



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 1-27-11 TIME 9:15 am

SERVED BY Canille Vigil

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, February 8, 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, February 8, 2011 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES January 25, 2011

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-10-115	1160 Camino de Cruz Blanca	Case #H-11-002	617 ½ A & B Acequia Madre
Case #H-09-069	130 Camino Escondido	Case #H-11-003	623 Garcia A & B
Case #H-10-066	1033 Old Pecos Trail	Case #H-11-005	125 Washington Avenue
Case #H-11-001	624 E. Alameda #B2		

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

I. OLD BUSINESS

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-004. 1200 Old Pecos Trail. Historic Review Historic District. Historic Preservation staff requests an historic status review of this non-statused property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-007. 433 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gil Gonzales, agent/owner, proposes to construct an 859 sq. ft. addition to a height of 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14' on a non-contributing residence. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-006. 520 Jose Street #2. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Cody North, agent for Joseph De Stefano, owner, proposes to construct a 23 sq. ft. addition and perform other remodeling on the contributing residence and the property. Two exceptions are requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and to enlarge an opening on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)). (David Rasch).

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations or an interpreter for the hearing impaired, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to hearing date. If you wish to attend the February 8, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, February 8, 2011.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

February 8, 2011

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes January 25, 2011	Approved as amended	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as presented	2
Communications	None	2
Business from the Floor	None	2
Administrative Matters	None	3
 Old Business	 None	 3
 New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 11-004</u> 1200 Old Pecos Trail	Postponed to February 22	3
2. <u>Case #H 11-007</u> 433 Camino Don Miguel	Approved with conditions	3-6
3. <u>Case #H 11-006</u> 520 José Street #2	Approved with conditions	6-12
 Matters from the Board	 None	 13
 Adjournment	 Adjourned at 6:20 p.m.	 13

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

February 8, 2011

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair
Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair
Mr. Dan Featheringill
Dr. John Kantner
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

One Vacancy

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Assistant City Attorney
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Historic Planning Department.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rasch said Case #H 11- 004 was postponed by staff until February 22.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the agenda as amended. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 25, 2011

Ms. Rios requested a change on page 11, 9th paragraph after "window" to add "and other features such as banisters."

Ms. Walker requested a change on page 2, under Approval of Minutes should said "Ms. Walker" instead of "Mr. Schreiber."

Dr. Kantner requested a change on page 20, middle of the page in the motion - The first condition should have added on the end, "and with brick coping."

Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of January 25, 2011 as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDINGS OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-10-115	1160 Camino Cruz Blanca	Case #H-11-002	617½A/B Acequia Madre
Case #H-09-069	130 Camino Escondido	Case #H-11-003	623 Garcia A & B
Case #H-10-066	1033 Old Pecos Trail	Case #H-11-005	125 Washington Avenue
Case #H-11-001	624 E. Alameda #B2		

Mr. Featheringill recused himself from this matter.

Ms. Walker asked if 11- 005 had brick coping in the findings. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as presented. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by 4-0 voice vote. Mr. Featheringill abstained.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

There were no administrative matters.

I. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-11-004** 1200 Old Pecos Trail. Historic Review District. Historic Preservation staff requests an historic status review of this non-statused property. (David Rasch)

This case was postponed under Approval of Agenda.

2. **Case #H-11-007.** 433 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gil Gonzales, agent/owner, proposes to construct an 869 sq. ft. addition to a height of 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14' on a non-contributing residence. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

433 Camino Don Miguel is a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style at an unknown date after 1945. A full-length portal was constructed on the street-facing elevation at an unknown date after 1966. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property by constructing an 859 square foot garage and guesthouse that will be attached to the existing residence at the non-historic portal by an offset roofed "breezeway." The addition will be 12' high where the maximum allowable height is 14'.

The addition will feature stepped massing with rounded edges, a roof-penetrating fireplace with sculpted chimney, and finish details that will match the residence.

An eyebrow over the east elevation sliding glass door shown on the elevation is not detailed on the

floor plan in reference to the depth. Therefore, staff is unable to determine if structural roof supports or vertical posts are needed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the condition that the eyebrow depth be discussed to confirm a design that meets protocols up to 18" or up to 4'.

He also called attention to a letter from Mr. Armijo who had a business across the street. [attached as Exhibit A]. It was not a zero lot line on the east. Also, if the garage didn't face the street the setback would be a minimum of 7' and this was proposed at 8.5' so it met zoning requirements.

Present and sworn was Mr. Gil Gonzales, 533 Cam Don Miguel. He had nothing to add to the staff report but said it was something he desperately needed.

Ms. Walker asked about the eyebrow depth.

Mr. Gonzales said it was about a foot deep.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch if where he had his house met all the proper criteria.

Mr. Rasch agreed. It met the underlying zoning standards and this Board had authority to grant approval based on design and harmony with the street scape.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Gonzales for the width on the south elevation - the separation of the setback.

Mr. Gonzales explained that on that wall there is no setback. What there was there was just the separation of the two heights. Each section was about 15' for a total of about 30'.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Chair Woods asked about length along street side.

Mr. Rasch said the west taller mass was 35.5' and the shorter mass was 9.25'.

Ms. Mather asked Mr. Gonzales if he had spoken with Mr. Armijo.

Mr. Gonzales said he had not and this was the first he heard of the concern. He said The only view Mr. Armijo had was into his living room. This would give him privacy. Everyone at Mr. Armijo's store could see all that he was doing at his home.

Ms. Mather shared his concern about fenestration. There was no distinguishing details on that building - just a blank wall. Whereas all the rest had windows or openings of some sort. On the plan it was plain.

Mr. Gonzales said he didn't put anything on the street façade so that people couldn't get into it. He said he could put in a feature that would not penetrate the building like a grill or matching something on the front. There was also landscaping with trees and vines. Only half of it would be visible.

Ms. Mather said as they drove down the street they felt it needed something.

Mr. Gonzales said he could do that but not a penetration like a window. He suggested a large nicho with wood grill.

Public Comment

Present and sworn was Ms. Polly Rose, 410 Camino Don Miguel. She said she lived just down the street from Johnny's store and Mr. Gonzales's buildings. She said he was a fine builder and had good tastes. She was pleased to see that the heights were not offensive.

She explained there was a death in the neighborhood and Mr. Armijo was at the rosary. She believed he could deal with the façade very well.

Her question was where the access to this building and the garage would be. She pointed out the driveway. Mr. Rasch said the access was over at the other side.

Ms. Brennan showed her the access on the plat.

Ms. Rose understood and thought it was okay as long as it didn't infringe on the other traffic. All the guys out working would come to Johnny's for tamales at noon. There was a lot of traffic. She had no objection to the project.

Ms. Rios wondered if a shallow nicho would work or if it just needed landscaping.

Ms. Walker thought it needed some relief - like the hotel at the last meeting.

Mr. Rasch said there was no specification on the depth in the motion on the hotel.

Mr. Featheringill noted the fence itself was six feet tall and would mitigate most of it. Trees could be planted.

Mr. Gonzales said he had a tree there and would much rather have that.

Ms. Walker asked if it would be an evergreen.

Mr. Gonzales didn't know yet what he would plant. Piñon would not be very tall. He had a fruit tree there now.

Dr. Kantner asked if the finish on the garage doors and windows would be stained or painted.

Mr. Gonzales said the garage door and window on the north would be wood stained with a color to match the woodwork on his existing house. On the east elevation he was hoping to use a bronze colored wood clad door.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case #H 11-007 per staff recommendations and the eyebrow not more than 12" deep, exterior lights back to staff and colors to match existing. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and asked for colors of the windows to be brought to staff. Mr. Featheringill agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-11-006.** 520 José Street #2. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Cody North, agent for Joseph De Stefano, owner, proposes to construct a 23 sq. ft. addition and perform other remodeling footprint rule (Section 14-5.2 (D) (2) (d)) and to enlarge an opening on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D) (5) (a)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

520 Jose Street #2 is a single-family residence that was constructed between 1935 and 1940 in a vernacular manner. In May 2007, the HDRB approved an exception to construct an addition on the west elevation at less than 10' back from the north elevation and denied a request to exceed the maximum allowable footprint by 67 square feet by reducing the size of the two additions to meet the 50% footprint rule. The building is listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District and the north elevation is designated as primary.

The applicant, a new owner, proposes to remodel the property with the following seven items.

1. A 23 square foot addition will be constructed on the south, non-primary elevation. The laundry addition will have no fenestration and it will match existing adjacent height. An exception to construct an addition that exceeds the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) is requested and the required criteria responses are appended to the end of this report.

2. An existing non-historic entry door on the primary north elevation will be removed and the opening enlarged for the installation of divided-light paired French doors with divided-light full sidelights. An exception to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)) is requested and the required criteria responses are appended to the end of this report.

3. Three eyebrows will be installed over the doorways. On the primary north elevation an "L"-shaped eyebrow will be supported with angled brackets and finished with metal that appears to be ProPanel. Two similar but smaller eyebrows will be installed over doors on the south elevation.

4. An existing non-historic vinyl window will be removed and replaced with a divided-light window in the same dimension and the non-historic doors will be replaced with wooden Dutch doors.

5. A 6" high stuccoed yardwall surmounted with an irregular-top latilla coyote fence with wooden pedestrian gate will be constructed at the north elevation to enclose the front courtyard.

6. A 6' high irregular-top latilla coyote fence with a coyote latilla pedestrian gate will enclose the back yard and a 6' high irregular-top latilla coyote fence will enclose the patio outside of the south elevation of the bedroom.

7. The courtyard in front of the north elevation and behind the proposed yardwall will be remodeled as a garden with the addition of a 550 square foot earth-toned concrete walk and patio that wraps around the north, east, and south sides of the building, more flagstone pavers to add to the existing flagstone for a 200 square foot courtyard at the northeast, and a 2' high moss rock wall to create a planter at the northeast lot corner.

Exception to exceed 50% footprint rule

(i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape;

The addition of this utility room will not be seen by the streetscape.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;

The existing dwelling does not have a utility room which presents a hardship. A very small existing stackable washer/dryer is presently contained in an undesirable location next to the toilet in the bathroom.

An on-demand hot water heater currently exists in the kitchen. This location makes an already small kitchen even smaller. When in use, the hot water heater is undesirably noisy in the kitchen and un-appealing. The electric breaker panel is currently located outside of the dwelling. There is no existing location for it inside. We would like to create an inside location for all electric circuit breakers in the utility room for safety, ease of use and for obvious security reasons. We would also utilize this location as a home run for all home security, and media low voltage requirements.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts;

Keeping the footprint of the utility room as small as possible is in keeping with the vernacular of the historic district. The positioning away from the streetscape preserves the contributing historic stature of the dwelling. A utility room is a necessary function in modern life and our very minimal addition would improve the experience of living in a contributing historic home.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;

The need for this minimal utility room addition is particular to this dwelling. Because of the size of the dwelling, there is no other solution or room to locate an interior utility room and all of its contents.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant; and

Modern living necessitates the use of washers/dryers, water heaters and internal electric and low-voltage panels. This is not a result of the actions of the applicant.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in §14-5.2(A)(1).

By doing the minimum footprint, locating it away from the streetscape, by not removing any historic materials in it's creation and positioning it on a non-contributing wall, we therefore believe this proposed addition has the least negative impact on this dwelling and helps to make this dwelling livable in modern lifestyle standards.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

Exception to alter opening dimensions on a primary elevation

(i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape;

This opening is positioned away from the front of the dwelling and behind a yard wall, thus minimizing the impact to the streetscape. We have investigated historic Santa Fe books, and have found identical entrances to what is being proposed. By using historical illustrations and historically accurate design and consultation, we will replace a 1970-1980s era mass-produced six-panel door that is damaged and will replace with one that is consistent with the look of historic dwellings of Santa Fe and Northern New Mexico.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;

The absence of a designated main entrance has made this dwelling uninviting and confusing. By proposing this exception, we will be restoring a more obvious main entrance that will be most welcoming and inviting. Because of the small nature in this dwelling in modern times and the climate of Santa Fe, there is a need to bring the outdoors - indoors and make this small dwelling warm and livable. We also look forward to bringing the indoors - outdoors through the use of a wider doorway and glass and the use of the attractively landscaped walled-in yard.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts;

After much investigation and research, we have identified an entrance design that will maintain the contributing historic nature of this Santa Fe dwelling and create a livable, modern lifestyle for the applicants.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are

not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;

Due to the layout of this dwelling, the only reasonable and attractive placement for a main entrance is through the courtyard and along this primary elevation. Because of the size of the dwelling, there is no other solution for a main entrance.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant; and

The fact that the existing door is of non-historic materials or design, and because it is warped and damaged which creates heat loss and access to insects and rodents, motivates this action and is not the result of neglect or any action of the applicant.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in §14-5.2(A)(1).

Because the applicant is interested in additively restoring historic features and removing non-historic features, i.e. doors and vinyl windows, while at the same time making this dwelling livable and up to modern lifestyle standards, this design is of least negative impact to the contributing historic nature of this dwelling.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the two exception requests to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District with the condition that the metal shed roof finish shall be standing seam or corrugated as more appropriate for this contributing historic structure.

Mr. Rasch showed the pedestrian gate design they wanted to emulate.

Ms. Rios asked if the doors were on the primary façade.

Mr. Rasch said the Board considered the north primary but could consider the east as well. It was the final part that had not been altered.

Chair Woods asked if it would lose its status if it was altered.

Mr. Rasch thought if the Board granted an exception to alter the primary elevation that it would keep contributing status.

Ms. Brennan said the Board should not grant it if it would lose its status and the Board could consider

that part of the code.

Chair Woods commented that this building had a lot of alterations so the question was if it would now make it lose its contributing status.

Mr. Rasch thought it might if they made the door opening wider.

Ms. Mather said the eyebrow also was altering that façade.

Mr. Rasch said they would be widening it and removing historic materials which were permanent changes but an eyebrow could easily be removed so it was reversible. But it would change the character.

Mr. Featheringill considered that if it changed the appearance of the building it changed the contributing status of the building.

Mr. Rasch agreed and said they had no portals or eyebrows on this vernacular building so it would be a new character.

Chair Woods concluded that in the list of what he wanted to do, changing the door was of concern and not the others.

Present and sworn was Mr. Cody North, 520 José Street. He said he was open to discussion and didn't know where to start. It sounded like the door was of most concern. He was trying to create an entryway that made it more livable and was trying to meet the criteria. He did a lot of investigation and met with Mr. Rasch. The owners have had it in their family a long time. His brother (who lived there) died and they wanted to keep it in the family. They found doors that were similar and were trying to create a warm and inviting entry to maintain its livability and keep its historic character. That was why they wanted to do the old fashioned screen doors (custom made). He said everyone thought the present door was from the 1970s or 1980s.

Chair Woods explained they couldn't grant an exception if it lost historic status. She said if the door opening was maintained, perhaps a side opening could help. That might be the best way to keep the status.

Mr. North said they were talking about doing the other wall as the primary elevation. He asked if that would help if they kept another elevation intact.

Chair Woods explained that this building had already gone through a whole lot of change and there was not much to save and the applicant was now asking for more change. The Board understood he wanted to make it more livable. This courtyard was historic.

Ms. Walker suggested to make it clear what the front door was, they might have some screening.

Mr. North said it was a kitchen door. He asked if it was acceptable if they stayed with a single door and

do two separate eyebrows.

Ms. Walker thought if he did just an eyebrow over the single door would that work.

Mr. North asked if they could do two separate eyebrows to make it possible to get out of the weather going into the kitchen.

Dr. Kantner said the Board would be much more willing to consider changes on the south elevation which was not primary. There was more latitude to work with that elevation. That was the only entrance on that façade. Mr. North agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods commented that there was a lot of concrete paving going on.

Mr. Rasch agreed and showed where it was on the site plan, besides the building alterations there was the coyote fence and gate and then some flagstone and a little wall around planter area . The entire back yard except a little area would be concrete.

Ms. Walker asked if it would be earth toned concrete.

Mr. Rasch said just the patio would be earth-toned.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-11-006, noting that the exception for the addition was accepted and that the exception to add double doors to the primary north elevation was not accepted because it would threaten the historic status and approving the eyebrows but not on the primary elevation and that on the north elevation it should retain its original opening dimension. Ms. Rios seconded the motion.

Ms. Walker asked if they needed the depth of eyebrows included.

Mr. Rasch said they were under four feet and had brackets.

Ms. Rios asked to clarify if they were talking about the eyebrows over the two doors.

Ms. Mather said they were on the south elevation at the living room and the bedroom doors but not on the north.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. North asked for an explanation since they were in a discussion about the front door and putting lights on each side and an eyebrow over that. Then all of a sudden that was not even an option.

Mr. Rasch said the proposal was approved except for changing the primary elevation opening or

putting eyebrows on the primary elevation. Everything else was approved.

Mr. North asked if he then had to keep that 1970's door.

Chair Woods thought if he wanted to change the door she thought he could bring that back to staff without changing the opening dimension and Mr. Rasch would determine if it needed to come back to the Board. It probably wouldn't since it was not an historic feature.

Mr. North asked then if the side lights did not get approved.

Chair Woods agreed that did not happen but the Board could vote to reconsider.

Ms. Rios asked Ms. Brennan if they could discuss that portion.

Mr. Brennan said the Board couldn't discuss that portion but could if the Board voted to reconsider and made a new motion.

Ms. Rios moved to reconsider the prior the motion. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 11-006 application as stated by Ms. Mather in her motion except that on the door that leads to the living room and side lights on both side could be take to staff for review and approval and an eyebrow over entry door. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion.

Mr. Rasch asked if the eyebrow for approval was only over the entry door or over both door and side lights.

Ms. Rios said only over the entry door.

Mr. Featheringill asked them if the eyebrow would just go over the width of door. Ms. Rios agreed.

Mr. Featheringill said it would be 4'x2'.

Chair Woods concluded that he could replace the door with the same opening dimension but have two side lights.

Mr. Featheringill asked for a friendly amendment to approve having corrugated or standing seam for the eyebrow. Ms. Rios agreed.

Chair Woods summarized there would be one 4' x 2' eyebrow over the existing opening and it would be either corrugated or standing seam and all of it would be taken to staff for approval.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

There were no matters from the Board.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer