



Town of Sudbury

Historical Commission

historical@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314
www.sudbury.ma.us/historicalcommission

MINUTES

AUGUST 4, 2020

VIRTUAL MEETING

Present: Chair Chris Hagger, Vice-Chair Diana Warren, Diana Cebra, Taryn Trexler, Steve Greene, Marjorie Katz, Fred Bautze.

Absent: Jan Costa

Others Present: Beth Perry, Planning and Community Development Administrator, Adam Duchesneau, Director Planning and Community Development

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting at 7:00 PM

16 Haynes Road – Bowker Store

The Commissioners reviewed the letter drafted to George R. Sharkey II, and sent by member Steve Greene as dated on March 5, 2019. The letter invited Mr. Sharkey or members of his family to speak about the Bowker Store.

Mr. Hagger mentioned that a DPW administrative employee, Allison Boland, is also related to the Sharkey family. He asked if Mr. Greene had reached out to Ms. Boland. Mr. Greene responded that he would try to contact Ms. Bowland.

Mr. Hagger suggested putting such correspondence on the Sudbury Historical Commission letterhead.

Ms. Cebra noted that it was beneficial to reach out to descendants who might provide additional information regarding the store. She cautioned that the connection cannot be perceived as encouraging on the owner. She felt that moving the building was not be likely.

Ms. Trexler indicated that she felt that reaching out was exactly what the Commission should be doing and regarding the contacts as a great first step.

Ms. Katz stated the correspondence was a great idea and suggested a minor change to the letter to George Sharkey to include language: “if your family would be interested” in the third paragraph. She suggested using language which did not imply immediacy.

Mr. Bautze echoed the statement made by Ms. Katz.

Ms. Warren was not present due to the storm.

Mr. Greene said he would rework the letter and bring it back to the next Commission meeting.

Route 20/Landham Road Intersection Historical Monument Placement

Mr. Hagger stated that he and Diana Cebra toured the monument with the contractor. He confirmed that he did not like the location which was staked out by the contractor because it was somewhat hidden by a type of transformer box. The contractor stated that he could move the monument closer to Landham Road on the southeast corner of the intersection, which would make it more visible for those coming north from Landham Road, and somewhat more visible for those traveling along Route 20, westbound. He noted that another possibility would be to place the monument in the southwest corner, which would ultimately contain additional structures and impair its vision some for those coming from the east on Route 20.

Ms. Cebra confirmed that she and Mr. Hagger were at the site for some time and indicated that the initial site mentioned was the preferred site for the monument and was at a stoplight so people can appreciate the monument (the southeast corner of the intersection).

Mr. Hagger suggested that the contractor install three feet of gravel around the perimeter of the monument to prevent damage from mowing operations. Ms. Cebra agreed.

Ms. Warren confirmed that the monument would not be positioned next to the tall electrical box. Mr. Hagger noted that the contractor would be moving the monument away from the box. Ms. Warren like the area of the crushed stone installation and suggested that granite pavers might be preferable.

Mr. Hagger mentioned that the contractor was only obligated to install the monument the way it was, but he would ask if the granite pavers might be considered. Ms. Warren suggested, that if given permission, the Commission might consider installing the pavers themselves, in consideration of a more permanent buffer. Mr. Hagger commented that there might not be enough time to consider the pavers.

Mr. Hagger motioned that the monument would be reset in the southeast corner of the intersection, closer to the Landham Road curb and near the end of the sidewalk, with the suggestion of a two-foot radius of crushed stone at the base. Ms. Cebra seconded the motion. Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Trexler-aye, Katz-aye, Warren-aye

It was on motion unanimously (6-0).

VOTED: That the monument would be reset in the southeast corner of the intersection, closer to the Landham Road curb and near the end of the sidewalk, with the suggestion of a two-foot radius of crushed stone at the base.

Current Fiscal year Commission Budget – use of Remaining Funds/General fund Purchases/iPad Purchase

Mr. Hagger stated that the Commission was able to purchase the iPad which was accounted for in last year's budget. He noted that currently the Commission was on a month-to-month budget. .

Hosmer House – Technology Purchases/Garden/Book Collection/Maintenance/Programs

Ms. Cebra asked Mr. Greene if he would like to review the books and take inventory of them at the Hosmer House once entry to the House was allowed.

Mr. Hagger asked the other members if they would consider other Commissioners such as the Historic District members coming into the Hosmer House.

Ms. Warren stressed that the Town has dictated that all Town-owned buildings remain closed with the exception of Town employees working on a staggered basis. She suggested that the Commission ask the Town Manager if the Hosmer House could be accessed by Commissioners.

Ms. Cebra noted that last Friday the Historic Society did move into the Parsonage with three members at the Parsonage coordinating the move, which was granted through the Town Manager. Mr. Hagger acknowledged that he would ask the Town Manager if entry to the Hosmer House was possible.

79 Nobscot Road under the Demolition Delay Bylaw

Present: Jaye Hefner, Owner of 79 Nobscot Road; Jonathan Detwiler, Contractor; Hilary Crowley, Realtor

Mr. Hagger outlined that the Demolition Delay Bylaw had been enacted by the Town in 2004 to be used as a tool to assist in the preservation of historically significant buildings in Town. Mr. Hagger highlighted the options associated with the Demolition Delay Bylaw which included incorporation of the building into future development of the site, adaptive re-use of the building, securing a new owner willing to preserve, restore/rehab, or moving (or part thereof) of the structure.

Mr. Hagger noted that the process is now in the discussion stage which are collaborative, informal discussions between the commission and the owner. He stressed that the Commission is willing to meeting with the owner and owner's representatives at each meeting going forward in order to reach an alternative agreement to demolition. He explained that the Commission has the ability to shorten the delay if the majority of the Commission and the owner can agree on an alternative solution to full demolition. Mr. Hagger reiterated that this is an informal discussion are not public hearings.

Ms. Hefner detailed that she retained the services of historical property contractor Bud Hayward in 2009 who determined that the building was not a candidate for rehabilitation and recommended demolition of the structure. He suggested building another structure that would be in keeping with the other homes in the area. Ms. Hefner stated that she was not financially able to move forward with the demolition and rebuild at the time (2009-2010). She noted that historical preservation contractor, Jonathan Detwiler had re-accessed the property and came to the same conclusion.

Ms. Hefner commented that if rehab was attempted, the structure would probably collapse. She stated that she put the property on sale because the cost of rehab or moving the property, would be excessive and several contractors agreed that rehab would not be the best alternative. She confirmed that she did have offers on the property and such offer/s were contingent on the ability for demolition and rebuilding of another structure. Ms. Hefner inquired about possible grants being made available.

Mr. Hagger asked if any potential buyer/s expressed interest in restoring the building, or have offers come solely from developers. Ms. Crowley, the owner's realtor stated that there have been multiple offers on the property and originally marketed it to people for rehabilitation and those potential buyers concluded that the expense associated with rehab would be prohibitive. She stressed that as a realtor she must disclose everything she knows about the property and she does refer those interested buyers to Mr. Detweiler's video. Once prospective buyers review the video, they are no longer interested in the property. She noted that Dr. Hefner recently approved of a dramatic price drop and we are almost down to land value solely.

Mr. Hagger stated if down to close to land value whoever is going to buy it if they are going to build a new house it is going to be an expensive proposition and it would interesting to find someone to appreciate the house and spend a similar amount of money instead of building something new to restore what is there and modify it. Dr. Hefner said that it would not be feasible to restore all the features of the house and elements would have to be taken away. Mr. Hagger asked what elements would have to be taken away. Ms. Hefner suggested that Mr. Detweiler could address this aspect, noting that such restoration would involve the elimination of many of the historic features.

Mr. Detwiler agreed that this building reflects many different periods of construction and the rehab would be far more extensive than sill repair. He emphasized his preservation background and is disheartened that the homeowner is being asked to do something that is not economically feasible.

Mr. Hagger commented that the expense of demolition and construction of a new home could likely cost more than the rehab of the property. He emphasized that the site has great land which is set off from the road. The realtor commented that the property has been on the market for many months with many price reductions and queried how Dr. Hefner could continue to pay taxes on the property that cannot find a buyer willing to rehab. Mr. Hagger mentioned 24 Church Street whose exterior appears in far worse condition than 79 Nobscot Road and appears to have been purchased by someone willing to restore it. He noted that there are real estate agencies that specialize in selling historic properties and ones that need to be restored. He suggested that the applicant talk with one of these firms and working in conjunction with her current real estate firm to identify potential buyers for this type of project.

Dr. Hefner stated she was “underwater regarding the site” and wants to divest her interest in the property as soon as possible and indicated that she has done everything that she can.

Mr. Bautze asked if the petitioners are seeking an alteration to the six-month demolition delay aspect. Mr. Hagger responded that there has been no such request.

Dr. Hefner asked about the related price of the property on Church Street, as well as the renovation costs. She noted that the seller’s agent when she purchased the property in 2005, did specialize in antique homes and did not disclose that the Town had just adopted the demolition bylaw and assured her there would not be any restrictions on the house. Dr. Hefner stated that the Town does not disclose the facts about the bylaw and was not aware that the demolition bylaw could be changed to reflect a shorter time frame and is preferable to initiating a court case.

Mr. Detwiler stated that the issue is more than neglect of previous property stewards and reiterated that the work done with the multiple additions, were not completed in an appropriate manner, which reflected a non-unified construction plan. He stressed that moving the property would likely not be possible and the existing frame is being pulled apart.

Ms. Warren provided comment in several areas:

- The 79 Nobscot Road is one of the oldest properties in Sudbury, and is the type of property for which the Demolition Delay Bylaw was enacted. The six-month demolition delay bylaw is rather minimal time period of six months when compared to other demolition delay bylaws in neighboring towns; Concord, Framingham, Lincoln, Weston, Acton, Hopkinton (12 to 18 month-demolition delay bylaws).

- The timing that the application was brought forward was the owner's decision and could have been submitted earlier.
- Not the responsibility of the Historical Commission to inform potential buyers purchasing historic homes that they are subject to the Demolition Bylaw. She maintained such considerations are part of a buyer's due diligence when purchasing a historic home.
- Suggested that within the next six month period, the property be advertised/marketed to buyers who are interested in antique homes.

- Noted that the Loring Parsonage could not have been picked up and moved without collapsing and it had serious structural issues and it had also represented a structure that represented an evolution with additions.
- There are not building issues that cannot be rehabilitated and restored.
- Maintained that there are more than a few elements that make this property historically significant.

Mr. Detwiler asked what the historic elements were. Ms. Warren referred to the demolition report which was issued by the Commission. Mr. Hagger responded that the history of the structure and its former occupants that contributed to making it historically significant which was discussed at prior meetings. Mr. Detwiler stated that he supported demolition bylaws but also appreciated that financial aspects in relation to the condition of the property.

Ms. Crowley commented that she has heard nothing about the Town seeking to buy the property or the offering of related grant funding.

Mr. Hagger asserted that the Commission is seeking to work out an alternate plan with the existing owner or a new owner. He mentioned a recent historical building acquisition, where the owner is saving part of the original historic building; and planning adaptive re-use of part of the building. He noted that if such an alternative was brought forward, the six-month bylaw delay could likely be shortened, and the Commission would be supportive of any zoning changes that might be required.

Mr. Greene opined regarding reducing the structure to mimic what it was in an earlier period and working with the Town to allow the developer to build a residential home next to the preserved structure (which could possibly be rented). Mr. Hagger asked Dr. Hefner if she was open to such an idea.

Dr. Hefner was opened to the idea, but noted it would depend on the economics of the suggestion. She stated that she was unwilling to put any additional time and effort into more processes with the Town, especially in consideration of the pandemic and her job. Mr. Hagger responded that it would be the responsibility of the new owner and Dr. Hefner would obtain the same dollar amount on the land. Mr. Detwiler mentioned that the realtors had sufficient experience with the property to determine the probability of such an alternative idea and felt it would not be realistic.

Ms. Warren suggested the owner reach out to channels that advertise to buyers interested in historic properties. Mr. Detwiler asked if specialized real estate firms came back with the same results, would that be a way to shorten the demolition delay bylaw. Ms. Warren stated that the only fair measure of that would be to have the property tested on the market for a period of time with such specialty real estate companies. Mr. Detwiler asked for the names of those specialty real estate companies. Mr. Hagger mentioned John Petraglia as one of those firms. Mr. Detwiler said he was familiar with that firm. Mr.

Detwiler asked if the Commission would listen to the opinion of Mr. Petraglia. Mr. Hagger responded the Commission is open to any suggestions. Mr Detwiler stated that he appreciated the openness of the discussion.

Ms. Cebra indicated looking at old homes for sale there was a market for such historic properties and have it listed for a while. She emphasized that it was about the history of the building, not just the feature and trying to keep the house due to its history. Once it is demolish it is gone. And important to try all efforts in those six months. She recognized that a six-month demolition delay is a modest period of time.

Dr. Hefner stated that she was being paged and had to leave the meeting. She indicated that the comments made by the Commission were somewhat insulting as she has a good team currently, and indicated that the Commission has not listened to anything she or her team has mentioned.

Ms. Trexler asked Mr. Detwiler if at end of six month demo do you have any contractors in mine to demo that would preserve some of the historic resources so could be re-used. Mr. Detwiler responded affirmatively and stating with a little conflict of interest he has mined houses that are being torn down – windows, old glass, flooring but not my intention in this situation and that there were pieces of this house that are worth extracting. But that they are not a ton in this house to salvage.

Ms. Warren asked Mr. Detwiler to describe those elements that are worth salvaging. Mr. Detwiler suggested repurposing the door into the kitchen, floor boards on the first and second floor, the glass in the windows, a Federal mantel, a panel wall on the southeast parlor. Mr. Detwiler stated that re-use is very selective and there is not a ton on the property worth salvaging. Ms. Warren summarized the listing – and that there are no beams to mine.

Ms. Crowley mentioned that her firm is one of the few real estate companies in Town that listed this property under the MACRIS website and have provided extensive historical background of the property. She recommended that the Commissioners review the MLS listing as well.

Mr. Hagger confirmed that Mr. Detwiler would relay the discussion to Dr. Hefner. Mr. Detwiler confirmed that he would. Mr. Hagger repeated that if there is a potential buyer for the land, he would encourage that such buyer feel free to contact the Commission to work with them to ensure a smoother process in consideration of some form of preservation. Ms. Crowley thanked Mr. Hagger and noted that was helpful information, noting that she would contact Mr. Hagger directly if such case arises. Mr. Hagger stated that the Commission would speak very favorably about the house. Ms. Crowley replied that it was appreciated.

Mr. Hagger mentioned condition #8 under the Demolition Delay Bylaw, and stated it was effective after the six-month pause and the owner is responsible for property securing the building/structure to the satisfaction of the Building Inspector. Ms. Crowley confirmed that Dr. Hefner has been in direct contact with the Town Building Inspector and asked to get everything he requires in writing.

Mr. Hagger noted that the Commission would be able to include any conversation with the 79 Nobscot Road team at future meetings.

Eversource – Transmission Line Project

Ms. Warren provided the Commission with an Eversource update and stated that the July letters to the Mass Historical Commission and to Eversource were mailed, but no response has been received on the

July letters or the June 17, 2020 letter to Eversource. She stated that the Conservation Commission continues to hold hearings regarding the project. She recommended that Commissioners attend such hearings virtually in order to understand what is happening with the project's permitting.

Ms. Warren mentioned that Protect Sudbury had sent a letter to the Sudbury Conservation Commission.

Ms. Warren commented that DCR (Department of Conservation and Recreation) has laid out specific procedures for rail trails in MA and specifically the MA Central Rail Trail - Wayside Branch that mandates DCR is to engage the community in the design concept and that DCR's charge is to not only appreciate environmental concerns but also the cultural resources and to protect and enhance the cultural resources. She stated that with regard to the railroad complex in Sudbury DCR has not followed its own procedure.

Ms. Warren stated that the Commission will continue its review as additional information becomes available from Eversource. She stated that the Commission will ultimately make a recommendation to the MA Historical Commission who then makes recommendation to the US Army Corp. of Engineers. She noted that she drafted a letter to Barbara Newman, of the Army Corp. of Engineers that the US Army Corp. of Engineers requesting formal designation that the Sudbury Historical Commission is a "Consulting Party" and that the Commission is awaiting pertinent information from Eversource. Ms. Warren reviewed the draft letter, which acknowledges that the Eversource project constitutes an "adverse effect."

Mr. Hagger reinforced that the Commission has not received any comment from letters sent to them over the past several months. He reiterated the part of the letter to Ms. Newman which agrees with the Mass Historical Society determination that the Eversource project does create "adverse effect." Mr. Hagger indicated that the "adverse effect" language did not necessarily have to be included at this time.

Ms. Katz asked how the Commission could agree with the "adverse effect" finding when the Commission has not completed its review. Mr. Hagger said that aspect was his concern as well.

Mr. Bautze recommended not included the "adverse effect" language in the draft letter.

Ms. Trexler stated that retaining the "adverse effect" language was acceptable, and perhaps include a disclaimer to indicate that an "adverse effect" finding be made with additional forthcoming information. Ms. Katz noted that the Army Corps of Engineers does not have to grant permission that the Commission become the "Consulting Party." Ms. Trexler indicated that she thought the Commission was already an official "Consulting Party," due to the Historical Commission designation.

Mr. Hagger repeated the letter editing discussion because Ms. Warren lost power during that discussion.

Ms. Warren said this particular wording was listed directly from the Mass Historical Commission's Dec 2019 letter's language. Ms. Warren confirmed that the Historical Commission is granted the "Consulting Party" title.

Ms. Warren stated she was OK with deleting the reference to the "adverse effect" language.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the letter to be sent to Ms. Barbara Newman of the Army Corps. of Engineers, as edited by the Commission members. Ms. Cebra seconded the motion, Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Trexler-aye, Katz-aye, Bautze-aye. (Ms. Warren connection to the virtual meeting was interrupted due to electrical outage was not presented for the vote.)

VOTED: To approve the letter to be sent to Ms. Barbara Newman of the Army Corps. of Engineers, as edited by the Commission members.

Ms. Warren stated that she was back online once more and suggested a site visit sometime in the fall and stated that she was planning to obtain plan renderings from the Conservation Commission for the Commission can assess the project's impacts on the Section Tool House.

Resident Nicholas Pernice, 255 Peakham Road, noted a Historical Society letter in 2016 stated that the Eversource project would destroy the view, the environment, the historic essence and the Town would gain nothing from the Eversource intrusion. Mr. Hagger confirmed that such communication did not originate for the Sudbury Historical Commission and believed that the Historical Society might have written that letter. Mr. Pernice asked if the HC was becoming a party to the rail trail.

Ms. Warren commented that the Commission was not part of the rail trail per say and was asking the Army Corps of Engineers to acknowledge the Commission status as a "Consulting Party" so that the Commission can be a party to the provisions of a Memorandum of Agreement between the Army Corps and Eversource. She stated that the purpose of Commission role is to act as advocate to preserve historical resources in the Town along the trail corridor, especially the bridges, archaeological and other elements. Mr. Pernice mentioned the importance of the Indian archaeological places along the route. Ms. Warren stated that the Commission needs to determine what the native and archaeological resources are discovered so the Commission can protect them and that the Commission will make contact with the tribes – the Nipmuc Nation, the Wampanoags of Gay Head, the Wampanoags of Mashpee and the Narragansett Tribes. Mr. Pernice stated that historical aspect of town is incredibly important and he thanked the Commission for their efforts.

Resident Rebecca Cutting, 81 Maynard Road, stated that she had been following the project through MEPA (MA Environmental Policy Act) and supported the Commission. She grew up in Sudbury and joins others and Mr. Pernice in his concerns about historical resources. She commented during the MEPA process and the (EPA) Secretary remarked in the MEPA Certificate that Eversource and should pay better attention to historical resources so that was the first reference to her comments. Ms. Cutting commented on the survey that Commonwealth heritage Group had conducted and asked if the Commission has the survey?

Ms. Warren responded that Commonwealth Heritage had performed three surveys, with the third being an archeological survey and that the Commission has request a copy of that study and inquired if the study work was complete. Ms. Warren commented that CHG failed to finish their study to determine National Register eligibility of the railroad complex. She also commented that her recent assessment of the current project plan for the Section Tool House does not avoid an adverse effect. Ms. Cutting stressed that Eversource activity put the Historical Commission and the Conservation Commission in a difficult situation with having to make decisions without critical information. She went on to state that she agrees with Commissioner Warren that the initial assessment of the project is an adverse effect and there should be no doubt in the minds of the people of Sudbury that it will have an adverse effect if the project proceeds as currently designed. She stated it is important to inform MA Historical Commission that Eversource has not provided information.

Master Plan – Preservation/Cultural Resources

Ms. Trexler thanked the Commissioners for their comments/edits. She stated that she worked with Fred Taylor and Anu Shah of the Historic Districts Commissions and representatives for the MPSC asked that the Commissioners clarify how the demolition bylaw does or does not affect post-1940 homes and the Committee expressed that some of the preservation mechanisms in Sudbury are punitive for homeowners. Mr. Hagger asked if the Steering Committee members understand the Demolition Bylaw and Ms. Trexler replied many did not. She noted that she met with Mr. Taylor and Mr. Shah of the Historic Districts Commission to review that question and rework some language. Ms. Warren commented that while the Master Plan includes as an action item a Town Historic Preservation Plan she suggested it also recommend a Town Archaeological study as well.

Historic Building Survey Grant Update

Ms. Trexler noted there were no updates and she would ask the Ma Historical Commission if the Town was still eligible for the grant. Ms. Trexler asked who would be presenting the CPC Article at Town Meeting. Mr. Duchesneau noted that the Chair of the CPC usually presents the Article.

Ms. Warren added that the Chair of the Historical Commission should be prepared to provide related comment at Town Meeting. Mr. Duchesneau explained that many Article presentations will be recorded in advance and people can review the presentations this way.

Cemetery Restoration Update

Ms. Katz stated she counted the stones that had to be cleaned at the two Town Cemeteries and presented that information to Elaine Jones of the Selectmen's Office. Ms. Katz confirmed that there was no chance that the Commission would lose funding for the cemetery restoration. Ms. Katz detailed that Ms. Jones is working on the RPF for the cemetery restoration.

RR Section/Tool House

Mr. Hagger explained that the Town leases the tool house from the MBTA for a minimal yearly lease fee and the Historical Commission oversees the tool house. He acknowledged that there is historical memorabilia on the interior walls of the tool house and the roof needs to be steam-cleaned again.

Mr. Greene volunteered to monitor the tool house and report back to the Commission.

Ms. Warren suggested that the Commission get an updated copy of the tool house lease with the MBTA.

Sudbury Historical Society Request

Mr. Hagger noted that the Sudbury Historical Society requested the rights to a digital file of Florence Hosmer's self-portrait. Ms. Cebra commented that she forwarded the request to Rebecca Weeks, the Vice-President of the Sudbury Historic Society, who is also an attorney, as well as to the Executive Director of the Historic Society.

Ms. Katz recommended that Town Counsel review this request. Mr. Hagger agreed. Ms. Warren suggested that the Commissioners should view this request as a policy issue, and suggested granting use of the painting.

Mr. Hagger suggested that Ms. Cebra and Ms. Katz meet to further explore and address this request. Ms. Katz and Ms. Cebra agreed to meet.

Sudbury Foundation Meetings

Ms. Cebra spoke about the “Doing Good Sudbury” group of 30 to 40 people which connects with the Sudbury Foundation. She stressed that the group supports many Sudbury programs.

Ms. Katz and Mr. Hagger offered their participation with the “Doing Good Sudbury.”

Ms. Cebra inquired about making Hosmer House brochures available outside of the House during COVID-19 emergency. She noted that many people do asked about the Hosmer House. Mr. Hagger suggested that this item be included on the agenda of the next Commission meeting.

Tribal Agreement

Ms. Warren has been considering the protection of Tribal and archaeological resources in Sudbury, and felt that this aspect has been neglected. She detailed aspects of an agreement with the tribes which reflects a Statement of Intent that states that members of the Agreement will protect and preserve such resources. She believed that Wayland had entered into the Agreement. Ms. Warren confirmed that she would gather information on the Tribal Agreement to share with the Commission.

Open Meeting Law and COI Training

Mr. Hagger explained the annual/bi-annual COI, ethics and Open Meeting Law training. He recommended that commissioners contact the Town Clerk’s office if such credentialing is not maintained.

Date for Next Meetings(s)

Mr. Hagger announced that the next meeting would be scheduled for Tuesday, August 25th at 7:00 PM., September 22nd, and October 20th and November 17.

Adjourn

Mr. Hagger motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Katz-aye, Hagger-aye, Warren-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Trexler-aye, Cebra-aye, Bautze-aye.

It was on motion unanimously (8-0).

VOTED: To adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:07 PM