

**THE MINUTES OF THE 416th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
9 April 1997**

**City Council Caucus Room, 401 City Hall
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Arlene Matzkin
Shelly Merhige, Office of the City Council President
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Maria Walker
Dennis Ward
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community
Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie Wolf, Ph.D.

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historical Research Technician
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Specialist
Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also, with affiliation and/or project

Evelyn Federico, 1719 Rittenhouse Square Street
Ruth Peters, Friends of Rittenhouse Square
Tina Makouljian, Ballard, Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll
Joanne Phillips, Ballard, Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll
Paul Kleim, AT&T Wireless
Evan Rosenberg, AT&T Wireless
James Harter, Sr., AIA Basco Associates
Gregory Myers, Buchart-Horn Engineers
Stephan White
Siraik Zakarian, 2201 Green Street
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association
Joe Bento, Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation
David Gilfillan, DPG Old House Restoration
James Raynock

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 416th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:05 A.M.

MINUTES of the 415th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Brownlee and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the 415th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 12 March 1997, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

MINUTES of the Continuation of the 415th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Ms. Walker noted that her name on page nine should say "Ms." Upon a motion made by Mr. Ward and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the Continuation of the 415th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 19 March 1997, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, as corrected.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE REPORT, 25 March 1996,
Arlene Matzkin, Chair

Ms. Matzkin read the Committee's recommendations before discussion of each proposal.

126 Richmond Street

Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation, Owner

Joseph Bento, Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: New windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of wood two-over-two windows.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for wood, true muntin, two-over-two windows. Mr. Tyler noted that the proposal conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards*.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which passed by a unanimous vote.

1919 Green Street

Hugh O'Callaghan, Owner

Warren Kerschbaum, Applicant

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Legalize re-stucco of former party wall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin stated that, without a permit, the owner re-stuccoed the former party wall. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* allow for patching stucco as long as the new stucco matches the old in strength, color, and texture.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried by a unanimous vote.

322-330 Race Street, Old First Reformed Church

Michael Hauptman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1836-37

PROPOSAL: Asphalt parking area

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the Commission previously approved the proposal for the parking area, but the present proposal involves different paving material. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* allow for new unobtrusive parking areas that respect the historic relationship between buildings and landscape.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1223 Pine Street

Ian Canham, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Legalize door infill, roof deck, dormer

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of dormer and deck, with staff to approve a code compliant railing; table decision of door infill.

Ms. Matzkin explained the history of the property. A previous owner installed brick infill in one of the two corner doors. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation to that owner. The owner then sold the property to the Canhams who did not know the property had an outstanding violation. Also without a permit, the Canhams installed a dormer with a door and a roof deck on the rear ell. The proposal calls for legalizing all of the work.

Mr. Wilds and Mr. Sklaroff questioned the Committee's decision for the door infill. Ms. Matzkin stated that the Committee believed that the door constituted an important feature of the house, yet some of the members did not want the present owners burdened with the cost of restoring it. The Commission members, after some discussion, decided that they should vote on the work itself and not discuss finances or responsibility for costs.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the deck and dormer with staff to approve railing details and to disapprove the door infill. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2201-2205 Green Street, Bergdoll Mansion

Siraik Zakarian, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: New gate, parking area

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of twelve-foot or eighteen-foot opening in the wall with only a simple return, wrought-iron picket gates with decorative arrows, with staff to approve gate details.

Ms. Matzkin described the project. The owner and the Committee preferred a twelve-foot opening in the wall on the side of the property for access to a parking area at the rear of the building. The Streets Department required an eighteen-foot opening. However, since the Committee meeting, the Streets Department has approved the twelve-foot opening. The opening will have simple returns and a wrought-iron picket gate with arrow points.

Mr. Sklaroff questioned the approval of cutting into an historic wall. Ms. Matzkin noted the badly deteriorated condition of the wall and the owner must rebuild it regardless of the installation of the gate. She also noted that the Commission had approved a similar proposal for a property in Germantown. Mr. Sklaroff then questioned the gate, asking if it would give a false historical impression. Mr. Baron and Ms. Matzkin stated that the gate will have some of the same elements as the historic wrought-iron gate at the front of the building, but will have a simpler design and will not look exactly like the original.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee, but for a twelve-foot opening only. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

1024 Race Street

Kuo Cheung Lee and Lai Lee, Owners

Albert Tantala, Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Cut new storefront in residential facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the proposal includes cutting out the residential facade on the first floor and installing large commercial windows for a storefront. Without a permit, and not part of this proposal, the owners have painted the building which was never painted, installed an awning, and rerouted the downspout.

Mr. Wilds questioned the necessity of keeping the residential facade since most of Chinatown has turned commercial.

Mr. Baron explained that the building provides an excellent example of the Greek Revival style. The marble watertable, bull's eye blocks at the end of the window lintels, Flemish bond brick and detailed cornice are intact elements of the Greek Revival. Mr. Brownlee concurred, adding that the four bays of the house add to its uniqueness. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has consistently denied proposals for introducing storefronts into residential facades, including a flower shop in Society Hill. Mr. Tyler noted that Standard Two provides for the retention and preservation of the historic character of a property and the avoidance of the removal of historic materials or alteration of features.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which passed with twelve votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

301-313 North Broad Street AKA 1345 Vine Street, Roman Catholic High School

Mark Ueland, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1886

PROPOSAL: Addition and new fence on Vine Street

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin briefly described the addition to the high school. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* allow for additions as long as the addition does not destroy any historic materials and is compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the historic property. Also, Standard Ten states that, if the new addition is removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property must remain intact.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which passed with unanimous vote.

2051 Walnut Street AKA 119-151 South 21st Street

Vladimir Tamarkin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855; c. 1950 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Exhaust fan

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the proposal approved by the Commission several months ago proved infeasible because the contractor could not drill through the landing of the stairs to run the ductwork on the interior. The proposal now calls for three feet of ductwork on the exterior of the building on the

Moravian Street facade, topped by a mushroom fan at ten feet above grade. The work will be visible from 21st Street.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

337 South Camac Street

Richard Schiro, Owner

Robert Kurtz, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865; c. 1920 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of cornice brackets; cover cornice and bays in aluminum

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Tyler stated that the owner has requested that the Commission table its discussion and vote for this proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

6331 Malvern Avenue, Overbrook School for the Blind

Daniel Jalboot, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1896

PROPOSAL: Remove non-historic stairtower; erect elevator tower, ADA ramp

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the project which includes removing a non-historic stairtower, erecting an elevator tower and installing a handicap access ramp on the rear of this very large complex.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Walker seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

1801-1835 North Broad Street, College Hall

Temple University, Owner

David Murray, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1893

PROPOSAL: Roof, cornice work

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the discussion and vote.

Ms. Matzkin explained the parts of the proposal which include: moving the slope of the roof further back, removing a visible air vent, and replacing the deteriorated metal cornice with a fiberglass one that will exactly replicate the original

cornice details. Staff will review the details for approval.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which passed with twelve votes.

1919 Wallace Street

Matthew Compton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: New windows, door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of two-over-two vinyl windows if the muntin has the correct profile and depth; if not, approval of wood, two-over-two, true-muntin sash; approval of wood, two-pane hopper or awning windows in basement; approval of double-leaf door or a single-leaf door that has the appearance of a double-leaf door with staff to approve all details. The applicant must submit a better drawing for an actual door sample for the staff to review.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal. Mr. Compton, owner of the property, purchased the building in November and installed six-over-six vinyl windows to seal it. He proposes to have the vinyl windows altered to two-over-two. Both the Committee and staff doubt that the vinyl windows will allow for the correct depth required for the muntins. If Mr. Compton cannot accomplish the correct size and depth of the muntins, he proposes to install wood, true-muntin sash. The proposal includes new two-pane awning or hopper windows in the basement. Mr. Compton also proposes to replace the non-historic salvaged door with either a double-leaf door or a single-leaf door that has the appearance of a double-leaf.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

15 South 7th Street, Atwater Kent Museum, Old Franklin Institute

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Joseph James Ahern, Applicant

DATE: 1825

PROPOSAL: Tent pavilion in rear

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Wolf recused herself from the discussion and vote.

The Atwater Kent Museum proposes to install a tent on the extant concrete-paved area at the rear of the museum. The museum will erect the tent in warm months and remove it during the winter.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Walker seconded the motion which passed with twelve votes.

1034 Spruce Street

Camille Partnership, Owner

Danilo Vicencio, Applicant

DATE: 1845; 1920 - facade alterations

PROPOSAL: Exhaust vent

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the louvered vent for the Cypress Street facade. The ductwork and fan will remain on the interior.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Spilove passed the gavel to Ms. Wolf, Vice-Chair.

Rittenhouse Square

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Ruth Peters/Friends of Rittenhouse Square, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Fencing for planting beds

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the fence for the planting beds in Rittenhouse Square. The fence, 24 to 30 inches in height, has a double hairpin design. The drawing by the contractor, Mr. Devito, the photographs of a fence in a square in London, and the sample fence previewed by Mr. Baron all differed slightly. Mr. Brownlee noted that the vernacular Philadelphia fence of the 19th century had a single hairpin design. Ms. Wolf replied that the early 20th century Beaux Arts design of the square may have shunned the vernacular of Philadelphia and copied the design found in a London park.

Ms. Walker made a motion to approve the fence of a double hairpin design as in the drawing by Mr. Devito. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which passed with twelve votes.

Ms. Wolf returned the chair to Mr. Spilove.

321 Chestnut Street

The Liberty Museum, Owner

Sandra Kelly, Applicant

DATE: c. 1890; 1905 - addition

PROPOSAL: Step replacement, signage, remove window grates

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the curved, cascading steps; approval of the sign; approval of removing the window grates with staff to approve details.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the Liberty Museum has taken over the building from the Maritime Museum. The Liberty Museum proposes to replace the missing granite cascading steps, install a glass sign with white letters above the front door and remove non-historic window grates.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Spilove again passed the gavel to Ms. Wolf.

1839-1841 Spruce Street AKA 269-275 South 19th Street

Rittenhouse Place Condo Association, Owner

Dan McInerney/AT&T Wireless of Philadelphia, Applicant

DATE: c. 1925

PROPOSAL: Antenna tower

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the support skeleton and antennas with several conditions: none of the equipment projects higher than five (5) feet above the parapet of the maintenance shed; AT&T paints out all equipment to match the shed; AT&T removes all equipment when it becomes obsolete.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for a support skeleton and eight antennas on the roof of the maintenance shed of this corner high-rise condominium building. Ms. Matzkin emphasized the Committee's two main concerns: that the height of the antenna structure be regulated to limit the visibility of the equipment and that other companies may want to be on the same building because they tend to co-locate.

Joanne Phillips, attorney for AT&T Wireless, explained that the triangular-shaped structure will support eight antennas, but can accommodate up to fourteen. The proposal includes a small equipment box on the main roof with cables running up the side of the maintenance shed to the antennas. AT&T will paint out all of the equipment to match the color of the maintenance shed and will remove all equipment when the technology becomes obsolete. Mr. James asked if the antennas could be located on the main roof and if not, could a new screen hide the antennas and make them appear

as part of the maintenance shed. Evan Rosenberg, an engineer for AT&T Wireless, stated that the presence of the maintenance shed would interfere with transmissions of antennas on the main roof.

Also, AT&T understands that the owners of the top floor condominium have some roof rights as well, complicating the lease agreement with the building's owner. Mr. Rosenberg stated that a screen that adequately hides the antennas, yet does not interfere with transmissions, is not available.

Mr. Brownlee stated that he did not understand some of the technical requirements for these antennas. Mr. Zecca, counsel for the Commission, stated that all technical requirements should be in writing. Ms. Kaplan and Mr. James noted that at the last Commission meeting, a Commission member suggested having an ad-hoc committee to investigate the technology, establish procedure, and educate the other Commission members.

Ms. Kaplan made a motion to create an Ad Hoc Committee to review the laws and technology of the telecommunication systems. Committee members will include a representative from the Architectural Committee, Law Department, Department of Public Property, Department of Commerce and Department of Licenses and Inspections. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which passed with eleven votes.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that any procedures set by the Historical Commission must be followed by all applicants and the Commission cannot single-out the telecommunication companies for a separate procedure. Ms. Phillips stated that the Secretary of the Interior does not have guidelines for this technology yet.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the committee but required the applicant to continue to work with staff to find ways to limit the visual impact of the equipment on this building. Mr. James seconded the motion, adding that this vote is for this particular proposal and does not set a precedent. The motion with both conditions passed with eleven votes.

Ms. Wolf returned the chair to Mr. Spilove.

1901 Spruce Street AKA 264-276 South 19th Street

Rite Aid Corporation, Owner

Richard Janezic, Applicant

DATE: c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for a wood, shield-shaped sign for the corner of the building.

*Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation.
Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.*

1719 Rittenhouse Square Street

Franco Bonsignore, Owner

Evelyn Federico, Applicant

DATE: 1921

PROPOSAL: Storm windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of exterior storm windows, but approval of interior storm windows.

Ms. Matzkin described the storm windows proposed for the property. The Committee believed that the windows obscured too much of the original sash and caused the windows to read as one sheet of glass.

Mr. Wilds noted that in the discussions of the district designation, the Commission promised property owners that it would approve exterior storm windows. Mr. Brownlee agreed, but added that the Commission did not mean that it would approve any storm window; the windows must conform to the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards*. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* do allow for storm windows; however, the storm windows must match the original window in shape, color, and at the meeting rails. Ms. Federico, with her contractor, showed the Commission a sample window from Allied Window Incorporated.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the storm windows presented to the Commission with staff to approve details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Spilove turned the chair over to Ms. Wolf.

324-328 South 19th Street AKA 1901-1905 Panama Street

Rittenhouse Management Corporation, Owner

Palmer Masonry Restoration, Applicant

DATE: c. 1925

PROPOSAL: Rebuild brick corners, repair balconies

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff and perhaps a Committee member to approve a brick match and pointing sample.

Ms. Matzkin described the failure of the brick at the corners of the building and in some horizontal areas. In some places the metal shelf angles and flashing need replacing along with the brick. Mr. Baron noted that the Committee wishes that the new brick match the present, weathered color rather than the original white color.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's proposal with staff to approve the work. Ms. Walker seconded the proposal which passed with twelve votes.

Again, Ms. Wolf returned the chair to Mr. Spilove.

2108 Walnut Street

GiaVanni Scott, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1868; c. 1920 - storefront installed

PROPOSAL: Re-cover awning

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of new awning cover of matte fabric; approval of removing the awning completely; approval of removing the light bar.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the Committee voted to recommend approval of a new covering for the awning. However, upon a representation by the Center City Residents Association Zoning Committee Chair stating that the Zoning Board of Adjustment had issued a use variance for the property subject to several restrictions, including the removal of the awning and light bar, the Committee voted to recommend approval of the removal of the awning and light bar. Ms. Wolf noted that since the Zoning Board will not allow the awning at all, the Commission really should not vote on the proposal.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to disapprove recovering the awning, since the Zoning Board has not allowed any awning. Mr. James seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

1924 Rittenhouse Square Street

Basile Al-Ramadi, Owner

Daniel Foley, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; c. 1925 - resurfaced

PROPOSAL: Paint masonry

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the colors proposed for the building which has been painted in the past: cream base, burnt orange accents and black window trim.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

1907 Spruce Street AKA 1906 Manning Street

George Sfedu, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Partial rear demolition; new rear deck and door;

lighting fixture; brownstone repair on front facade; storm windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the removal of the shed and installation of the deck with three door options: doors and sidelights within the same arch, arched doors with wood side panels, or squared doors and sidelights, with staff to approve door and baluster details; approval of a single-arm Victorian style light fixture with staff to approve detail; approval of brownstone repair with integrated color with staff to approve patch. The Committee recommended that Mr. Sfedu use interior storm windows.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for the property, including the removal of the third-floor shed, a new deck, a light fixture on the front, brownstone repair, and exterior storm windows.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the removal of the third-floor shed, the installation of doors and a deck; the installation of a light fixture; brownstone repair; and exterior storm windows with staff to approve details of the work. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote.

ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT

1300-1324 Market Street, Wanamaker Building

May Company, Owner

Mark Coughlin, Applicant

DATE: 1902-1910

PROPOSAL: Plaque signs on pilasters, film in one window on Juniper Street

Mr. Tyler described the proposal. Instead of the script signs previously approved by the Commission, the owner wishes to have plaque signs that say "Lord and Taylor" on the sixteen pilasters of the building. Also, the owners wish to have the second bay window on Juniper Street darkened with film. The first bay closest to Chestnut Street will remain open and the third bay already has film.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the proposal for plaque signs and film in one window on Juniper Street. Mr. Ward seconded the proposal which carried by unanimous vote.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, March 1997, Richard Tyler.

Mr. Zecca noted that the Law Department has settled the

appeal of the School District of Philadelphia concerning Masterman School. The School District will submit a proposal to the Financial Hardship Committee of the Historical Commission. If a compromise cannot be reached with the Committee and Commission, the School District will renew its appeal to the Board of License and Inspection Review.

RULES AND REGULATIONS: Adoption of the document *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.

Mr. Tyler briefly described the differences between the *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings* and the *Standards for Rehabilitation* now used by the Commission. He explained that the consolidated *Standards* contain standards and guidelines for four treatments, i.e., preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction, and distinguishes them. He emphasized that, with a few exceptions, the proposals reviewed by the Commission are rehabilitation projects. Mr. Tyler reviewed in greater detail the differences between the old and new texts of the *Standards for Rehabilitation*. He then recommended the adoption of the *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings* for inclusion in the Commission's Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that he had not had enough time to review the new document and believed that the Commission should meet separately to discuss the new standards and guidelines. Judith Eden of the Center City Residents Association noted that the change of document is for the new Rules and Regulations and expressed dismay that further review of the Standards will hold up the Rules and Regulations at the Law Department even longer.

Some other Commission members agreed that a separate meeting should take place to discuss the new Standards. Mr. Spilove stated that he and the staff will set a date and time for another meeting and will contact Commission members.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura M. Spina