



**Schenectady Historic District Commission**

**Meeting Minutes  
August 15, 2016**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Commissioner Britt called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

**II. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:** Carrie Britt-Narcavage, Chair; Ben Wiles, Vice Chair; Jackie Craven; David F. Lowry; Patricia Yager

**EXCUSED:** Dr. Dean Bennett; Mark Meigher

**STAFF:** Rima Shamieh, Assistant Planner; Ryan Bailey, Assistant Corporation Counsel; Jennifer Mills, Secretary

**III. CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

None.

**IV. ADOPTION OF MEETING MINUTES**

Motion by Commissioner Craven, seconded by Commissioner Yager, to adopt the July 18, 2016 Meeting Minutes as submitted.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Presentation by Jackie Mancini, Director of Development, regarding the FEMA grant application for flood mitigation funding in the Stockade.**

Prior to the beginning of the consideration of applications, Director of Development Jackie Mancini spoke briefly regarding the FEMA grant for flood mitigation funding for the Stockade Historic District. She explained that city staff is currently working on completing the application and that in order to finish the work they must gather specific information regarding every Stockade property in the 100 year flood plain. She stated that the Department is in the process of initiating a comprehensive community outreach program, the goal of which is to speak with each property owner and to help them develop a list of all of the specific repairs they have had to make to their properties due to water damage. Ms. Mancini noted that there will be a community meeting for all affected property owners and neighbors on Thursday, August 25<sup>th</sup> from 6 to 7:30 p.m. at the Schenectady Public Library Community Room.

Commissioner Britt asked Ms. Mancini what percentage of the affected properties must be analyzed in order for the grant application to be considered complete. Ms. Mancini explained that ideally all of the properties would be covered, but that in the cases where properties have been abandoned or are currently vacant it might be necessary to use information from neighboring properties or to try to gather information from neighboring property owners who might know some of the history of the vacant property. She stated that FEMA obviously has records of any claims made to them, but that they are also looking for information regarding more minor incidents which may or may not have even been covered by homeowner's insurance. Commissioner Britt stated that she believes that a representative from the Commission should attend the meeting, ideally a Commissioner who resides in the Stockade. Commissioner Lowry noted that he will be out of town on the 25<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Britt stated that she will ask Commissioner Bennett if he is able to attend and if not she will go in his place.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS - Applications**

### **A. Consideration for approval submitted by George Gordon to replace a non-structural masonry garage wall with a wooden clapboard wall. The premise is located at 31 North College Street.**

Elaine and George Gordon appeared before the Commission. Mr. Gordon explained that the masonry side wall on their garage is failing and they would like to replace it with a wall that would be sided with wood to match the siding on the front of the garage. He stated that the wall was never meant to be an exterior wall; it was originally a dividing wall tied into the neighbor's garage, which has since been removed. He noted that the wall is not tied in to the roof and is currently being held up with braces, since it is in danger of falling. Mrs. Gordon then read the statement that was included in the application, reiterating the background and current condition of the wall, as well as the proposed repair.

Commissioner Lowry noted that since this was never meant to be an exterior wall, its appearance should not be considered as such. Commissioner Britt agreed. Commissioner Craven stated that she appreciated the applicants' efforts to maintain the garage under these circumstances. Commissioner Yager asked the applicants if it will be necessary to reframe and rebuild the entire wall. Mr. Gordon responded that it would be. Commissioner Britt asked the applicants if they intend to extend the wood molding that is currently at the roofline of the front of the garage around the corner and along the new side wall. The applicants stated that they had planned to, but they would be happy to do whatever the Commissioners think would be best.

Commissioner Britt stated that she would support the replacement of the current failing wall with a wood framed and sided wall. The Commissioners agreed. Mr.

Gordon stated that he would like to extend an identical wood molding around the corner at the roofline, but that he would prefer to slope it slightly so that it follows the line of the roof. The Commissioners stated that they would be amenable to this. Commissioner Yager asked what the Commissioners felt would be an acceptable alternative if the applicants are not able to find a matching trim to what is on the front. She stated that she would agree with the trim changing at the corner if an exact match is not available. Assistant Planner Shamieh noted that there will still be a need for a corner piece to bring the two moldings together at the corner. Commissioner Britt stated that she does not believe that the trim needs to be an exact match, as it is not the restoration of an original design element. She added that because the exterior wall never existed before, no original exterior trim used there. Commissioner Lowry noted that an alternative option would be to remove the front trim and replace both sides with a matching product. Commissioner Britt stated that she appreciated the intent of this suggestion, but that she believes that it should be a priority to keep what is original on the front side.

Commissioner Craven asked if the applicants have any photographs depicting the original garage before the other half was removed. The applicants stated that they do not. Commissioner Lowry asked Mr. Gordon if he knows how old the garage is. Mr. Gordon stated that he does not, but that the adjoining side was removed about twenty years ago by the neighbor.

Motion by Commissioner Britt, seconded by Commissioner Lowry, to approve the application as summarized below:

1. The existing failing masonry wall will be replaced with a wood framed wall with wood clapboard siding to match the siding on the front of the garage.
2. The color will be painted the same as the garage front.

And with the following conditions:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed within one year.
2. The slope of the roof will delineate the elevation of the new wall.
3. The existing molding at the roofline at the front of the building will be continued around the side of the building. The new trim will match the existing trim as closely as possible.

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. The existing masonry wall was originally an interior fire separation wall between two garages, one of which has been removed, leaving what was originally an interior wall on the exterior. Therefore, the applicants are replacing an interior wall with an exterior wall. The materials originally used on the wall are not conducive to use on an exterior wall, thus supporting the approval of the use of different materials.
3. The wood siding used on the front of the garage will be used on the new side exterior wall.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

**B. Consideration for approval submitted by Maxine Guinel to paint the garage and install a driveway gate. The premise is located at 108 North Ferry Street.**

Maxine Guinel appeared before the Commission. Mr. Guinel explained that he would like to paint the stucco garage body “Briarwood” by Benjamin Moore, with the trim black and the doors the same color as they are currently. He noted that the garage can barely be seen from the street. Commissioner Yager asked if the stucco has been previously painted. Mr. Guinel responded that it has not, but that the garage had been covered with ivy, which has since been removed, that had caused some damage to the stucco. Commissioner Britt asked the applicant if he intends to repair the stucco before painting the garage. Mr. Guinel indicated that the stucco will be prepared prior to painting. Commissioner Britt commented that painting the stucco will help to prolong its life. Commissioner Yager asked Mr. Guinel if he will be using paint formulated for use on stucco. Mr. Guinel confirmed that he will be using the Benjamin Moore paint type that is meant for this application. The Commissioners agreed that the proposed colors for the garage are acceptable.

The discussion next turned to the proposed driveway gate. Mr. Guinel explained that he had recently repaved the driveway and that many motorists have been mistaking the driveway for a street or alley and have been driving down it, since the garage at the rear of the property is not very visible from the street. He stated that he has also had problems with pedestrians trying to cut through his property at night, and he believes that the gate would give some added security for the property. He explained that he had chosen the aluminum style gate because it would be easier to maintain than a wood gate, which would most likely have to be refinished yearly.

Commissioner Britt asked the Commissioners to state their opinions regarding the gate. Commissioner Lowry commented that he has no objection to it, given that it is sitting back at the front corner of the home, and because there are many different styles of gates visible throughout the Stockade. He explained that he also feels that the style of gate chosen fits with the style and era of the house. Commissioner Britt commented that she would support an aluminum gate over wood, and that she understands why Mr. Guinel would prefer this material. Commissioner Craven stated that when she visited the property she felt that the house seems much closer to the street than it appears in the photos, and that she believes the gate will also seem to be close to the street if it is placed at the front corner of the house. She asked Mr. Guinel why he had chosen to place the gate there and further along the driveway towards the back of the property. Mr. Guinel explained that because of the placement of the windows on that side of the house he believed that close to the front corner would be the best placement. Commissioner Britt commented that she also would feel more comfortable if the gate were placed further back on the

property, as it would then seem less imposing and more in scale with the house. Commissioner Craven agreed, stating that a gate that is six feet high and more than ten feet wide would seem like quite an imposing structure if placed this close to the street. Commissioner Yager asked if the gate will be operable if there is a heavy snowfall. Mr. Guinel replied that he believes that it will be fine, but if there is an issue the gate can simply be left open in this case.

Commissioner Britt noted that unlike in other historic districts in the city, there is evidence of a heavy use of gates and fences in the Stockade. She stated that she is fairly certain that adding a gate to this property will not change the character of the street. Commissioner Lowry stated that many homes in this area have gates, some in a similar location and some placed further back on the driveway. Assistant Planner Shamieh noted that the proposed gate is six feet high and approximately thirteen feet across, including the ten foot gate and the two side sections. Commissioner Craven commented that she feels that six feet is quite tall for this location. Mr. Guinel stated that he was informed by the fence company that six feet would be a standard height for this type of gate.

Commissioner Wiles commented that he believes that all of the objectives served by a six-foot gate could also be met with a four-foot gate. He added that he would have trouble supporting a six foot fence height, adding that in the past he can only recall one instance where a six-foot fence was approved by the Commission, and that was in the case of a property which housed a dog rescue organization. Commissioner Lowry stated that he believes that a four-foot fence is much easier for a person to hop over. He noted that he had been considering submitting an application to the Commission to change his four-foot gate to six feet. Commissioner Britt asked if any of the Commissioners would object to the gate at four feet high. The Commissioners agreed that a four-foot high gate would be more in keeping with the scale of the rest of the property. Commissioner Craven commented that at a six-foot height she feels that the proposed gate design appears very commercial and imposing, more like something that might be seen on a bank, and that she does not believe that it fits with the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Yager stated that she has observed many gates in the Stockade that are six feet in height. Commissioner Craven stated that she could not recall seeing any six feet high and this wide. Commissioner Lowry agreed that while there are many that are six feet high, they are not nearly as wide and are often set back more towards the rear of the properties. Commissioner Britt asked if four feet is a standard available height. Commissioner Wiles responded that most likely the property owner can choose whatever height they would like.

Commissioner Yager asked Mr. Guinel if he plans on parking his car behind the gate. Mr. Guinel stated that he does. Commissioner Craven asked if the proposed gates will swing in only; Mr. Guinel stated that they would. Commissioner Yager asked if the Commissioners would approve a six-foot gate if it were to be set back

further on the property. Commissioner Wiles stated that he would not support a six-foot gate unless it were set back far enough on the driveway that a vehicle could comfortably park in front of it when the gate is closed. He noted that on the application it is not clear what the measurement is from the street to the proposed gate location. Commissioner Britt asked the Commissioners if anyone was prepared to support the gate at the size and location submitted. Commissioner Lowry stated that he would. Seeing no other support from the Commissioners, Commissioner Britt suggested that the gate be set back at least three feet from the front elevation. Commissioner Wiles stated that he believes that the gate should only open in. Mr. Guinel stated that he would be amenable to this. Mr. Guinel stated that he would agree to a four-foot high gate in this location. The Commissioners agreed that this would be the best option. Commissioner Britt explained that because of the gate's proximity to the front of the property, even if it were to be set back three feet from the front elevation a six-foot gate would look out of character with the scale and design of the area. The Commissioners concurred. Mr. Guinel stated that he would be willing to amend the application as discussed.

Motion by Commissioner Wiles, seconded by Commissioner Britt, to approve the application as summarized below:

1. The body of the garage will be painted Benjamin Moore "Briarwood". The applicant will use the paint formula specifically designed for use on stucco. The garage trim will be black and the garage doors will remain green. All necessary repairs will be made to the stucco prior to painting.
2. A four-foot gate will be installed across the driveway in the color and design submitted. The gate will be set back a minimum of three feet from the front elevation of the house.

And with the following conditions:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed within one year.
2. The gate will be a maximum four feet in height from the ground to the top rail.
3. The gate will be located a minimum of three feet back from the front elevation of the house and will open in.

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. The property has a unique configuration of the house and garage on a very deep lot. People cross the property to access another parcel and also mistakenly think that the driveway is a road and thus attempt to drive down the driveway. The use of a gate across the driveway will help to mitigate these issues.
3. The gate will only open in and not towards the street.

***Motion carried unanimously.***

**C. Consideration for approval submitted by Wayne Kimball to replace windows. The premise is located at 404 Union Street.**

Wayne and Joyce Kimball appeared before the Commission. Mr. Kimball explained that the current windows on the building are wood windows set in vinyl jambs and frames and that they are in serious disrepair and the wood windows are falling out of the frames. He stated that he is proposing to replace the windows with vinyl windows. Assistant Planner Shamieh noted that the building was renovated several years ago by its previous owners (General Electric) and no permits or approvals were granted for the work. Commissioner Wiles asked if the photos submitted of properties with vinyl windows show neighboring properties. Mrs. Kimball stated that they do. Ms. Shamieh noted that the submitted photos of a neighboring building depicted wood windows, not vinyl, but that they were not approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Wiles asked the applicants if they propose to replace all of the windows on the front elevation. Mr. Kimball responded that they would initially like to replace the four windows on the first floor, and then the upper five windows later, when it fits their budget. Commissioner Britt asked if they plan to replace all of the windows within one year. Mrs. Kimball stated that they would like to. Commissioner Britt explained that an approval by the Commission would be good for one year, so if they were to complete all the windows within that time they would not have to return with another application. Commissioner Britt asked why the applicants were required to submit an application if they are replacing like with like. Ms. Shamieh explained that the current windows are not all vinyl, but wood sashes in a vinyl jamb and frame, and the applicants are proposing installing 100% vinyl replacement windows. She explained that if the applicants chose to only replace the jambs and frames and repair the wood sashes they would not need the Commission's approval. Mr. Kimball stated that the wood sashes are too deteriorated and this option would also be prohibitively expensive.

Commissioner Wiles noted that in the past the Commission has never approved vinyl windows to replace another material. Mrs. Kimball stated that the neighboring properties all have vinyl windows that were installed without permission and she feels that they are being punished for following proper procedures. Commissioner Wiles asked her why they had chosen the vinyl windows. Mrs. Kimball stated that the new windows will offer greater energy efficiency, they will be low maintenance, they will improve the appearance of the building, and they will give the residents added security and comfort. Commissioner Wiles noted that new wood windows would also meet all of those objectives. Commissioner Britt stated that one of the responsibilities of the Commission is to protect and preserve the integrity of historic properties. She explained that the lifespan of wood windows far exceeds that of vinyl replacement

windows. Ms. Shamieh noted that there are properties nearby that have replaced wood windows in kind.

Commissioner Britt asked Mr. Kimball if he had sought an estimate for wood windows. Mr. Kimball stated that he had not, but that he believes that they are much more expensive than vinyl. Commissioner Yager suggested that perhaps the applicants could consider replacing some of the windows at this time and the upper five at a later time, thus allowing them more time to budget the expense. Mrs. Kimball stated that this would not be an option due to the cost. Commissioner Britt noted that the current windows were installed in 1993, and that given their current state had most likely lasted in good condition for less than twenty years.

Commissioner Craven commented that if the expense of the wood windows is the main issue perhaps the applicants should consider a hardship application. She added that it is beyond the scope of the Commission to address the financial problems of applicants. Commissioner Britt noted that if the applicants could find this type of windows with a vinyl frame and wood sash they could replace the windows in kind. She explained that otherwise the Commissioners hands are tied, as they are not allowed under the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior to allow vinyl windows to replace a window that was previously another material.

Motion by Commissioner Wiles, seconded by Commissioner Britt, to approve the application as summarized below:

1. The windows on the front façade of the building will be replaced with vinyl windows. The windows are currently constructed of a vinyl jamb and frame with wood sashes.

*Motion did not pass, with Commissioners Britt, Wiles, Craven, Lowry, and Yager opposed.*

**D. Consideration for approval submitted by Mark Bryant and Wendy Fung to replace the roof, flashing, and pipe boots; paint, and install a satellite dish. The premise is located at 15 Washington Avenue.**

Mark Bryant and Wendy Fung appeared before the Commission. Mr. Bryant explained that they have been experiencing some leaks in the roof, and thus are proposing to repair it. He also noted that they would like permission to install a satellite dish on the roof, and paint portions of the building that were forgotten or missed when the building was last painted. Assistant Planner Shamieh noted that an application for a new roof on the building was approved in 2011, but it was not clear if the work was ever done. She stated that the approved shingle was a dark gray, either architectural or three-tab. Mr. Bryant stated that he does not believe that the new roof had been installed in 2011, as the current roof is a very light gray and he believes that it is much older than five years.

Commissioner Britt suggested that the Commissioners begin their discussion with the roof portion of the application. Commissioner Craven stated that she questioned the choice of shingles with an uneven configuration, as these shingles are meant to resemble wood shingles and the roof on this building was most likely originally slate. Commissioner Britt explained that slate would have a more even, regular pattern. Commissioner Lowry asked if the roof is visible at all from street level. Mr. Bryant stated that it is visible on the front mansard-like portion, while only a small amount of the rear roof is visible unless the viewer is standing quite a distance away. Mr. Bryant explained that they chose the proposed shingles because they liked the low color contrast of the chateau green, and the architectural grade shingles are a much higher quality with a longer proposed lifespan than any three-tab shingle available. He noted that they would like to use a shingle of the highest possible quality to ensure the optimum longevity of the roof. He added that the faux slate product was also considerable more expensive than the architectural shingles. Commissioner Britt asked Mr. Bryant if the roof was originally slate. Mr. Bryant replied that he believes that it was, although the only physical evidence of this is the sag in the roof which indicates that it had a very heavy covering at one time. Commissioner Britt noted that she did not have a strong opinion as to what type of shingle is used on the rear of the roof, where it is barely visible, but that she believes that the front should have the more regular finish of a three-tab or faux slate shingle. Commissioner Craven agreed.

Mr. Bryant searched the internet and suggested an Owens Corning Devonshire Tudor shingle which has a faux slate appearance. He presented a photo to the Commissioners and they agreed that it would be a great choice. Assistant Planner Shamieh commented that the assessment form for the property noted that in 1945 the roof was slate and composite. Mr. Bryant explained that the proposed flashing on the roof will be the standard aluminum, and that they are proposing to replace the rubber pipe boots with aluminum as well, as this material is now commonly used and will provide the best protection against leaks. The Commissioners concurred that they approved of this material.

Mr. Bryant noted that the painting in the application refers to some portions of the building that were either forgotten or missed when the building was last painted. The Commissioners agreed that this was a good idea. The discussion next turned to the satellite dish. Commissioner Britt stated that it will not be visible from most vantage points on the street. Mr. Bryant stated that it will not, although the exposure may be slightly greater in the winter. He noted that the dish is an oval shape and measures approximately 20 inches by 26 inches. Commissioner Craven noted that she feels that the satellite dish meets all of the criteria laid out in the guidelines that the Commission had drafted in 2010. She explained that an effort had been made by the applicants to place the dish as unobtrusively as possible, that it is less than one meter in diameter and is not placed on the side or front of the building, the wiring will be hidden from view, and no surfaces of the building will be damaged by the installation. Commissioner Wiles asked the applicants if

Verizon and Time Warner service their location. Mr. Bryant stated that they do. Commissioner Wiles asked if the dish must be removed if service is discontinued. Mr. Bryant replied that it will. Commissioner Yager asked how the satellite dish will be wired into the house. Mr. Bryant stated that the wires will be inserted through a hole in the side of the roof hatch.

Motion by Commissioner Britt, seconded by Commissioner Craven, to approve the application as summarized below:

1. The roof, flashing, and pipe boots will be replaced.
2. The portions of the building left unpainted will be painted to match the rest of the building.
3. A satellite dish will be installed on the roof as detailed in the application.

And with the following conditions:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed within one year.
2. The front elevation/mansard portion of the roof will be shingled in Owens Corning Devonshire Tudor faux slate shingles.
3. The applicants may choose to complete the whole roof in Devonshire Tudor shingles or use a complementary shingle on the rear portion of the roof.

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. The faux slate shingle choice recommended is based on the original slate used on the roof. This shingle appearance will best mimic the original look of the building.
3. The satellite dish meets the conditions proposed by the Commission in their 2010 draft of satellite dish design guidelines.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

**E. Consideration for approval submitted by Michele McGovern to paint the building and repair or replace the front door, install vents in foundation window wells, install gate and lighting. The premise is located at 27 North Street.**

Michele McGovern appeared before the Commission. Prior to the beginning of the discussion Commissioner Britt noted that the roof is not visible from the public right-of-way and thus should be removed from the application. The Commissioners concurred. The discussion then turned to the painting of the building. Commissioner Britt explained that traditionally a home of this era would have had a three-color scheme, with one color used on the body of the building, one on the trim, and the third darkest color used on the door and window sashes only. Thus she noted that the white sashes proposed would not be historically accurate. Commissioner Craven agreed. Ms. McGovern stated that she had proposed the colors that she had because she wanted to test some colors on the building and see

how they look. She added that she would like to repair the door before deciding on a color.

Ms. McGovern stated that she would like to place a keypad lock on the door in place of the current deadbolt. She noted that the current lock is not original. The Commissioners stated that they would not object to the keypad lock. Commissioner Wiles asked Ms. McGovern if the property is in the 100 year flood plain. Ms. McGovern stated that it is. Commissioner Britt stated that she would be comfortable with approving the body color of the building while giving the applicant the choice of two additional colors to use on the trim. The Commissioners agreed. Commissioner Craven stated that all of the proposed colors are historically accurate, so she would approve the use of any of them, but feels that a darker shade should be chosen for the window sashes and door.

Commissioner Britt asked Ms. McGovern to explain the proposed vents. Ms. McGovern stated that she has decided to restore the basement windows and thus would not be using the vents. Commissioner Britt asked Ms. McGovern to explain what she proposes to install for a new gate. Ms. McGovern stated that she would like to restore the stockade fence style gate which was originally on the property but had been removed by the property caretakers. Commissioner Britt explained that in order to approve the gate the Commissioners would need to see a cut sheet showing the specific design and dimensions. She added that the same would be true for any new proposed lighting. Ms. McGovern stated that she had decided to repair the existing lighting at this time, but that she would be happy to return to the Commission with details of the gate and the lighting, if she does decide to eventually replace it.

Commissioner Britt asked if Ms. McGovern intends to remove the mailbox and install a mail slot. Ms. McGovern stated that she would like to do so for security purposes. Assistant Planner Shamieh noted that the doors did not originally have a mail slot. Commissioner Britt stated that she does not believe that adding a mail slot would compromise the historical integrity of the doors. Ms. McGovern stated that many of the surrounding homes have mail slots. Ms. Shamieh cautioned the Commissioners to keep in mind their guidelines and standards and make sure that they are justified in allowing the slot. She stated that this house did not originally have a mail slot. Commissioner Wiles agreed that it did not, but stated that houses contemporaneous to this one did.

Motion by Commissioner Britt, seconded by Commissioner Craven, to approve the application as summarized below:

1. The building body of the building will be painted “Beach Glass”. The trim will be painted “Sand Fossil” and the applicant will choose one of the darker accent colors submitted for the door and window sashes.
2. A mail slot will be installed in the front door.

3. The roof is not visible from the right-of-way and thus is not a part of this application.
4. The foundation vents have been removed from the application.
5. The installation of the boiler is not under the purview of the Commission and is removed from the application.

And with the following conditions:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed within one year.
2. The applicant will return to the Commission with a cut sheet showing the specific design of the gate prior to its installation.
3. If there are any changes made to the lighting the applicant will return to the Commission with a cut sheet of the new proposed lighting prior to its installation.
4. The paint colors are approved as submitted for the body and trim of the house. The applicant will choose one additional accent color from the three proposed. The window sashes and door will both be repainted the darker accent color chosen.

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. The paint colors proposed are all historically accurate. Traditionally, three different colors would have been used on a building of this era – one for the body of the building, one for the trim, and the darkest color for the door and window sashes.
3. The gate is not a part of this approval because more details on the specific design are need in order for the Commissioners to properly consider the proposal.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Discussion of zoning ordinance.**

Assistant Planner Shamieh noted that there have been no new developments since the last meeting.

### **B. Discussion of street trees in historic districts.**

Commissioner Britt noted that she had revised the draft letter submitted last month by Commissioner Yager. She stated that she had sent the revised letter to Ms. Shamieh and Commissioner Wiles for review. Ms. Shamieh noted that she had made some revisions and sent the draft to the Corporation Counsel for review.

**VIII. MISCELLANEOUS**

None.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner Lowry, seconded by Commissioner Britt, to adjourn the meeting.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 pm.