

DRAFT MINUTES

State Historic Preservation Review Board Friday, March 25, 2022, 9:30 a.m. Teleconference via Microsoft Teams (Recorded)

Present: Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki (via phone), Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards (Chair, via phone), Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan (via phone), Mr. McMillan, Mr. Wigren

Absent: Ms. Saunders

Staff: Jenny Scofield (presenting), Todd Levine (presenting), Mary Dunne, Erin Fink, Jonathan Kinney, Cathy Labadia, Jane Schneider, Marena Wisniewski

Guests (by Agenda Item):

IV.A.1 Robert Avena (Attorney for Town of Waterford), Marguerite Carnell (consultant, AHS), Bob Nye (municipal historian), Abby Piersall (Planning Director, Town of Waterford), William Sweeney (attorney, Tobin Carberry, O'Malley, Riley & Selinger), Virginia Moignard Tanger, Jim Wray (property owner)

IV.B.1 Mary Jo Blain Andrews (Shipman & Goodwin LLP), Mario Coppola (Berchem Moses PC) Mathew Ranelli (Shipman & Goodwin LLP)

I. Call to Order

Ms. Scofield confirmed that a quorum of Board members was present. Mr. Edwards called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Ms. Scofield provided the digital meeting procedures and announced that the meeting will be recorded. Ms. Scofield acknowledged guests in attendance and asked that guests introduce themselves under the agenda items they are affiliated with. There is generally a five-minute limit for each speaker. Ms. Scofield referenced that a phone number was provided in case anyone experiences technical difficulties. SRB members introduced themselves.

III. Approval of the December 3, 2021 meeting minutes

Mr. Edwards requested comments on the June minutes. No comments were heard.

A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Dr. Feder, to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2021 meeting (Y-6, N-0, Abstained-0).

Board members voting yes: Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Wigren

Mr. Herzan was present but unable to come off mute. He rejoined the meeting and requested to reopen discussion of the minutes. He provided minor comments.

A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Dr. Feder, to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2021 meeting as amended (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-0).

Board members voting yes: Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Wigren

Board members absent from vote: Mr. Barlow, Ms. Saunders

IV. Action Items

A. Completed National Register Nominations

All registration forms are subject to changes made by the State Historic Preservation Review Board (SRB) and by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) staff.

1. Oil Mill Historic District, Waterford (Criterion A and D, local level)

Ms. Scofield summarized that nominated property is a 55-acre district in southeastern Connecticut at Head of Niantic River. It was developed during the nineteenth century. It includes 4 contributing archaeological sites and 16 buildings. Staff recommends the district for listing at the local level under Criterion A for Industry, Community Development, and Social History, and D for Archaeology. The period of significance is from 1804, beginning of production at the first oil mill through 1921, when the almshouse returned to private ownership. Other changes occurred around 1920 such as a shift toward tourism and automobile travel.

The nomination was initiated by the municipal historian in 2014. Notice of a community meeting and the SRB meeting was sent to the First Selectman and property owners about 40 days before the meeting by direct mail. The community meeting was held at Waterford Public Library on March 1 and was listed on the library's event calendar. A second notice about the SRB meeting was mailed on March 11, 2022 to inform owners that the meeting changed to virtual format only. The nomination was posted on the SHPO website, and a hard copy was available at the local library during noticing period. The CLG response was positive from the local Historic Properties Commission. The First Selectman filed a negative CLG response along with an explanatory letter. One letter of support was received from two owners of property in the district and one letter of objection was received from an owner of property in the district.

Marguerite Carnell and Meg Harper of AHS; and Bob Nye, municipal historian, attended the meeting to represent the nomination. Other guests included Robert Avena (Attorney for Town of Waterford), Abby Piersall (Planning Director, Town of Waterford), William Sweeney (attorney, Tobin Carberry, O'Malley, Riley & Selinger), Virginia Moignard Tanger, Jim Wray (property owner).

Mr. Edwards invited public comment.

Attorney William Sweeney of Tobin Carberry addressed the SRB. He represents the owner Stone Ridge RE LLC who owns 22 acres in the proposed district. This property consists of vacant forested land at 21 Gurley Road. This is the largest parcel in the district and is located at the eastern edge. Attorney Sweeney filed an objection to the nomination on behalf of his client and requested that the nomination boundary be amended to exclude 21 Gurley Road. His client purchased this property, which has been in the town's industrial park district, with the intention of developing it for industrial use. His client has been working with town planning and economic development and is poised to submit an application to local land use agencies. During that process, the proposal to include the property in a historic district was not discussed or raised. His client received notice of this meeting last month. He stated that town officials were equally surprised, and the proposal was not vetted with the town. The First Selectman objected to the district because of failures in the process and because the boundaries were not discussed with the town; the boundaries extend into the town's industrial district. He noted that his client has no objection to identifying historically significant homes and buildings along Oil Mill Road.

Attorney Sweeney stated that he and his client are familiar with the National Register designation and its benefits but are also aware of a major drawback, the Connecticut Environmental Protection Act. That is unacceptable for his client who is about to invest significantly in property for major economic development purposes. He contends that the property [21 Gurley Rd] is not worthy for inclusion in the district. The property at one time may have been a place of historic significance as the site of the almshouse but there is no integrity left that warrants any level of designation or additional protection. The nomination indicates the almshouse is demolished in 2015 and only rubble remains. The pictures in the nomination form are almost 7 years old. He submitted additional pictures [shared with the SRB] showing that the site has been obliterated and taken over by vegetation. Subsurface investigation and excavation of the site can be done without National Register designation; Attorney Sweeney's client's development will likely trigger a stormwater permit and archaeological survey work will be part of a mandatory process. He acknowledges that a lot of work went into the nomination and there are good intentions but including this vacant industrial site makes no sense. He requested that the SRB amend the boundary to exclude the property.

Ms. Scofield clarified that this nomination was the result of a state grant to the Town at the request of the municipal historian. The town was granted the funds to prepare the nomination.

Town Attorney Robert Avena introduced himself. The First Selectman thanks the SRB and asked him to speak on behalf of the town. He is familiar with the Oil Mill area and its history. He applauds the designation along Oil Mill Road. However, there is the 21-acre parcel that fronts on the I-95 corridor and has been zoned industrial for a long time. Eighty or so percent of the town is zoned residential and there are limited commercial/industrial areas. This parcel is vacant except for the almshouse footprint, which is near a wetland at the edge of the property. The Planning & Zoning is reviewing a possible use that is allowed in that zone. The Town has no issue with the designation of homes and the residential area along Oil Mill Road. He has been town attorney since 2000 and has worked to designate several areas of town. Bob Nye has done an excellent job as the town historian. The issue came up today for the first selectman, town planner, and himself because this parcel was included in the designation along Oil Mill Road. The Town is supportive 90 percent of the time, but this is an issue to raise – the designation of the entire parcel versus a further look at whether the footprint of the almshouse needs further designation. It still needs to be

looked at in the development regardless of the designation. Attorney Avena thanked the state for the granting of grants that allow the town historian to do what he does. This is more of a perimeter issue. That was the point of the First Selectman's note and follow up letter.

Mr. Edwards asked Ms. Scofield for comment. Ms. Scofield noted that the 21 Gurley Road parcel was in every version of the district boundary that she's seen. She clarified that when you do a [National Register] nomination, you don't start out with a boundary already delineated. The boundary of a district is based on intact resources that are associated with each other; associated with the themes in history that are important. You might start with an area that you're studying, but the boundary is defined during the research and fieldwork process. The boundary of this district was adjusted over time as the work was done, but this parcel was always in, since the beginning of the project back in 2014.

Mr. Barlow joined the meeting.

Mr. Edwards opened the SRB discussion.

Bob Nye requested to return to public comments.

Bob Nye introduced himself as the Waterford municipal historian. Regarding some of the comments, [21 Gurley Road] was not just the site of the almshouse, but also part of a 100-acre town farm (now 22 acres). It was all part of the almshouse/town farm, looking after paupers. You can't just isolate the almshouse site. If 21 Gurley Road) is not included, an important part of a very diverse community will not be told. The name of the brook and road is Oil Mill. Oil Mill site is often referenced in the land records, but it's beyond that. This site included ship carpenters, mill workers, mill workers, and others, and the store at 2 Oil Mill Road. Store did business with Town at the poor farm and supplied medicines. Eliminating 21 Gurley Road is eliminating an essential/critical part of the story of this district. The fact that it is zoned for industry is entirely irrelevant.

Mr. Edwards returned to the SRB discussion.

Mr. Herzan commented that Mr. Nye answered his question, which was to discuss the significance of the property and its relationship to the rest of the district. He asked for the consultant to comment on the integrity. He asked if this parcel were included if that will preclude future development if the area has archaeological significance. Would this provide resources to study those sites before the development occurred, which would be beneficial to the owner? He asked if the owner has considered that benefit.

Mr. Wigren stated that the role as a Board is to review the history to determine whether the site has historic significance and integrity and whether the nomination adequately documents that. Zoning or potential development programs have nothing to do with the SRB's consideration. He is happy to encourage good development of sites but its not their role to weigh in on that or to consider that laws can be misused by people, unfortunately.

Mr. McMillan commented that the nomination is well-researched. It is missing a context statement. He read three different stories – the oil mill/extraction, transition to tourism, and the

almshouse. How those things tied together was lacking. Whether the outbuildings are contributing or not is dependent on the construction year. There is an interesting story there that could play out in the description of each property. The discussion of whether the area has integrity is a moving target until the context is more clearly established.

Mr. Edwards requested that the text recognize the connection of the area to Niantic Bay. This was one of the natural ports. What is called the Niantic River is a long arm of Niantic Bay. This portion of the river is contiguous with the bay and all of the shipping and related service to the watercraft. The merchants sailing in and out [possibly] getting sumac. There is a geographical component that is lacking in the nomination. Adjacent to this area is Oswegatchie on other side of river. Important members of the New York arts community summered there. That also points to these earlier industrial developments that relate back into the 18th century.

Mr. Wigren asked about adding tourism as a theme. He requested clarification about whether the terms almshouse and work house are used interchangeably or if there is a distinction. On p. 8-35, add a source for the interior descriptions.

Ms. Carnell stated that there are many authors of the nomination. The source for the description of the almshouse was added after her organization completed the nomination. In terms of adding tourism as a theme, she deferred to Ms. Scofield. She noted that the State Historic Preservation Office was involved with the boundaries of the district and period of significance. Her feeling is that the tourism aspect came in later than the period of significance end date.

Ms. Scofield clarified that tourism begins when the period of significance ends. This nomination was focused on the 19th-century mills and development of the turnpike. The community developed here for those reasons. This nomination could have encompassed hundreds of acres, including all of Wolf Pit and a 400-year period of significance. It was honed down to collection of archaeological resources at the intersection of Oil Mill and Gurley Roads. The boundary was expanded from the intersection and pulled down along Oil Mill Road to include the residences of mill owners and people engaged in important aspects of the community, inns on the Post Road and the Chapman store. Archaeological resources are primary to this particular nomination. We don't get these as frequently as building-heavy districts. When considering the integrity, you're talking about the integrity of the archaeology, not just the buildings. This project has been going on since 2014; there have been different iterations, a lot of input, and multiple authors.

Mr. Edwards stated that this site on the Niantic River relates to what is going on not only on the bay, but also Long Island Sound. It justifies why these different industries that we're talking about exist where they exist. There is no mention of relationship of this nomination area to Long Island Sound on p.7-5. Add geographical context or geodetic survey map.

Ms. Scofield responded that geographical context can be added to the setting paragraph.

Mr. McMillan asked for a map or illustration that identifies features that are talked about in terms of context like Harvey's Landing. He couldn't figure out where it was historically. Some references to the development of this area – the use of the river, the use of Hartford Road and extant elements of King's Highway could inform the reader. It is not clear where those things are now but they're important to this story.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll requested clarification of contributing and non-contributing in the body of the text regarding the outbuildings. In the integrity statement, clarify what the multiple aspects of integrity mentioned on p. 7-13 are.

Attorney Sweeney commented on integrity. He referenced the discussion of determining district boundaries by studying the intact resources. He did not hear discussion of integrity of the district as it applies to 21 Gurley Road. To include this [property in the] district simply because there may be something of value underneath this site – it lacks that integrity. The site is obliterated, and the structures have been removed. He contends that the property does not have integrity that is required and requested that the boundary be amended.

Mr. Edwards noted that unless appropriately investigated to determine whether there is or isn't archaeological remains is the only way you know the property has integrity.

Ms. Scofield clarified that there have been past archaeological investigations in that area. When you do a nomination for archaeological significance, it is not just simply sensitivity. You look at past studies and what's been found.

Mary (Meg) Harper, president of PAST and lead archaeologist for the company, stated that the almshouse site has impeccable integrity based on her 35 years of experience. She saw the almshouse building when it was still standing; it never had any plumbing or electricity. The building was removed, but not removed by digging a hole or earth modification. She carefully walked the property herself and with her husband, a senior archaeologist. Ms. Harper gave her professional opinion that the entire property has tremendous integrity. If you put a shovel in the ground anywhere on the property you would find everything you want to see from a 17th-century occupation through to its the demolition; she's never seen such an intact site. It has not had a lot of other land modifications. She expects that an archaeological survey with formal testing would confirm what she is sure is there.

Dr. Feder, archaeologist, shared that he has excavated 17th, 18th, and 19th-century features. The default assumption is that there is going to be material there unless there has been blasting, enormous amounts of road modification, dragging of huge stumps out of the ground, or reconfiguring of the surface. Dr. Feder referenced the most recent photos sent to the SRB. He understands that the intent was to show that that there is not integrity, but for an archaeologist it shows the opposite. The possible significance for an archaeological component is heightened because there is no above-ground component. Barring any direct evidence that this has tremendous subsurface modification, in every instance in which he is familiar there will be substantial subsurface evidence of what was happening on that property.

Mr. Edwards called for a vote. Mr. McMillan asked if the SRB is voting on the boundaries as proposed or is the SRB is addressing Attorney Sweeney's request to have Gurley Road removed. Mr. Wigren stated that he made the motion, which was to approve the nomination as written, with some updates that will be added based on the discussion.

A motion was made by Mr. Wigren, second by Mr. Herzan to recommend the Oil Mill Historic District for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-0).

Board members voting yes: Mr. Barlow, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Wigren

Board members absent from vote: Dr. Bucki, Ms. Saunders

B. Review of Eligibility Status of National Register Listed Property

1. 39, 43, and 47 Church Street; 1, 2, and 3 Putnam Court and 32 Sherwood Place, Fourth Ward Historic District (2000), Greenwich

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Mr. Wigren to review the agenda item.

Ms. Scofield stated that this is a review of the current status of property that is already listed. The SRB is asked to discuss whether or not these buildings continue to contribute to the Fourth Ward district that they are within. This review is at the request of staff because it is helpful; it is not an official change to the National Register listing.

Mr. Levine introduced himself as an architectural historian and the Connecticut Environmental Protection Act liaison for SHPO. He noted that legal counsel for the developers who are proposing demolition requested postponement and promised not to demo until the next SRB meeting, but he is not in favor of postponing.

The Fourth Ward district was listed on the National Register on April 21, 2000. The Fourth Ward Historic District was listed on the National Register under Criterion A in the area of community development as “one of the two earliest urban subdivisions in the Town of Greenwich in 1836. The only such ventures that predate the coming of the railroad in 1848, which brought about the transformation of Greenwich from an agricultural town to a renowned residential suburb of New York City.” The district is also significant under Criterion A in the area of Ethnic History, as a neighborhood associated both with Greenwich’s Irish population, including the site of the first Roman Catholic church, and as the location of an important African American community, including structures such as the First Baptist Church in 1897, 1910.

According to the nomination, the property located at 39 Church Street is described as, 19th century vernacular, 1889, and given Inventory Number 3. The property located at 43 Church Street is identified as the Samuel A. Moshier House, Italianate, 1884 (Inventory Number 5), and pictured in Photograph 10 of the nomination. 47 Church Street is also featured in Photograph 10 of the nomination, and is identified as Second Empire, 1884. Both 43 and 47 Church are further characterized in the nomination as, the district’s best example of the Italianate style, and its only example of the Second Empire style. 1 Putnam Court is identified as, vernacular Dutch Colonial Revival, c. 1910, while both 2 and 3 Putnam Court are described simply as 20th century vernacular, with a construction date c. 1910. These three properties are described as having been constructed as the result of a subdivision of a larger lot facing Sherwood Place. Lastly, 32 Sherwood Place is identified as nomination as a 20th century vernacular, c. 1908.

Staff is requesting that the SRB determine if these continue to contribute to the Fourth Ward Historic District.

Mr. Edwards opened the item for public comment.

Mary Jo Blain Andrews introduced herself as an attorney at Shipman & Goodwin. She represents Church Sherwood LLC, which is the owner of the properties. Attorney Andrews asked to show a presentation. Ms. Scofield noted that several people are on the phone and will not be able to see it; she asked that Ms. Andrews describe what she is trying to convey. Attorney Andrews echoed Attorney Sweeney's comments about the procedure; her client was given short notice of the proceeding today; there not enough time to prepare, which was one of the reasons she asked for a postponement. She understands that the SHPO and Preservation Connecticut knew of the opposition of the proposed project several months ago but didn't notify her client until three weeks ago.

Attorney Andrews began a slide presentation (shared by Mathew Ranelli). She read the first two sentences of the Fourth Ward Historic District significance statement, in which the area is described as a diverse, moderate-income neighborhood in a town with affluence of national renown. She stated that the only criterion for listing mentioned is Criterion A for social history. Today the area is another luxury wealthy enclave and is not a model of diversity. The average rent is more than \$4,000 a month. In a letter to the zoning commission opposing plans for development of the property, the recently created Greenwich Preservation Network stated that the Fourth Ward has been a model of affordable housing throughout its history. 18 of the 160 contributing structures have been demolished in the 22 years since the listing: one for a driveway, one for a larger backyard, and 16 for luxury homes and condos, with monthly rents over \$10,000. There is a public trust in structures on the National Register, but her research shows no opposition to these demolitions for luxury housing. Attorney Andrews referenced her slide showing three contributing structures built in 1886 demolished and replaced with a single-family home that last sold for almost \$5 million. There was no opposition to the demolition that allowed this construction. Each demolition has moved the Fourth Ward farther from its moderate-income roots.

In assessment of contributing status, the location of structure within district and what exists around the structure are factors to consider. There are dozens of contributing buildings- over 100. She showed a slide with a map of the locations of the subject properties clustered at the far edge of the district, surrounded by properties that are not in a district. Three are on a private road, not visible from the street. The subject properties are not in the center of the district and their loss would not affect the cohesion of the district as a whole. She pointed out the locations of the 18 contributing properties demolished. Keeping Criterion A in the forefront, the assessment must go beyond the physical condition of the building. There is an opportunity to bring affordable housing to the edge of this district- an opportunity to bring more diversity to the Fourth Ward, bringing back in a small way the reason there is a district here. It is acceptable in town to demolish historic structures for luxury housing, but not acceptable to demolish historic structures for affordable housing. Historic preservation in this case is a pretext for opposition to affordable housing.

Mr. Edwards clarified that the role of the SRB is to review whether the seven structures still have integrity. The observations about what could or should happen are appreciated but are not part of the SRB's consideration.

Mr. Mario Coppola of Berchem Moses, PC introduced himself as the attorney representing the Town and Country Condo Association, which is located across the street at the subject properties at 20 Church Street. Within the association are numerous residents who are opposed to the development that is the impetus for demolition. Position that they do contribute to the historic district. There has been no material change or alteration to any of the properties. The historical and architectural integrity have been maintained. They continue to contribute to the Fourth Ward Historic District.

The proposed 200-unit development with parking will change the character of what's there now.

Attorney Coppola responded to the argument made by Attorney Andrews. To insinuate that because other contributing structures have been demolished that it is ok to demolish others – there is no precedent in the law for that – reminds him of the process for variance relief. This is an argument used when there is no other argument to make. Mr. Edwards clarified that this point is irrelevant to the SRB's discussion.

Mr. Edwards called for SRB comments on the integrity of the 7 contributing buildings.

Attorney Coppola added on behalf of Town and Country that he opposes the request for continuance. There is a pending application before the zoning commission in Greenwich for the development that will require the demolition of these buildings.

Mr. Edwards returned to the SRB discussion.

Dr. Bucki stated that the buildings are not well identified in the photographs that are part of the packet they look historically intact and contribute.

Mr. Wigren agreed that the buildings are identifiable in their current form and in some cases details and materials as well as described in the nomination. He suggests going on record as affirming that.

Mr. Edwards noted that it is difficult to see the difference between the photos taken in the last few months and 22 years ago.

A motion was made by Mr. McMillan second by Mr. Barlow that the properties at 39, 43, and 47 Church Street; 1, 2, and 3 Putnam Court and 32 Sherwood Place, continue to possess integrity and contribute to the significance of the Fourth Ward Historic District (Y-7, N-0, Abstained=0).

Board members voting in favor: Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Wigren

Board members absent from vote: Dr. Feder, Ms. Saunders

C. State Review Board Policy Statement

1. Native American Heritage Advisory Council Review of National Register Nominations

Ms. Scofield introduced a draft policy statement, which was initiated by SHPO about a year ago. The purpose of the statement is to establish a more formal process for input from the indigenous community on nominations that assign indigenous cultural value to a place or offer interpretations of indigenous history. SHPO does occasionally have eligibility requests and nominations involving indigenous history that are not from members of the existing indigenous communities; it is important to have input to make sure that we're presenting equal weight on both sides of a story. There are some Contact Period nominations where there are different accounts of stories or in some cases one sided is recorded or the other is not recorded at all or in the same way. We want to make sure we're thinking about nomenclature and that we give the indigenous community a chance to interpret that history. Connecticut has a Native American Heritage Advisory Council (NAHAC) and we're asking that council to engage in providing comments on nominations of interest. That council has a similar quarterly meeting to the SRB. This policy statement was discussed and approved by NAHAC at their regular quarterly meeting on March 4, 2022.

Mr. McMillan supports adopting the policy. He asked who interprets if a nomination is of interest or not, if all nominations will be shared because [NAHAC] may have insights that people wouldn't be aware of.

Ms. Scofield responded that a list of active nominations can be shared. There are some that are obvious and SHPO will let NAHAC know in advance when those nominations are expected. Otherwise SHPO will maintain regular contact with NAHAC to share the list of nominations. Mr. McMillan stated that he supports sharing the list. Ms. Scofield noted that nominations are shared now and publicly noticed but this is a way that we can invite NAHAC to help.

Dr. Bucki asked who decides who is on NAHAC; how is it appointed? Ms. Labadia clarified that NAHAC is written into statute. By statute their responsibility is to provide advice to the State Historic Preservation Office and the Office of State Archaeology. Required within that statute are appointments of members from the two [Connecticut] federally recognized tribes and three state-recognized tribes. They have voted on members for each tribe. In addition, there is a member from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, a member who represents the professional archaeological community, and two legislative appointments from the senate majority and minority leaders. Dr. Bucki observed that the appointments come from the represented organizations; Ms. Labadia confirmed that as correct.

A motion was made by Mr. Wigren, second by Mr. Herzan to adopt the statement as policy (Y-7, N-0, Abstained= 0).

Board members voting in favor: Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Wigren

Board members absent from vote: Dr. Feder, Ms. Saunders

V. Discussion

No items were discussed.

VI. New Business

No new business was heard.

VII. SHPO Staff Report

Ms. Scofield announced that the Pinto House in New Haven is scheduled to be moved onto its new foundation the week of April 4th. There is a historical consultant monitoring the progress as the SRB requested.

Dr. Bucki asked if the SRB will be informed when an exact day is known. Ms. Scofield responded yes and noted that in terms of logistics, we don't have permission to access the construction site (stay on the public way).

VIII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Edwards, second by Mr. McMillan to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:20 a.m.