglia
George Cipolloni
John Zalamari
John McGrorty
Prince Price III
Mikecia Witherspoon
Conservator
Matthew Minsky
Chuck J. McDade
Jay Farrell
Paul Steinke
Michael J. Cerruti
Anna DiNardo
Joe Finio
Jason Greenspon
Brian Fritz
Eric Morales
Matthew Minsky
Karen DiGiacomo
Alecia Reid
Jennifer Diabo
Deb Cunningham
Randy Duque
Mabel Rosenheck
Maria Sciarrino
Ralph Marano
Claudia Becker
Cameron Kline
Sharon Erwin
Bunrath Math
Holly Logan
Santo Montecalvo
Andrew Richman

Allison Krumm
Dave Allende
Elizabeth Milroy
Manny Smith
Vincent Thompson
Chris Mattioli
Julie Goodman
Anthony Mirarchi
Ellie Silverman
Santo Bocchinfuso
Theresa Franchetti
John Buonamici
Robert Ciullo
James P. Benassi
Rocco Gallelli
Marc Fuggi
Jennifer Baker
Vinny DiBac
John Patane
Paul Dupnick
Lee Norelli
Jim Gardner
Rosetta Conigliaro
Sally Louise Polk
Jerry Vernose
Vaughn Ross
Brian Clinton
Jonathan Doran
Marcel Pratt
Christopher Mauger
Michael Bonasera
Susan Wetherill
Charlie Sarkioglu
William Marchio
Marsha Moss
David Fecteau
Nancy Quinn
Joe Ambro
Frank DeSimone
Ron Cellini
Mark Gatti
Alex Balloon
Marylouise DeNicola
Greg Montanaro
Joyce Kemmler
Jared Klein
Anne Kelly
Susan Tavella
Coryn Wolk
John V. Avicoli
Catena Spiritosanto

Johanna Ramos
Kacie Liss
Jack Conviser
Eleanor Sharpe
Stephanie Mach
Barbara Capozzi
Anthony Depascale
Sis Ferlaino
John Doe
Michelle Schmitt
Kaitlyn Hemsley
Saverio Nestico
Joanne Crane Tsucalas
Kristin Bray
David Fillippo
Keith Monahan
Sean McGrath
Beige Berryman
Anthony Depascale
Elizabeth Milroy
Rosetta Miriello
Mike Iannuzzi
Mary McGettigan
Starr Herr-Cardillo
Gina Renzi
Vincent P. Durso
Kelvin Carrington
John McGrorty
Anthony DiMeo
Danielle Walsh

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS STATUE

Proposal: Remove statue from Marconi Plaza and store at secure location

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Margot Berg, Public Art Director

History: Sculpted and installed at Centennial Exhibition, 1876; relocated to Marconi Plaza, 1976

Individual Designation: 3/10/2017

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

This application proposes to relocate the Christopher Columbus Statue from Marconi Plaza on S. Broad Street to a secure storage facility. The City's Public Art Director submitted the application on behalf of the Administration of Mayor Kenney. The City owns the statue and the site, which is managed by Parks & Recreation. The application contends that removing the statue is necessary in the public interest to protect and preserve public safety and the statue itself.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE STATUE AND ITS DESIGNATION

The statue was sculpted for and installed at the Centennial Exhibition of 1876, a World's Fair held in Philadelphia to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Staged in West Fairmount Park, the Centennial was an enormous event of international significance that ran for six months, included exhibits from 37 countries, and hosted 10 million visitors. The Columbus Monument Association, which was primarily composed of members of Philadelphia's Italian-American community, commissioned the statue and gifted it to the City for display at the exhibition. It was installed at the intersection of the two main axes on the exhibition grounds. The identity of the sculptor is unknown. Although nearly all of the exhibition buildings were removed after it closed, the statue remained in place until 1976, when it was moved to its current location at Marconi Plaza.

Acting on a nomination submitted by a member of the public, the Historical Commission designated the statue as an historic object on March 10, 2017, finding that it satisfied Criteria for Designation A and B (Section 14-1004). The City's historic preservation ordinance defines an "object" at Section 14-203(195) as:

A material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historic, or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, movable yet related to a specific setting or environment.

The designation includes the statue and pedestal only, not the site or appurtenances like the enclosing fence. Marconi Plaza is not designated as historic and is not under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

At the time of designation, the Historical Commission found that the statue satisfied Criterion A because it was installed at the Centennial, a celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, and Columbus had been adopted as a symbol for the emerging nation by George Washington and others during the Revolutionary Era. The Historical Commission found that the statue satisfied Criterion B because it was created for and installed at the Centennial, a pivotal event in nineteenth-century America, where the country emerged as an economic, technological, and political power on the world stage. The nomination emphasized that the sculpture was located at an important place at the center of the exhibition. The nomination acknowledged that sculpture had subsequently been moved to Marconi Plaza in 1976, but it made no claim that the current site has any historical significance in its own right or that the statue itself derives any significance from that site.

APPLICABLE LAW AND REGULATION

The Historical Commission is considering this matter today because the Public Art Director has requested its approval of a building permit application to move the statue. Generally, the Historical Commission identifies and designates buildings, structures, sites, objects, interiors, and districts as historic, and then regulates those resources for preservation purposes through the review of building permit applications. The Department of Licenses & Inspections may not issue a building permit for an historic resource until the Historical Commission has approved the permit application.

The Historical Commission designated the statue as an object. The definition of "demolition" at Section 14-203(88) in the preservation ordinance asserts that: "Demolition includes the removal of an ... object from its site." Therefore, if Marconi Plaza is considered the object's "site," the removal of the statue from that site, even if safeguarded when moved, is considered a demolition in the legal sense. Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance prohibits the Department of Licenses & Inspections from issuing demolition permits for historic resources except in two cases. The ordinance stipulates that:

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of an historic ... object ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the ... object cannot be used for any purpose.

The public interest exception is applicable in this case; the other is not. Therefore, if the Historical Commission construes the removal of the statue from its site as a “demolition,” it should only approve the application if it first finds that the issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest.

The preamble to the preservation ordinance at Section 14-1001 asserts that historic preservation is in the public interest. Likewise, the promotion of health, safety, and security, a primary function of municipal government, is in the public interest. The application argues that the removal of the statue is necessary to preserve both public safety and the statue itself. If the Historical Commission agrees, it may approve the application to remove the statue as necessary in the public interest.

Even if the removal is necessary in the public interest, the Historical Commission should also consider whether removing the statue from Marconi Plaza would have an adverse effect on the aesthetic and historic qualities and significance of the statue and whether the application proposes a method of removal and storage that will ensure that the statue is protected and preserved.

The nomination for the statue adopted by the Historical Commission in 2017 asserted that the statue is related to a specific setting or environment, the Centennial grounds in West Fairmount Park, its former location. The nomination made no claim that the statue is related in any way to Marconi Plaza, other than the fact that it is currently located at the plaza. The Historical Commission could decide that removing the statue from Marconi Plaza would have no adverse effect on the statue itself. To make such a determination, it would apply the standard Review Criteria enumerated in Section 1005(6)(e) of the preservation ordinance to ensure that the proposed removal and storage comported with them.

SUMMARY OF THE APPLICATION

The application makes two primary assertions that are significant to the Historical Commission's deliberations today. First, it asserts that removing the statue is necessary in the public interest to protect and preserve public safety and welfare and to protect and preserve the statue itself. Second, the application contends that the statue will be removed and relocated to a secure storage facility in a manner that will preserve the integrity of the statue and its base.

The Historical Commission's focus should be narrow while reviewing this application and should seek to answer four questions.

- Is the removal of the statue from Marconi Plaza necessary in the public interest to preserve public health, safety, and welfare?
- Is the removal of the statue necessary in the public interest to preserve the statue itself?
- Does removing the statue from Marconi Plaza have an adverse effect on the statue itself? In other words, does removing the statue adversely impact the artistic or historic qualities or significance of the statue?
- Does the proposed method of removal and storage ensure that the statue will be preserved?

Making a determination on this application does not require the Historical Commission to make determinations about Columbus, his historical significance, or his legacy, about whether he was a hero or villain, about what identity group or groups should or should not be represented at Marconi Plaza, or other matters that exceed the Commission's purview. Moreover, the Historical Commission will not be considering the final disposition of the statue today, only whether or not it should be moved from Marconi Plaza to storage to allow for a discussion of the statue's future. Regardless of the decision on the current permit application, the statue will remain designated as historic and under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. The Historical Commission will review any subsequent applications to relocate, alter, or demolish the statue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission find that the issuance of the building permit for the removal of the statue is necessary in the public interest and approve the application, provided the City confirms that the Historical Commission retains jurisdiction over the statue, reports annually to the Commission on the its condition, and confirms that the City will seek the Commission's approval for any subsequent relocation, alteration, or demolition of the statue, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) and (e) of the preservation ordinance.

The issuance of the permit for the removal is necessary in the public interest and would align with the purposes of the ordinance, in that it would protect and preserve both public safety and the statue. The removal would have no impact on the historical, architectural, or aesthetic significance of the object; the object would retain any such significance that it currently possesses. The removal would not have an adverse effect on the object; the statue would be moved, but otherwise unchanged. The removal and storage would be undertaken in a manner that guarantees that the safety of the statue. The relocation would satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, including Preservation Standard 5 and the Building Site Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:08

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Mayor's Chief of Staff James Engler, Public Art Director Margot Berg, and attorneys Andrew Richman, Danielle Walsh, and Sean McGrath represented the application.
- Mr. Engler stated that the protests following the murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis has compelled cities across the country to confront systemic racism. He stated that Philadelphians must confront such racism and reconsider the life and deeds of Christopher Columbus. While Columbus is venerated as an explorer by many and celebrated by the Italian-American community, he is also condemned by some for his treatment of native peoples. Mr. Engler stated that the recent civil unrest at the Christopher Columbus Statue in Marconi Plaza has made it clear that the statue cannot be maintained in place, and safety and security maintained at the plaza. He stated that the City would like to move the statue to a storage facility to allow for a public discussion of the statue and its future. Maintaining the statue at the plaza is "against the public interest" and "completely unsafe." False rumors that the statue would be removed immediately brought people with weapons including rifles to the statue to "defend" it. Other gathered at the statue to protest Columbus. The unrest around the statue led to violence and arrests. Police were deployed, distracted them from their other duties. The statue was boxed, but tensions remained high. Mr. Engler referenced the affidavit of Philadelphia Police Officer Francis T.

- Healy, Special Advisor to Police Commissioner Outlaw, and stated that the unrest at the plaza will continue if the statue is left in place. It is necessary in the public interest to remove the statue to restore peace to the plaza and to allow the disposition of the statue to be considered in a manner that will seek unity. Mr. Engler concluded that the City acknowledges the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the statue and will seek the Commission's approval once a plan for the final disposition of the statue has been developed.
- Ms. Berg reviewed the history of the statue, including its original installation at the Centennial Exhibition in Fairmount Park in 1876 and its relocation to Marconi Plaza in 1976. She noted that the Historical Commission designated it as historic in 2017. She stated that "the statue is not a site-specific object." Ms. Berg recounted the unrest and violence around the statue that followed the murder of George Floyd. She noted the clashes between armed people claiming to protect the statue and those protesting the acts of Christopher Columbus. She noted that the City erected a plywood box around the statue to protect it from vandalism. She noted the unrest around the statue even after it was boxed; the unrest led to injuries and arrests. She stated that police are stationed at the statue 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Ms. Berg referenced the affidavit of Philadelphia Police Officer Francis T. Healy, Special Advisor to Police Commissioner Outlaw, and stated that the continued display of the statue is a threat to public safety. She stated that the City contends that the relocation of the statue is necessary in the public interest to ensure public safety and to protect the statue. She stated that protesters have toppled Columbus statues and municipalities have removed them in cities throughout the country. She stated that the statue is fragile and needs to be protected. She described the process the City has initiated to elicit and analyze public opinion on the statue and presented preliminary findings based on that opinion. She stated that the City has an obligation to protect public health, safety, and welfare and to protect its public art. It is necessary in the public interest to remove the statue from Marconi Plaza. It is not feasible to leave the statue on the plaza. Both public safety and the statue itself are at risk if the statue is left in place. Ms. Berg stated that the statue will be moved by a qualified rigging team under the direction of a sculpture conservator to a secure City storage facility. She stated that the statue will be stored until a feasible private site for its relocation is secured.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Mattioni acknowledged that the legacy of Christopher Columbus may be difficult for some people. He observed, however, that Columbus is a product of his time. He objected to relocating the statue to a private location. He stated that it is a piece of public art. He asked why it would not be relocated to a public location like a museum. Mr. Mattioni asked the applicants if the City had selected a new location.
 - Ms. Berg stated that it is premature to decide on a new location. The City must first engage the public to better understand public opinion on the statue. She stated that it cannot feasibly remain at Marconi Plaza. She said that the City hopes to find a location where it can be viewed by the community that appreciates it. She stated that it must be moved to protect public safety.
 - Mr. Mattioni responded that he is aware of the events that have gone on around the statue, but asserted that it is the City's responsibility to promote public safety and protect its art. If the City has not met these obligations, it has failed.
 - Ms. Berg responded that it is not feasible for the City to station police officers at the statue permanently.

- Mr. Mattioni asked what steps the City has taken to elicit the opinions of those who want the statue to remain in place.
- Ms. Berg replied that the City is “in emergency mode,” but will take everyone into account when making decisions about the statue. Mr. Engler added that the pandemic has slowed outreach efforts, but those efforts will be undertaken. He noted that the City has not yet formulated a final plan for the statue. He acknowledged that the Historical Commission would retain jurisdiction and have an opportunity to review any final plan. Ms. Berg stated that the City is in communication with the Friends of Marconi Park and other community representatives.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if the staff would be involved in reviewing the details of the move and storage.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that the staff could review those details, if so directed.
 - Mr. Mattioni stated that, if the Commission approves the removal, it should condition the approval to ensure the safe removal and storage.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that the Historical Commission could determine that the statue has a historic association with the plaza.
 - Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Mattioni’s assertion that one could argue that the statue has a historic association with the plaza, but he noted that the nomination adopted in 2017 makes no such argument and the Historical Commission made no such finding at that time.
- Mr. Thomas asked if the statue would be stored in the City of Philadelphia.
 - Ms. Berg responded that it would be stored within the City.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Farnham read a letter, dated 24 July 2020, from Councilman Squilla to the Historical Commission into the record.
- Attorney George Bochetto stated that he is representing the Friends of Marconi Plaza, which has brought legal action regarding the statue in the Court of Common Pleas. He stated that he represents Joseph Mirarchi, a South Philadelphia resident. He stated that he also represents Gardner Cadwalader with regard to the former Fairmount Park Commission.
 - Mr. Bochetto stated that the Commissioners are being pressured by the Mayor, but they must remain faithful to their oath, the City Charter, and the Commission’s mission statement.
 - Mr. Bochetto stated that the meeting is illegitimate because the Historical Commission did not provide notice of the meeting to the residents and business owners who surround Marconi Plaza. The rules regarding public input have not been observed. The process has been politicized.
 - Mr. Bochetto stated that the City’s survey is flawed. He stated that the criticisms of Columbus regarding genocide, slavery, and other abuses are unsubstantiated. He stated that the City has provided no witnesses or evidence. The City’s claim that it cannot protect its art is not convincing.
 - Mr. Bochetto stated that the City is “railroading” the removal of the statue through Historical Commission. He asked the Commissioners to be faithful to their oath of office.
 - Mr. Bochetto stated that the Historical Commission designated the statue three years ago and found it “worthy of public display.”
 - Mr. Bochetto stated that the criteria by which historic objects are designated shows that the statue is historically associated with Marconi Plaza. He stated

that, according to Criterion for Designation G, when the Historical Commission designates an object as historic, it must be “part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif.” He stated that the Historical Commission certified the statue based on this criterion. He stated that removing the statue from Marconi Plaza would be contrary to the Home Rule Charter.

- Mr. Bochetto stated that the current unrest is related to refusing to allow the public to have its input. The public is being oppressed. Now, Mayor Kenney is oppressing the public and the Historical Commission by “railroading” this application through the Historical Commission. Mayor Kenney is being dictatorial. The Historical Commission is not following its rules and procedures. Mr. Bochetto claimed that the statue is in place in Marconi Plaza today only because of his actions; he stated that he obtained an emergency court order forcing the Administration to follow the law. He asked the Historical Commission to table the application. He stated that there are alternatives to removing the statue. He stated that he will litigate the decision for years in the state and federal courts. He said that Philadelphia should be the “shining example” for the country. He asked the Historical Commission to act lawfully.
- Mr. Farnham asked the chair to give him an opportunity to correct two misstatements by Mr. Bochetto. Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission satisfied all of its notice requirements with regard to this meeting. He stated that Mr. Bochetto was incorrect when he contended that the Historical Commission was obligated to provide direct notice to residents, business owners, and citizens of South Philadelphia. Mr. Farnham then stated that Mr. Bochetto was incorrect with regard to Criterion for Designation G. He stated that the Historical Commission did not find that the statue satisfied Criterion G, is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area, when it designated the Columbus statue. Criterion G is one of 10 criteria that the Historical Commission may cite when it designates, but it did not cite G in this case. The Historical Commission found that the statue satisfied Criteria A and B. It made no such finding with regard to Criterion G, which relates to the setting. Ms. Turner agreed with Mr. Farnham, stating that the Historical Commission designated the statue as satisfying Criteria A and B, which are unrelated to site or environment. She stated that the statue is designated as an object. The site is not designated. Mr. Mattioni stated that, although the site was not recognized in the designation, it does have an association with the statue.
- Rich Cedrone stated that he is the president of the Friends of Marconi. He objected to the City’s survey and claimed that it is inaccurate. He stated that the statue is important in Italian-American culture and associated with important events. He stated that there has been no trouble at the statue until the recent unrest. He asked the Historical Commission to follow the legal process and not allow mob rule. He asked the Historical Commission to table the matter until the pandemic is over.
- Carol Delaney, a historian who has studied Christopher Columbus, defended his reputation. She said she had no position on the statue. She spoke about a book she wrote on Columbus. She stated that Columbus wanted to take Jerusalem back from the Muslims. She stated that Columbus baptized the natives; he did not enslave them. Men accompanying Columbus raped and marauded, but Columbus did not. She asked people to buy her book on Columbus.
 - Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman stated that testimony about who Columbus was or was not is not pertinent. Today’s meeting is not a referendum on Columbus

the man. Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission has already determined that the statue is historically significant. The question today is whether it should be moved for public safety and the safety of the statue itself.

- Vincent Fumo stated that the Historical Commission should not decide on whim or mob rule. He stated that the Mayor would have ignored the Historical Commission if he and his comrades had not obtained a court order. Mr. Fumo stated that Columbus is important because he made the western hemisphere a “civilized” part of the world. Mr. Fumo asked Ms. Edwards to recuse herself because she is biased. He claimed that she was making facial expressions during earlier testimony.
 - Ms. Edwards responded that Mr. Fumo is out of order and out of line. She asked Mr. Fumo not to personally attack her.
 - Mr. Fumo stated that Ms. Edwards should resign.
 - Mr. Mattioni asked Mr. Fumo to move on and present his testimony.
 - Mr. Fumo stated that Columbus is a historic figure and has historic significance. He objected to the City’s survey. He offered to conduct a new survey. He stated that the statue is a point of pride for Italian Americans. He stated that placing the statue in storage is not protecting the statue.
- Jody Della Barba stated that she represents the 1492 Society and the Girard Estate Area Residents. She stated that she is familiar with the Historical Commission. She objected to the removal of the statue. She objected to mob rule and bigotry.
- Russell Kolins stated that he is a security and public safety expert. He stated that the statue can be protected. He stated that the police were told to stand down when the “anarchists” approached the statue. He stated that the police were “handcuffed.” He complained that the “anarchists” are let go and the police are prosecuted. He said that the statue can be protected with cameras wired to the real-time crime center. He stated that the statue can be protected in place. He objected to the “anarchists” who burned the Wendy’s restaurant where Rayshard Brooks was shot and killed by police in Atlanta. The storage facility where the statue is relocated could also be burned.
- Francis Recchuiti introduced himself as legal counsel of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania Sons & Daughters of Italy. He noted that he submitted a package of letters between himself and Mayor Kenney. He stated that his organization offered to pay for cameras, alarms, and lighting at the statue wired to the police station. The City has not responded. He stated that the Lenni Lenape who objected to the statue at the Art Commission meeting should direct their anger at William Penn, not Columbus. He noted that his members pray and salute the flag before every meeting. The statue is like the flag for his members. The people who objected to the statue were not protesters, they were anarchists, looters, arsonists, and thieves. He said that the statue is not going to come alive and take a knee. He again offered to provide protection for the statue and asked the Historical Commission to table the matter.
- Robert Petrone stated that the Historical Commission must consider Columbus himself. Mr. Petrone stated that he is a Columbus expert. He stated that he was retained by City Council to research Columbus. He stated that Columbus was the first civil rights activist of the Americas. He did not rape, enslave, or maim. He suggested that people should read the original sources. Columbus created the first Underground Railroad. Columbus saved people from cannibals. Columbus urged the passage of civil rights legislation.
- James Jordan stated that he is a rigger. He stated that he has moved works of art. He stated that the statue requires professionals to remove it successfully. He stated

that the Historical Commission must look closely at the details of the plan to move the statue.

- Christopher Binetti stated that he is a political scientist, historian, adjunct professor, and Italian-American civil rights activist. He stated that he is the president of the Italian American Movement, a New Jersey organization. He objected to the removal of the statue. He said that Columbus should be referred to as Colombo. He referred to the 1891 massacre of Italians in New Orleans. He stated that politicians selected Columbus Day as a holiday for Italians.
- Michael A. Santo stated that he is active in Italian-American organizations. He stated that Colombo changed the history of the world and deserves to be commemorated. He objected to the possibility of removing the statue. He questioned the Historical Commission's authority to consider this matter. The people who support the removal have an agenda. He stated that he is prepared to fight the removal of the statue.
- Anthony Delvecchio stated that he was part of the group protecting the statue. He objected to being called a racist. He said that people on both sides were white. He said that he was protecting his neighborhood. He said that the protesters were agitators. The protesters were planning to damage the neighborhood. He said that the protesters are manipulating the situation. He objected to Philadelphia allowing murals of a convicted killer of a police officer and Malcom X. He said that there were bad and good people on both sides. He stated that he was protecting his neighborhood and family; it was not about race. He said that he would not allow people to come into his neighborhood and burn it down. He concluded that people are using George Floyd to push their "leftist, socialist movement."
- Vince Borelli stated that he is a retired police officer. He contended that the statue is not creating a public safety threat. The problem is inadequate police planning and deployment. He stated that former Mayor Rizzo knew how to handle security problems and was able to protect the Liberty Bell. He stated that the protesters are the problem, not the statue. The protesters are "giving way to anarchy." The neighbors were forced to protect the statue. He objected to the removal of the Rizzo statue. He said the removal of it was anarchy.
- Mario De Lorenzo stated that he is the founder and president of an Italian pride organization at Drexel University. He is a student there as well. He objected to revisionist histories and to the removal of the statue. He stated that he does not feel welcome in America with the removals of Columbus statues.
- Joseph Mirarchi stated that he lives in the Marconi Plaza neighborhood. He stated that he objects to the meeting because it violates the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, 36 USC 1701 Subsection 3, and 36 USC 42 Subsection 1983. He stated that he agrees with Mr. Fumo and Mr. Squilla. He presented an estimate for a glass box that can be placed around the statue to protect it. He stated that the cost is \$24,000. He stated that the neighbors will be able to enjoy the statue in the box. He stated that the protesters will also be able to see the statue, but they are unlikely to visit it again unless George Soros pays them.
- Bennett Levin stated that he was the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections in the 1990s and also sat on the Historical Commission and Board of Building Standards. He observed that the statue was paid for by Italian immigrants who were proud of their home country. He stated that an unruly mob of anarchists should not be allowed to judge Columbus. He said that we should not erase history. Revisionists rewrite history for their own political goals. We should question history, not destroy it. The Historical Commission should stand as a bulwark against the mob and promote scholarship and interpretation.

- Christine Flowers objected to the removal of the statue because it offends one group, while it is a source of pride for another. She equated the removal of the statue with the erasure of history and said that its removal would be an act of totalitarianism. She stated that history exists and has already been written; we should not attempt to rewrite it. She concluded that such thought tyranny should not exist in Philadelphia.
- Toni Kolumbus stated that she is both Italian American and African American. She stated that her Italian-American relatives did not choose Columbus; instead, he was thrust upon them by politicians atoning for the New Orleans lynching. She advocated for equal justice for all.
- Penny Bach stated that she is the executive director of the Association for Public Art and the chair of the City's Public Art Advisory Committee. The committee has reviewed and supports the Mayor's proposal. She thanked the City for protecting the sculpture and including boxing it. She named the members of the committee. She stated that the committee submitted written testimony. She asserted that the statue is not site specific. She confirmed that the nomination cites Criteria for Designation A and B, but not G and H. She contended that Marconi Plaza was not part of the designation. She suggested that the Historical Commission protect the statue itself. She stated that it is marble and porous. She referenced the affidavit of Philadelphia Police Officer Francis T. Healy, Special Advisor to Police Commissioner Outlaw, and noted that the statue poses a real public safety risk.
- Joseph Rollo stated that he came to the United States from Italy in 1976. He stated that he hopes that the Commissioners have not already made up their minds about the matter. He objected to historic revisionism. He stated that rewriting the history of Columbus would constitute an act of arrogance. He stated that we should apply today's standards on the past. He objected to the removal of the statue.
 - Mr. Reuter noted that Mr. Rollo did submit written comments. He may have been cut off because he was having technical problems, but the Commission has his full testimony.
- Pasquale Colavita stated that he is an attorney and is familiar with the Historical Commission's process. He stated that he is an Italian American. He stated that South Philadelphia was made up of many ethnic communities. He stated that the statue is a gathering place for Italian Americans. He stated that there was no violence in the neighborhood until the protests started. He stated that there is evidence that Columbus was not an oppressor. He explained that there are no problems with the statue within the Marconi Plaza neighborhood. Those who object to the statue are outsiders. He said that the outsiders are coming into to his neighborhood and objecting to his statue.
- Jeffrey Bussmann asked for information about the movement of the statue from its original site to its current site in 1976. He asked if the wishes of the original donors were taken into account in 1976. He asked if the Rizzo Administration followed the appropriate processes in 1976.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that he supports the staff's recommendation. He stated that his organization supports the removal and safe storage of the statue. He observed that the legacy of Columbus is not something that should be celebrated in a public park. He stated that, speaking for himself, as an Italian American who lives in South Philadelphia, he does not have a deep or meaningful attachment to Columbus. He stated that he does not require Columbus as a vehicle for his pride in his heritage. He stated that this moment in history calls for empathy and shared humanity.

- Susan Davis stated that she is a public art consultant and architect and a member of the City's Public Art Advisory Committee. She stated that she supports the application.
- Mabel Negrete stated that she is of mixed heritage with Native American and Spanish backgrounds. She stated that she supports the removal of the statue. She noted the atrocities perpetrated against native peoples.
- Mary Foster stated that she is both Native American and Italian American. She stated that she is an educator here in Philadelphia and pointed out that schools no longer teach that Columbus was a hero. She stated that the statue is a symbol of violence. She stated that people have always objected to the statue; the events around George Floyd have allowed the people opposed to the statue to speak their opinions. She added that the statue is not good art.
- Jess did not provide her last name. She observed that people have accused the community people of being racist. She stated that she was at the protests and the protesters were racist as well. She objected to the City survey. She stated that the Mayor should have met with the community members. She stated that the protesters want to destroy the statue. She questioned the City's claim that the statue cannot be protected in place. She asserted that Mayor Kenney wants to get rid of the statue because of a "Marxist ideology."
- Maurizio Lo Piccolo is the president of the American Friends of Italy. He stated that the Historical Commission is being "thrown under the bus" by the Kenney Administration. He stated that the City should not take away from one side to make the other side happy. He stated that the statue should stay in place.
- Pasquale F. Nestico stated that Columbus is the hero of the nation and the world. He asked the Historical Commission to respect history. He suggested that the Historical Commission should play God Bless America at the beginning of every meeting.
- Someone speaking using the name John Doe stated that the Kenney Administration is using the statue as a scapegoat for the failures of the administration. He stated that the removal of the statue has nothing to do with real justice.
- Akilah Abdul-Rahman stated that she stands in solidarity with indigenous people calling for the removal of this statue.
- Rue Landau, the executive director of the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, the City's civil rights agency, stated that the statue must be removed. Columbus was a colonizer and exploiter. The statue is a cruel and constant reminder of our past. We should commemorate Italian Americans, but not with this statue.
- Francesca (no last name) objected to the survey. She stated that crime does not come from a marble statue. She objected to removing the statue. She asserted that the City should not tell her who to venerate. She said several times that she is first and foremost a "free American."
- Frank Ferriolo stated that he was born in South Philadelphia, but has lived in Michigan for 35 years. He stated that, if the issue is public safety, then allowing this statue to be removed for public safety reasons will set a precedent and William Penn will be next. He asserted that the demonstrators, rioters, and anarchists should not be permitted to decide what is and is not acceptable.
- Caitlin Borrelli stated that she is an Italian American from Philadelphia and supports the removal and destruction of the statue. She stated that Italian Americans should not be represented by a white supremacist like Columbus. She stated that the men with guns and bats is evidence of the racism that the statue incites. Columbus Day should be replaced with Indigenous Peoples Day. She said that this is not about erasing history; it is about correcting it.

- Oscar Beisert observed that the statue has already been removed from its original location. He stated that he supports the staff's recommendation to remove the statue. The statue could be replaced with something supported by the community. The City should work to overcome divides through interpretation. The Historical Commission should designate more sites related to Italian-American history.
- Dom Sabatini stated that the current site does have a connection to the Italian-American community and the statue. The Columbus Day parade has ended at the site for many decades.
- Jeanne D'Angelo stated that she is Italian American and she supports the removal of the statue. Columbus enslaved and exploited people and is now used to "uphold the goodness of the American colonial project." She objected to the "drunken mob" who claimed to be protecting the statue. She asserted that the statue is not artistically significant.
- Celeste Morello thanked the Historical Commission for protecting the statue. She stated that she nominated it in 2016 and it was designated in 2017. She apologized for putting the Historical Commission in the middle of this debate. She asked why Mr. Mattioni did not assert that the statue and Marconi Plaza had a significant association when the statue was considered for designation in 2017.
 - Mr. Mattioni replied that the question was not worthy of a response.
- Joseph Scelsa of New York observed that he is trained as a sociologist and has been associated with City University and Queens College. He stated that removing the statue will disenfranchise Italian Americans and violate their civil rights. He stated that he filed a civil rights complaint previously and was recognized as a legitimate representative of the Italian-American community. He threatened to file a civil rights complaint if the City in any way altered or removed the statue.
- Mr. Bochetto responded to the public comments. He asked the Historical Commission to focus on "Section 14-1004 of the Home Rule Charter." He asserted that the location of the statue at Marconi Plaza was "integrally intertwined with your considerations as to whether to designate it as an historic object." He stated that "to suggest that Subparagraph G was not part of your considerations merely because the box was not checked on the form I think is really exalting form over substance." The statue is associated with Marconi Plaza and to remove it from the plaza is to "denigrate" its historical significance. He asked the Commissioners to read their oaths of office and to consider the standards by which they designated the statue. He stated that the Home Rule Charter says that whenever the Historical Commission changes a designation or changes the location of a designated object, it must go through the same process it went through when it designated it. The oath of office matters.
- Ms. Berg, the applicant, stated that the City is not asking the Historical Commission to change the designation of the statue in any way. She stated that the City acknowledges that the statue is designated and will remain designated and under the Commission's jurisdiction. She stated that the unrest that has occurred at Marconi Plaza indicates that it is necessary to remove the statue to preserve public safety and the statue itself.
- Danielle Walsh, a City attorney, stated that she is working with Ms. Berg and on the Columbus litigation. She stated that she wanted to correct an inaccurate statement that was made earlier in the meeting. She stated that the claim that the City planned to remove the statue in an emergency fashion as it did with the Rizzo statue but was thwarted by a court order is not correct. Mr. Bochetto did request an emergency hearing based on a rumor that the City was planning to quickly remove the statue,

but the City Solicitor explained at that hearing that there was no plan to remove the statue in an emergency manner. The court did not issue an order stopping the removal. Instead, the City stipulated at a later hearing that the reviews would take place as they have been. Ms. Walsh stated that Mr. Bochetto included the transcripts of the emergency hearing on June 14 and the regular hearing on June 15 in his exhibit package. The transcripts indicate the City's actual plans and the court's actual order.

- Vanette Jordan-Lumogo stated that she is a case worker with a social service agency in South Philadelphia. She stated that the so-called protectors of the statue have made it difficult for her to do her work in the area. She stated that they intimidate people they perceive as from outside the neighborhood. A statue that creates that kind of animosity needs to be moved. She supported moving the statue.
- An unidentified member of the public stated that he was offended by the behavior of the protesters at the statue. He stated that he went to the protest dressed as a protester to blend into the crowd and to experience the protest as a protester. He said that the protesters were very angry and made false accusations regarding the neighborhood people to the police.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Mattioni stated that the applicant has not presented any alternatives to moving the statue. The City did, however, place a wooden box around the statue, but the box is not a permanent solution. Mr. Mattioni asked if the City considered any other alternatives to removal. He stated that the City has presented limited evidence regarding public safety. He stated that the City has not made a strong showing that there is a public interest in moving the statue. Mr. Mattioni stated that the protests against racial injustice and systemic racism were fully justified, but this statue does not really relate to those protests. He opined that it would be a radical move for this Historical Commission to approve the demolition by removal of this statue and allow it to be removed from Marconi Plaza. Mr. Mattioni acknowledged that the nomination of the statue adopted by the Historical Commission did not make claims about the relationship between the statue and Marconi Plaza, but contended, nonetheless, that a relationship or association does exist. The location of the statue is important to the people of South Philadelphia.
- Ms. Edwards observed that the statue could be damaged by protesters. It is fragile. She asked if it should be removed to protect the statue itself. She stated that removing it now would allow for a conversation about where the statue should be located and who its caretakers should be. She noted that removing the statue will not actually demolish the statue, even if removing it is considered a demolition in the legal sense.
- Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, stated that the City has not applied to destroy the statue, but only to move it to storage. However, the definition of demolition in the zoning code indicates that removing an object from its site should be treated as a demolition. The City is not proposing to destroy the statue.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the application proposes to remove the statue from its site and store it in a City warehouse. Mr. Thomas suggested that the Historical Commission should determine whether there are alternatives to removing the statue.
- Mr. Mattioni disagreed with Mr. Thomas. He stated that the Historical Commission should not need to enumerate the alternatives. The onus is on the applicant. The City has failed to present alternatives.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he believes that the statue must be moved because it will remain a flashpoint and pose a public safety hazard.
- Ms. Turner stated that the Historical Commission has a responsibility first and foremost to protect the statue. Moving the statue to a warehouse will protect it. Once it is safely stored, the City can consider alternatives for the statue. Moving it will also protect public safety and welfare.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Historical Commission is not asked to make a final decision on the statue today, but only to allow its movement to storage so that a discussion about its future can occur.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that the Historical Commission has not heard from anyone with expertise on public safety. He stated that the City's presentation was "meager."
- Ms. Edwards asked if other boards or commissions will consider the matter.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the Art Commission will consider the matter.
- Mr. Reuter stated that the court's order requires the Art Commission to wait to make a final decision until the Historical Commission has made its decision. He also explained that the Art and Historical Commission processes are entirely different and the records are separate. The Historical Commission also has different review criteria.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission's approval is a prerequisite approval for a building permit.
- Mr. Reuter stated that it is unclear whether the Department of Licenses & Inspections would require a permit to move the statue if it were not designated as historic.
- Ms. Stanford stated that the Historical Commission could place conditions on the removal.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the situation around the statue is unstable and unsafe.
- Mr. Thomas stated that there does not appear to be a better solution than moving the statue.
- Ms. Edwards stated that the reviews should be documented carefully for later considerations about the statue.
- Ms. Washington warned that the public safety issues that have arisen will arise again if the statue later put back on public display. She stated that public safety cannot be guaranteed if the statue is displayed. The same problems will be confronted again. She stated that the statue needs to be in a place where it is not going to incite riots.
- Ms. Stanford stated that simply moving the statue will not solve the problem.
- Ms. Washington disagreed. She stated that moving the statue to storage will protect the statue and public safety. She suggested keeping focused on the issues at hand.
- Mr. Mattioni asked if the City is admitting that it cannot care for its public art.
- Ms. Washington responded that the City is appropriately privileging public safety over art and history.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Historical Commission will remain a steward of the statue, even if it is in storage.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that the City should be barred from removing the statue from Philadelphia. He also noted that moving a fragile marble statue poses a risk. A qualified mover should be required. He noted that the proposal will require two moves, to storage and then to a new location in the future. Mr. Mattioni noted that most of the Commissioners appear to be in favor of allowing the removal.
- Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Mattioni that the movers should be qualified.
- Mr. Lippert wondered if the protests would move to the storage facility. It was noted that the location of the storage facility would be undisclosed.

- Mr. Reuter suggested that the Historical Commission weigh the public interest in safety as well as the public interest in the statue remaining in its current location.
- Ms. Stanford stated that moving the statue will provide an opportunity to have a reasoned public discussion about the future of the statue.
- Mr. Thomas stated that we are facing unprecedented times with the unrest and pandemic. Moving the statue to safety will allow for a public discussion without the public safety concerns. It will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the storage. Mr. Thomas suggested that the statue belongs in a museum of immigration.
- Mr. Reuter noted that the Historical Commission cannot condition an approval of relocation with a requirement that the statue is moved to a particular location because the City may not have control of that location.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that the statue may never be relocated to a new site.
- Ms. Washington asked if the Historical Commission could condition an approval with a requirement that the City install an interpretive plaque at Marconi Plaza. She stated that it could acknowledge both sides in this dispute.
- Mr. Mattioni questioned the Historical Commission's capacity to sort out the legacy of Columbus, given the disagreement between the various parties.
- Mr. Reuter stated that the Historical Commission probably could approve the removal with the requirement that the City install an interpretive plaque at Marconi Plaza.
- Ms. Washington stated that the Historical Commission should approve the removal if public safety cannot be guaranteed at Marconi Plaza.
- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners whether they needed additional information from the City.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the public interest in retaining the statue in place, perhaps in some secure box, does not outweigh the interest in public safety. The public interest in public safety is greater.
- Mr. Mattioni asked if keeping the statue as is means keeping it in a box or removing the box.
- Ms. Turner stated that moving the statue to storage would promote the two primary public interests, public safety and the preservation of the statue itself. She stated, however, that any approval should be conditioned.
- Ms. Stanford agreed with Ms. Turner.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the statue should remain in the City of Philadelphia and under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.
- Ms. Stanford stated that the statue should be stored in a secure location.
- Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that the location should not be disclosed to the public.
- Several Commissioners asked if the Historical Commission should require interpretive signage at Marconi Plaza.
- Ms. Washington asked if the Historical Commission should have jurisdiction over the installation of a replacement statue at Marconi Plaza.
- Mr. Reuter opined that the idea of requiring a plaque is acceptable, but he questioned the appropriateness of delegating decisions about the text on the plaque to the staff. He stated that that would be an impossible task.
- Ms. Washington withdrew her suggestion that the Historical Commission require a plaque or review any replacement statue.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the visual recordation should be made available to the public.

- Mr. Farnham stated that the recordation can be made available on the Commission's website as well as in Arches, which will be publicly available.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The affidavit Philadelphia Police Officer Francis T. Healy, Special Advisor to Police Commissioner Outlaw, regarding the civil unrest at the statue as well as the news reports summarized in the application demonstrate that the continued display of the Christopher Columbus Statue at Marconi Plaza is a danger to public safety and presents a significant risk to the City of Philadelphia.
- The letter from Mayor James F. Kenney to Public Art Director Margot Berg, dated 15 June 2020, indicates that moving the statue is "in the best interest of the City."
- The letter from Kathryn Ott Lovell, Commissioner of Philadelphia Parks & Recreation, to the Art Commission, dated 13 July 2020, indicates that covering the statue did not quell the unrest.
- The nomination for the Christopher Columbus Statue adopted by the Historical Commission in 2017, at the time of designation, did not indicate that the statue and Marconi Plaza have a historic relationship with one another. The nomination indicates that the historic setting or environment for the statue was its former location in Fairmount Park, where the statue was first installed for the Centennial Exhibition of 1876.
- The proposed removal of the statue from Marconi Plaza and storage at a secure facility will have no impact on the historical, architectural, or aesthetic significance of the object; the object will retain any such significance that it currently possesses.
- The proposed removal and storage of the statue will not have an adverse effect on the object; the statue will be moved, but otherwise unchanged.
- The plan for the removal and storage of the statue will be undertaken in a manner that guarantees that the statue will be safe and secure during the move and storage, provided it is moved under the auspices of a conservator and by a firm experienced in the moving of important works of art.
- Visually recording the statue with a three-dimensional, digital, laser scan before it is moved to the storage facility will establish a baseline and ensure that the statue's condition can be evaluated against that baseline for future reporting.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- There are no feasible or reasonable alternatives for maintaining the Christopher Columbus Statue at Marconi Plaza that will protect and preserve both public safety and the statue.
- The public interest in public health, safety, and welfare at Marconi Plaza and the public interest in preserving the statue itself outweigh the public interest in retaining the statue at Marconi Plaza.
- The issuance of the building permit for the removal of the statue is necessary in the public interest and would align with the purposes of the historic preservation ordinance, Section 14-1000 of the Philadelphia Code, in that it would protect and preserve public safety and the statue.
- The removal and storage of the statue will satisfy the Historical Commission's building permit application review criteria at Section 14-1005(6)(e) of the Philadelphia Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. Satisfying Preservation Standard 5, the "distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize" the statue

“will be preserved.” Satisfying the Building Site Guidelines, the nomination the Historical Commission adopted in 2017 when it designated the Christopher Columbus Statue did not indicate that the statue and Marconi Plaza have a historic relationship with one another and therefore moving the statue to another location will not disrupt any historic relationships between the statue and its surroundings.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to approve the application as necessary in the public interest, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, provided the following four conditions are met:

1. The statue is stored at an undisclosed, secure location within the City of Philadelphia;
2. The statue is moved to the storage facility under the auspices of a conservator and by a firm experienced in the moving of important works of art;
3. The City reports to the Historical Commission annually on the statue’s condition and situation; and,
4. The statue is visually recorded with a three-dimensional, digital, laser scan before it is moved to the storage facility.

Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 2. Messrs. Mattioni and Lippert dissented.

ITEM: Christopher Columbus Statue MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Turner SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman					X
Long	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)		X			
Mattioni		X			
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10	2			1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:46:40

ACTION: At 2:49 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adjournment					
MOTION: Adjourn					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman					X
Long (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.