

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
January 6, 2017**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Guarino, Chair and the roll was called by the Secretary.

**PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon**  
**ABSENT: Salmon**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

- HDRC Commissioner Work Session - February 1, 2017 - 12:00 PM  
- Historic Wood Window Repair Certification Class - February 3 and 4 - Richter House -Hemisfair Park  
- Realtor Training - February 14, 2017 - Plaza de Armas

- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                               |                       |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-532 | 110 GLORIETTA         |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2015-380 | 225 W MISTLETOE       |
| • Item # 3 Case No 2016-537   | 138 S JOSEPHINE TOBIN |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-534 | 823 OGDEN ST          |

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve the Consent Agenda with staff recommendations based on the findings.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**5. HDRC NO. 2016-470**

Applicant: Cibrian Properties LLC

Address: 419 N HACKBERRY ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a single family house to feature approximately 1,470 square feet on the vacant lot at 419 N Hackberry.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a single family house to feature approximately 1,470 square feet on the vacant lot at 419 N Hackberry.

b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee on December 14, 2016. At that meeting commissioners commented on the proposed foundation heights, setbacks, materials and fenestration patterns.

d. This request was to be heard at the December 21, 2016. The applicant was not present at that hearing and the HDRC made a motion to postpone the case to a later hearing.

January 6, 2017

e. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback of 8’ – 6” from the property line parallel with Glorietta and approximately 10’ – 0” from the property line parallel with N Hackberry. Average setbacks from the public right of way along Glorietta are greater than twenty (20) feet. Staff recommends the applicant provide a site plan noting the proposed new construction’s setbacks as well as the setbacks of adjacent structures.

f. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward N Hackberry. Along N Hackberry, historic structures on corner lots are oriented toward both N Hackberry and the secondary street. Staff finds the proposed entrance orientation appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a single story structure with an overall height of approximately twenty (20) feet in height. The historic structure in the immediate vicinity feature comparable heights. The applicant’s proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundations. The applicant has proposed a minimal foundation height of approximately 1’ – 3”. Historic structures throughout Dignowity Hill commonly feature foundation heights of up to eighteen inches in height. Staff finds the applicant’s proposed foundation heights appropriate.

i. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a roof form that includes both elements of a front gabled roof and a side gabled roof. Both roof forms are found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines.

j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are generally appropriately sized. Staff recommends the applicant consider installing additional window openings.

k. **LOT COVERAGE** – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant’s proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

l. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials to include an asphalt shingle roof and Hardi board siding. The applicant has not specified window or door materials. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows that are inset at least two (2) inches within each wall. Staff recommends the applicant refer to the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document for additional guidance on window installation.

m. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the applicant has proposed architectural forms that are consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the proposed front porch features columns that are inappropriately scaled and placed.

n. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has not noted the location and screening of mechanical equipment. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment from view of the public right of way.

o. **DRIVEWAY** – There is currently a curb cut, apron and concrete driveway approach on Glorietta. The applicant has proposed to maintain this existing configuration.

p. **SIDEWALK** – The applicant has proposed a front yard sidewalk to lead from the front porch to the public right of way along N Hackberry. Historically, front yard sidewalks were centered on the structure’s façade or on the structure’s front porch. The applicant has proposed neither. Staff recommends the applicant revise the proposed front sidewalk design and location. The sidewalk should feature a width found historically throughout the district.

q. **LANDSCAPING** – At this time, the applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through q with the following stipulations:

January 6, 2017

- i. That the applicant revise the proposed front porch design to include appropriately scaled and placed columns.
- ii. That the applicant include additional window fenestration.
- iii. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment.
- iv. That the provide staff with additional information regarding window materials and window installation.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** LuLu Francois spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for conceptual approval with a stipulation that the applicant place windows on either side of the door, that the applicant increase the width of the column size & that the length is increased on the windows including staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Connor, Garza, Garcia, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**6. HDRC NO. 2016-456**

Applicant: Christopher Gill

Address: 312 BURLESON

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Repair the existing wood windows.
2. Repair the existing front porch.
3. Construct a rear addition.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 312 Burleson was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and is found on the 1912 Sanborn map. The structure features many traditional elements including a front gabled roof as well as a side gabled roof and a raised front porch.
- b. The applicant has received administrative approval for various rehabilitative items including the removal of a non-original rear addition, the removal of metal siding, foundation repair, roofing repair and repair to existing wood siding. In addition to the previously noted administratively approved items, the applicant has proposed to repair the existing, wood windows. The applicant has noted that where non-repairable, windows will be replaced. Staff finds the repair of the wood windows appropriate.
- c. ORIGINAL MATERIALS – Many of the historic structure’s historic materials remain, including wood siding and wood architectural elements. Staff finds that all existing, original elements should be repaired and preserved including wood siding, wood trim, wood windows, wood doors and any other original architectural elements. Where the original materials are no longer existing, in kind materials are to be installed.
- d. PORCH RECONSTRUCTION – The porch at 312 Burleson features a concrete foundation, wrought iron columns and shed porch roof. The applicant has proposed to install square porch columns, a wood porch floor and per the elevations, the applicant has proposed to retain both front door openings and transom windows. Staff finds the replacement of the existing wrought iron columns appropriate as well as the installation of wood decking over the existing concrete porch. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to install solid wood doors in each opening. Staff finds this installation appropriate.
- e. PORCH COLUMNS – The applicant has provided information to staff regarding the installation of front porch columns, noting the installation of 6x6 inch wood columns with 4x1 inch trim at the capital and base. Staff finds this installation appropriate because the existing columns are not original and the original columns no longer exist; however, staff finds that the applicant should install columns that include chamfered corners.
- f. FOUNDATION SKIRTING – The applicant has proposed to install stucco skirting. The original skirting is not present; however, staff finds this installation of wood skirting or cement siding dimensioned as wood skirting appropriate.
- g. ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public

January 6, 2017

right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has properly located the proposed addition and has proposed a roof form that is similar to the historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to inset the addition to differentiate it from the existing historic structure.

h. **SCALE, MASS & FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature an overall roof height that matches that of the primary historic structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.B., additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the primary historic structure and should feature a height that is less than that of the historic structure. While the applicant has proposed a matching roof height, the applicant has proposed other design elements that will differentiate the proposed addition from the existing historic structure. Staff finds this appropriate.

i. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials for the addition that include wood siding, wood or metal windows, a standing seam metal roof and period appropriate doors. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant provide a door to be approved by staff prior to installation.

j. **REAR ELEVATION** – Staff finds that the proposed rear elevation lacks sufficient fenestration. Staff finds that the applicant should install window fenestration on the rear façade as well as install a window beneath the rear roof gable, which is architecturally appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of item #1 through #3 based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant introduce fenestration to the addition's rear façade including the installation of a window beneath the rear facing roof gable.
- ii. That the applicant repair all existing, original materials including windows, siding, doors and wood elements. Where original materials are no longer existing, in kind materials are to be installed.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Justin Flores spoke in support to the applicant's request.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**7. HDRC NO. 2016-457**

**Applicant:** Christopher Gill/CGRE Ltd Co

**Address:** 721 BURLESON ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

- 1. Rehabilitate the historic structure including the installation of a standing seam metal roof, foundation repair, siding repair and wood window repair.
- 2. Reconstruct the front porch.
- 3. Construct a rear addition..

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 721 Burleson was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and is found on the 1912 Sanborn map. The structure features many traditional elements including a front gabled roof as well as a side gabled roof, a raised front porch and a standing seam metal roof.

b. Work began on the historic structure located at 721 Burleson prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. On Wednesday, September 21, a stop work order was issued for the demolition of the existing front porch. A second stop work order was issued on Saturday, October 1, for the construction of a rear addition without a Certificate of Appropriateness. All necessary post work application fees have been paid.

January 6, 2017

c. REPAIR & MAINTENANCE – The applicant has proposed a number of repair and maintenance scopes of work which includes the repair of the historic wood windows, the installation of a new standing seam metal roof, the repair of wood siding to match the existing and foundation repair. The applicant's proposed scope of work is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Regarding the proposed new roof, the applicant should ensure that panels are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.

d. ORIGINAL MATERIALS – Many of the historic structure's historic materials remain, including wood siding and wood architectural elements. Staff finds that all existing, original elements should be repaired and preserved including wood siding, wood trim, wood windows, wood doors and any other original architectural elements. Where the original materials are no longer existing, in kind materials are to be installed.

e. PORCH RECONSTRUCTION – The existing porch at 721 Burseson featured a concrete foundation, round, nonoriginal replacement columns and a roof structure that was in disrepair. This existing porch was demolished without a Certificate of Appropriateness. At this time, the applicant has proposed to reconstruct the front porch. The applicant has proposed a front porch foundation height of 1' – 3" and a shed porch roof. Both of these items are architecturally appropriate.

f. PORCH RECONSTRUCTION – Per the applicant's architectural documents, the existing side front porch door is to be retained as well as the transom windows. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A.i., existing window and door openings should be preserved. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

g. PORCH COLUMNS – The applicant has provided information to staff regarding the installation of front porch columns, noting the installation of 6x6 inch wood columns with 4x1 inch trim at the capital and base. Staff finds this installation appropriate because the existing columns are not original and the original columns no longer exist; however, staff finds that the applicant should install columns that include chamfered corners.

h. FOUNDATION SKIRTING – The applicant has provided updated construction documents that note the installation of siding as skirting to match the profile of the existing siding of the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

i. ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition of approximately 480 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a rear gable roof and has proposed an inset and siding change for the addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

j. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature an overall roof height that exceeds that of the historic structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.B., additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the primary historic structure and should feature a height that is less than that of the historic structure. The applicant has proposed a height that is consistent with the height of the primary historic structure, however, the applicant has proposed to inset the addition and use a different siding profile for the addition. Staff finds this appropriate.

k. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials for the addition that include wood siding, wood or metal windows, a standing seam metal roof and period appropriate doors. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows, and a standing seam metal roof that is consistent with the primary historic structure's roof.

Additionally, staff recommends the applicant provide a door to be approved by staff prior to installation.

l. REAR ELEVATION – Staff finds that the proposed rear elevation lacks sufficient fenestration. Staff finds that the applicant should install window fenestration on the rear façade.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install a standing seam metal roof throughout that features that panels are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.
- ii. That the applicant introduce fenestration to the addition's rear façade.
- iii. That the applicant repair all existing, original materials including windows, siding, doors and wood elements. Where original materials are no longer existing, in kind materials are to be installed.

#### **CASE COMMENT:**

January 6, 2017

Work on the proposed scope of work began prior to approval. All necessary HDRC application fees have been paid.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** Lulu Francois, Justin Flores spoke in opposition of the applicant's request

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval with staff stipulations and an additional stipulation that the applicant submit a revised drawing of the proposed site plan with the rear window & the existing window on the east elevation.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**8. HDRC NO. 2016-488**

Applicant: Ricardo McCullough

Address: 215 CLAUDIA ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Demolish an existing rear addition featuring 298 square feet.
2. Remove all burglar bars and front ramp handrails.
3. Install new front porch columns.
4. Construct a rear addition of 1,036 square feet with a rear section featuring a three car garage and a second level dwelling unit.
5. Replace the existing wood windows with vinyl windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 215 Claudia was constructed circa 1910 and appears on the 1912 Sanborn maps. The structure is of the Folk Victorian style, featuring a front porch which spans the entire front façade of the structure, two brick chimneys, front and side roof gables and a rear addition. Per the 1912 Sanborn map, this historic structure originally featured a wraparound porch that has since been partially closed to provide additional interior space on the north side of the front façade. The applicant has proposed to demolish the existing rear addition, install new front porch columns, remove the existing front ramp railing, construct a rear addition and a rear garage and dwelling unit at the rear of the proposed new addition.
- b. This request was to be heard at the December 21, 2016. The applicant was not present at that hearing and the HDRC made a motion to postpone the case to a later hearing.
- c. **DEMOLITION** – The rear of the primary historic structure features an addition that the applicant has proposed to demolish. The addition features horizontal siding and a roof form that is not consistent with that of the primary historic structure. The applicant's proposal to demolish this existing addition is appropriate.
- d. **REHABILITATION** – The primary historic structure currently features burglar bars on the windows and doors as well as a non-original front ramp that features a guardrail. The applicant has proposed to remove each of the existing burglar bars as well as the front ramp guardrails. Staff finds this appropriate.
- e. **COLUMN REPLACEMENT** – The primary historic structure currently features steel front porch columns that the applicant has proposed to replace. The applicant has proposed to install hollow fiberglass columns around the existing steel columns. As mentioned in finding a, the primary structure originally featured a wraparound porch which has since been enclosed. The enclosure of this porch has resulted in an uneven column placement. Staff finds that the installation new columns appropriate; however, the applicant should provide additional information regarding the proposed new columns including a detailed drawing that notes appropriate massing and detailing.
- f. **ADDITION** – At the immediate rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition to feature 1,036 square feet. The Guidelines for additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed to construct the addition in a manner that would extend the hipped roof of the primary historic structure to serve as the roof of the addition. The Guidelines in regards to scale and massing note that an

January 6, 2017

addition's roof should be subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **TWO STORY SECTION** – At the rear of the primary historic structure and attached to the single story portion of the proposed addition, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear two story addition that is to feature a ground level garage to provide parking for three vehicles and a second level that is to house a dwelling unit. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way. Additionally, the Guidelines note that residential additions should be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block. This block of Claudia features approximately twelve primary historic structures, of which only one features two stories. Staff finds the applicant's proposed two story addition is not consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has provided a line of sight study noting the impact of the structure's height from the public right of way.

h. **TWO STORY SECTION** – The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature large overhead rolling garage doors, a north wall that lacks fenestration on the ground level and a west elevation that lacks fenestration for a large part of both the ground and second levels. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.

i. **ADDITION FENESTRATION** – The applicant has provided elevations of the proposed addition that feature a left façade that features only one small window opening. The Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i. states that the shapes of window opening should relate to those of the primary historic structure. Staff finds that the applicant should propose additional fenestration on this façade.

j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include a standing seam metal roof to match the existing, wood trim, siding and vinyl windows. At this time, the applicant has not specified a siding material or profile. Staff recommends the applicant install siding that features like materials and profiles as that of the primary historic structure. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant install wood windows in the proposed addition to be consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.

k. **WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has noted in the application documents that the existing wood windows in the primary historic structure will be removed and replaced with vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. states that historic windows should be preserved. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant restore the existing windows. If an original window is missing or beyond repair, the applicant should install a wood window with a matching profile.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings b and c.  
Staff does not recommend approval of items #3 through #6 based on findings d through j.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** Cherise Bell spoke in opposition to the applicants request

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone for approval of items 1, 2, 3 and denial of item 4.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**9. HDRC NO. 2016-206**

Applicant: Jose Nieves

Address: 1520 N MAIN AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install one 5' x 2.5' metal wall sign on the primary façade facing N Main to the right of the front entrance.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant was scheduled to be heard December 7, 2016, but asked to be postponed to December 21, 2016. The applicant was not present at the December 21, 2016 hearing, and the commission postponed the case to be heard January 6, 2017.

January 6, 2017

b. The building is mid-century style and is contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District which was designated in 2008.

c. Staff made a site visit November 22, 2016, and found the proposed signage is not scaled appropriately for the building, and that there are other signs existing on the multi-tenant building. The proposed sign is of a different color and character than the existing. Staff recommends that a master signage plan is developed for the building to ensure that all signs are coordinated in design and placement.

d. The proposed sign will be 5' x 2' metal and will be mounted on a façade that features original brick material, underneath the exiting wall sign. According to the Guidelines for Signage, signs should complement the character of the district or the building and should not obscure or damage original features or materials. The guidelines recommend that signs be made of durable materials, such as wood or aluminum. The proposed signage is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage in terms of materials and number of colors. However, staff finds the size and placement of the proposed sign, in addition to the existing sign, would overwhelm and distract from the character of the building.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through d. Staff recommends that a master signage plan is developed for the building to ensure that all signs are coordinated in design and placement.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to deny with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to Adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor & seconded by Commissioner Cone to adjourn.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Feldman, Lazarine, Cone, Laffoon, Grube**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:57 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair