TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes
Thursday, October 8, 2026
at 7:00 PM
Town Hall - 10 Court Street, Bristol Rhode Island

Written comments may be submitted to the Historic District Commission via regular mail addressed to:

Historic District Commission, Bristol Town Hall, 10 Court Street, Bristol RI 02809 or via email to ntoth@bristolri.gov

1. Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 7:00PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

In attendance: Lima, Church, Millard, Bergenholtz, Page, and Camara

Also in attendance: Town Solicitor Teitz, and Toth

Absent: Allen and Ponder

2. Staff Report

2A. Staff Report

3. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

3A. Review of minutes of the September 10, 2026 meeting.

Member Bergenholtz asked if anyone had any changes, questions, or additions to the minutes. Member Church's corrections were as follows: page 18, last paragraph, 3rd sentence down "he said there then would be a court summons" needed to be fixed to take out the word "then".

Motion made by Member Lima to accept the minutes of the September 10, 2026 meeting as amended; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

Voting Yea: Lima, Page, Millard, Bergenholtz, Church, and Camara

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4. Application Reviews

4A. 26-54: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten Discuss and Act on request to remove stone structure.

Applicant did not show.

Member Bergenholtz asked if it could be denied since it was the third time the applicant did not show up.

Motion made by Member Church to deny application #26-54 without prejudice as the applicant has failed to appear three times; Seconded by Member Page.

Voting Yea: Bergenholtz, Millard, Church, Lima, Camara, and Page

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4B. 26-113: 18 Burnside, 18 Burnside LLC Discuss and act on repair in kind of dormers, replacement of skylights in kind, replacement of cupola with replica in kind.

Member Millard recused.

Dean Nadalin of 9 Church Street representing 18 Burnside, LLC presented the application to the Commission. Member Bergeholtz acknowledged that there was a letter in the record allowing Mr. Nadalin to speak on behalf of the applicant. A discussion between the Commission members commenced thereafter.

Member Church asked if the facia boards, gutters, and roof shingles were covered by administrative approval. Nick Toth stated the gutters were going to be fiberglass which could be approved administratively, and the facia was to be repaired in kind which could be approved administratively as well. Mr. Toth said the roof was his most common administrative approval. Member Church

stated she didn't realize there was a new owner for the building as the last application listed a different owner and the application listed the use as all apartments in. She asked Mr. Nadalin if the use of the building was going to be mixed now and Mr. Nadalin stated that was the applicant's intent. Member Church said the Commission needed to approve of the new proposed use of the building. Member Bergenholtz thought it was the same owner that had presented the application previously. Member Church advised the Commission that it was a new owner.

Member Lima asked Attorney Teitz if the application needed to be presented to the Zoning Board before the HDC. Attorney Teitz said it was in a manufacturing zone so the applicant had to go to Zoning for the residential use but if it the building was to return to a commercial use, it probably wouldn't go to Zoning and probably from a historic preservation point of view it would actually be closure to its original use. Member Lima stated she meant if the applicant was going to make the building use into all residential, would the applicant then have to go to Zoning and Attorney Teitz said the applicant had already been to the Zoning Board.

Member Bergenholtz stated the application was really a repair in kind application and felt it really wasn't necessary to have been presented. Attorney Teitz said it was within Mr. Toth's jurisdiction not to approve something administratively and refer it to the Commission and given the scale of the application. Mr. Toth said realistically the only thing that Mr. Nadalin needed to come before the Commission for was the cupola, windows, and skylights as the they never approve of the windows and skylights administratively and the cupola was a reproduction. Member Bergenholtz stated everything seemed to be very straight forward to him.

Member Church asked if windows were all wood windows and Mr. Nadalin said yes. She also asked Mr. Nadalin if the panes would be the same and Mr. Nadalin said the panes would be the same as well. Member Church asked about what the windows in the back would be. Mr. Nadalin stated the windows in the back would be the Andersen windows. Member Church asked if the windows in back would also be wood and Mr. Nadalin said yes.

Alternate Member Camara asked Mr. Nadalin if the applicant had considered replacing the windows from the 1980s with the same type of windows that exist on the opposite side of the building. Mr. Nadalin said no because the windows on the other side of the building were completely different. He said the dormer on the north side had a different sash and number of windows.

Member Church asked if the purchase of the building include the warehouse that went all the way back. Mr. Nadalin said it was just the main building and the little addition on the south side, but not the warehouse. Member Church asked if the warehouse was sold and Mr. Nadalin didn't know the status of the warehouse.

Member Lima said although it would be an uphill battle, but commended Mr. Nadalin and the applicant for wanting to keep things the way they were on the building and felt it would be a wonderful addition to the area. Member Bergenholtz asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to come forward and speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward, Member Bergenholtz asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Page to approve application #26-113 the Herreshoff to repair leaks, in kind changes, replication of the cupola, skylights and facia, windows from the 1980s to be replaced; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

Voting Yea: Page, Lima, Church, Millard, Bergenholtz, and Camara

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 5, 6

Project Monitor: Bob Page

4C. 26-116: 439 Hope St, BEMS, LLC Discuss and act on installation of hanging sign for business on front of building.

Member Page recused.

Brent Maitland of 18 Sandra Drive presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then discussed the same.

Member Bergenholtz asked if any Commission members had any questions or comments.

Member Church asked Mr. Maitland why the proposed sign wasn't on a level with the existing sign? Mr. Maitland said it may be due to how it was shown on the rendering. Member Church stated the Commission needed to know. Mr. Maitland said the application stated 120 and Member Church advised Mr. Maitland that meant 120 inches and the Commission needed to know exactly where the sign would be installed. Mr. Maitland said it was just the perspective of the application. Member Church said it looked like the sign was being installed on the upper level which didn't look correct as the name of the building was part of the upper level.

Member Bergenholtz said the new sign looked like it was going to be installed on the parapet. Mr. Maitland understood what Member Bergenholtz meant and said that was not the goal to obscure the building name. Member Bergenholtz said the new sign should be equal to the other sign. Mr. Toth said the other sign was compliant with zoning height.

Member Bergenholtz asked if there were any other comments or questions. He stated that it wouldn't be a problem to drop the sign down to the correct spot. Mr. Maitland said he would be glad to confirm the placement of the sign. Member Church said it would be in the motion.

Member Bergenholtz asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. No one came forward and a motion was made.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application #26-16 for the installation of a sign with the stipulation that the sign was be installed on the same level as the existing sign to the north. The installation of the sign is to take place in the grout and not in the brick. The sign is to conform to the application design and measurements; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

Voting Yea: Church, Camara, Bergenholtz, Lima, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9, 10

Project Monitor: Sue Church

4D. 26-117: 549 Hope St, Peter Nunes Discuss and Act on demolition to addition on outbuilding, with remainder of building to be preserved, change of lot lines.

Peter Nunes of 4 Hopkins Lane, South Kingstown, RI, presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then discussed the same.

Member Lima clarified that Mr. Nunes was asked for the Commission's approval to demolish the side portion of the outbuilding while keeping the rest of the outbuilding, and then Ken Marshall would come back to the Commission to do a foundation and repair it. Mr. Nunes said that was correct, but the transfer of the property needed to be completed first. He stated it was a wonderful opportunity to preserve the structure.

Member Bergenholtz asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. Member Church asked Mr. Nunes if he knew when the outbuilding was built and Mr. Nunes was not sure of the year. Member Church said the hinges on the door looked unique.

Member Bergenholtz asked if anyone had any further questions or comments.

Attorney Teitz was very pleased with the overall motives but was concerned about the demolition in steps. He wondered if the removal of lean-to could be a condition of the restoration of main building. Attorney Teitz understood that it was something that would happen after the property was transferred. He wanted to see something more that would indicate that the other building was going to be restored rather than someone indicating that they hoped to restore it. Attorney Teitz was concerned about saving features like the chimney. Mr. Nunes stated there was a brick forge in the building and that's what the chimney was for. Attorney Teitz asked if the chimney was from the 20th century and Mr. Nunes said yes. Mr.

Nunes stated the whole building was from the 20th century. Member Church said it was in the barn portion of the building. Attorney Teitz stated there were no photographs of the interior that would allow for a determination of how old the building was. Member Church asked if there was a wall behind the lean-to. Mr. Nunes said the original wall of the barn was behind the lean-to. Alternate Member Camara stated in essences it was a 3-sided lean-to, and the 4th wall was the original part of the barn and Mr. Nunes said that was correct.

Member Church stated the approval of anything on a building goes with the building and not with the owner. She said the prospective owner could come before the Commission with the plans for the restoration and ask for the demolition of the shed. Member Church asked if the sale was contingent on the Commission's approval and Mr. Nunes said yes. She advised Mr. Nunes that he could come when the application for restoration is presented as the decision goes with building and not who owns it. Member Church was concerned that the new owner might change his mind about restoring the building. Mr. Nunes said he would have to apply if he changed his mind, but the new owner wanted it for storage. Member Church said Mr. Nunes could tear it down and felt the Commission should have the big picture before doing anything. Mr. Nunes stated the reason they wanted the permission to remove the lean-to was that it projected onto the property they were keeping.

Member Church had no objection to the removal of the lean-to but was worried about the future of the rest of the building. Mr. Nunes said it was the best case scenario for the building. He said the new owner was sincere about restoring the building. Mr. Nunes said they couldn't complete the sale unless it was agreed that they could remove the lean-to. He said the removal wouldn't be done before the transfer of the property; it would be done along with the restoration of the barn.

Member Church, pointing on the site plan, asked if the red line indicated what would be the new property line. Attorney Teitz said Mr. Nunes advised the Commission that there was already a lot but didn't see on the plan where it was indicated and asked where the existing property line was. Mr. Nunes approached Attorney Teitz and showed the location on the plan. Attorney Teitz stated the survey was not suitable for a subdivision as it didn't

show what existed and what's new, not just what's new. Mr. Nunes said it was an existing tax lot, but they were changing 1 boundary to encompass the barn.

Attorney Teitz asked if Mr. Marshall was buying the property on Hope Street and Mr. Nunes stated Mr. Marshall owned the property on Hope Street already. Attorney Teitz stated that there was no separate lot at all, they were just reconfiguring Mr. Marshall's lot. He was just asking for clarification as it was not clear on the plan. Mr. Nunes clarified that Mr. Marshall owned to the back of the Bristol restaurant building and Mr. Nunes owned the driveway and the barn.

Member Bergenholtz asked what the Commission was thinking of doing. Member Page felt because of the separation of the properties, it made sense for the lean-to to come down so the sale could go through and the barn be preserved. He appreciated everyone's concern about the preservation of the barn. However, Member Page stated the barn was a standing building and as long as only the lean-to was removed, the barn had a separate wall and they would have to come before the Commission for anything else. Everyone on the Commission was in agreement.

Member Lima as Attorney Teitz if that was okay. Attorney Teitz said it was up to the Commission. Member Page stated that razing it was not only appropriate, but it also gave an understanding of the property.

Attorney Teitz said what was important was the fact the barn had an exterior wall there already. He said it should be a condition of the demolition and a finding of fact so that it will not in any way endanger the existing barn by the removal of the lean-to.

Mr. Nunes said the soffit was still intact. Attorney Teitz said the Commission only had Mr. Nunes' testimony on that fact and nothing visual to back it up. Member Church said the Commission didn't have any interior pictures. Mr. Nunes didn't have any interior pictures.

Attorney Teitz stated that on page 42 of the application it could be seen where it looked like the roof of the barn overhangs the lean-to. He said it looked like the lean-to could be removed and the roof would stay intact

which would protect the soffit and the side of the building.

Member Bergenholtz asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward to speak, Member Bergenholtz asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Page to approve application #26-117 as presented for the removal of the lean-to with a finding of fact that the original wall of the barn is retained and exists. The property/lean-to has not required historic significance in its own right so it may be demolished; Seconded by Member Lima.

Voting Yea: Lima, Page, Camara, Millard, Church, and Bergenholtz

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 4

Project Monitor: Ory Lima

4E. 26-119: 217 Hope St, Tides Condominium Association
Discuss and Act on replacement of Slate roof with composite replacement material.

Jim Hurley and Bill Wood, residents of 217 Hope Street presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then had a discussion after the presentation of the application.

Member Church asked Mr. Hurley if he had the minutes from the Tides Condominium Association meeting in which the replacement of the roof was approved. Mr. Hurley said he had the minutes.

Mr. Wood showed a sample of the composite slate to the Commission. Mr. Hurley stated the brand name of the composite slate was F Wave classic slate composite shingle which had a 130mph wind rating and a 50yr manufacturer's warranty. Mr. Hurley stated it was a welcome solution to the slate roof issue at the Tides.

Member Bergenholtz stated the Commission had never approved it before. He was at Riverhead in Middletown and they had a similar product and he couldn't tell the difference. Member Bergenholtz' only concern was how long did it keep its look.

Steve Calabrese, representative for Hendersen Roofing, was present. He spoke in regard to the composite slate product. Mr. Calabrese said the life expectancy of the product was 50yrs. Member Page asked if that was without fading and Mr. Calabrese said yes. Mr. Calabrese stated there was a 50yr defect coverage on the product. Member Lima asked if there were any other roofs in Newport, Providence, etc., that had the product on them. Mr. Calabrese said there were several that he could forward links to for the Commission to see.

Member Church said the composite slate was not the same dimensions as the original slate. Mr. Calabrese said slate comes in many different shapes and sizes. Member Church asked Mr. Calabrese if the composite could match the rest of the roof slates. Attorney Teitz said the existing slate on the roof seemed to be much wider horizontally than the composite slate. Mr. Calabrese said the composite slate was going to be more narrow. Member Church said it wouldn't match the front of the building. Mr. Calabrese showed the Commission pieces of the original slate shingles evidencing that they were not hung horizontally and said that the Commission may have been looking at the image sideways.

Mr. Hurley stated the picture was taken of the back southwest corner of the building. Member Church said it was a distinct pattern, and the composite was going to look awkward. Member Lima said looking at the image on page 55 of the application, she felt the slate shingle may have been hung vertically and not horizontally. Member Bergenholtz suggested that the sample was from an end piece which was smaller than ones used in the middle.

Member Church asked if they had looked into replacing it with new slate shingles. Mr. Wood said the roof has been replaced with slate shingle before. Member Church stated St. Michael's Church replaced their roof with slate shingles. Mr. Wood stated that the Newport Catholic Group is replacing all of their slate with the composite product. Member Church said that was in Newport and they didn't know if it was in a historic district. Member

Church stated if the composite looked like the original slate roof, she would be more inclined to approve it.

Member Lima asked if the composite be configured in the way that the roof is shown in the image, i.e., could they be hung horizontally verses vertically. Mr. Calabrese said no. Member Millard said there wouldn't be any water coverage if the product was hung horizontally.

Alternate Member Camara said if they looked at page 54 and use the woodwork under the eve, it showed that the slate was a certain width. He stated the Commission was deceived by some of the close ups on page 55. Member Church said it looked like there were slate replacements that were not the same size. Alternate Member Camara said there were repairs over the years but felt they were off the mark by thinking the tiles were 1ft long.

Member Bergenholtz wanted to poll the Commission members to see how they felt about the composite material. Member Lima wanted a financial comparison as to the cost of the actual slate verses the composite.

Mr. Calabrese offered to show pictures from his phone of completed projects. Attorney Teitz said since it was a public hearing and the Commission needed to have physical evidence and having it on his phone didn't help at this point. Member Bergenholtz stated the issue was if it went through the Commission was the precedence that it would set for future applications for slate roofs in the district and they needed to be cautious. The Commission wanted more information and pictures. Alternate Member Camara said they needed measurements as well. Member Bergenholtz stated if there were other products available that might look closer to the slate, then that should be presented as well. Attorney Teitz advised Mr. Hurley and Mr. Calabrese to provide the specific addresses of other projects so the Commission members could go look at them as everyone was curious about the results. Member Bergenholtz stated he would like to drive to a location and look at it for himself.

Robin Foster who lived at the Tides on the 1st floor came forward to speak. She advised the Commission that she could not sit outside because some slates had fallen. Ms. Foster had hired someone to fix some slates above her area to prevent any further damage. She said it was an accident waiting to happen. Attorney Teitz asked if the

slates were original to the building and Ms. Foster believed they were original to the building. Attorney Teitz stated the slates were approximately 125yrs old which was about 25yrs past their lifespan and it wasn't a question of whether they needed to be replaced. He stated if the Association wanted to replace the roof with new slate, then they could get the permit administratively. However, the issue was that the Association wanted to do something different.

Mr. Hurley stated the estimate was over $500,000 for real slate shingles. Member Millard said there needs to be a consideration that this was not for an organization but rather people's homes. Attorney Teitz respectfully disagreed and said the Commission shouldn't take that into consideration. He said the value of it would go back into the building. Attorney Teitz said the new slate would last for 100yrs and that was the value aspect of it. He stated the cost of it was not really a reason for granting or denying it.

Member Bergenholtz said the new product would change the overall look of the property as it was a major character-defining feature. Mr. Wood said historically there were less and less companies that were repairing and doing slate roofs. He stated 50 to 100yrs from now there may not be anyone doing them.

Member Bergenholtz said the Commission was in agreement. Attorney Teitz asked if the Commission wanted to do a site visit. Member Church said that was going to be a bit difficult. Attorney Teitz said it would be visible enough from the street. Mr. Calabrese stated looking at it from the street was different than looking at it up close. He said when looking up at it, it does look horizontal but looking at it up close it looks square because of the overlapping tile rows.

Member Bergenholtz said that's why he wanted to visit another finished project to see what it looked like. Mr. Toth asked Mr. Calabrese to send him addresses of finished projects. Member Bergenholtz didn't think a site visit was necessary. Attorney Teitz suggested a motion to continue the application to the November meeting.

Motion made by Member Bergenholtz to continue application #26-119 to the November 5, 2026 meeting; Seconded by Member Lima.

Voting Yea: Bergenholtz, Lima, Millard, Church, Page, and Camara

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4G. 26-122: 25 Byfield St, Mary Ann Pellegrino Discuss and act on replacement of non-original windows.

Mary Ann Pellegrino presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then discussed the matter after the presentation.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Toth if he went out to the property and looked at the windows. Mr. Toth said he was not able to make it out to the property, but the photographs showed that the windows were in bad shape. Attorney Teitz asked Ms. Pellegrino when the windows that she wanted to replace were put in. Ms. Pellegrino said they were put in over 7 years ago.

Member Church said the house was built in 1780 and obviously the windows were not all original but all wood windows. She stated the house was a contributing house in the district. Ms. Pellegrino said she was going to keep the configuration 6 over 1. Member Bergenholtz stated the original windows wouldn't have been a 6 over 1 configuration.

Member Church wasn't against the windows being replaced but felt the windows should be all wood windows. Mr. Toth said that hadn't been the standard practice, and the new Standards Guide said a compatible substitute such as composite metal clad windows were allowable. Member Church stated the existing windows were wood and Mr. Toth said that the standards state if the windows can't be repaired then those other windows were suitable.

Ms. Pellegrino said that over the kitchen sink she couldn't get the insert to work to get air into the kitchen. She hired a handyman who charged her over $300 to take the piece apart and put it back so she could take the insert out and put it back. Ms. Pellegrino said the

handyman wanted $800 to do both sides. She stated it didn't make sense to throw more money at bad windows.

Member Lima asked Mr. Toth what it meant at the bottom of the cover sheet where it said alternations to major architecture since 1978 height, massing, wall covering, trim, windows, porches, and wood clapboards replaced with wood shingles by 1988 survey. She asked Mr. Toth if that meant that some of the windows had been replaced. Mr. Toth said that was just a standard field/specific field that he pulled from the survey and the "siding has been replaced since 1988" was the non-form part. Ms. Pellegrino stated that none of the windows had been replaced. She said she had replaced some of the flashing which hadn't worked.

Member Bergenholtz asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Member Church said the property was part of survey that was done in 1986 and was part of state record. She stated it was a major contributing property and 1 of the oldest houses in Bristol.

Member Bergenholtz asked if the Commission had approved of Andersen windows before. Mr. Toth said they had, especially Andersen 400 series. Attorney Teitz asked if the Andersen 400 was available in all wood. Ms. Pellegrino said no and Mr. Toth wasn't sure. Member Lima asked if the windows were original to the house. Ms. Pellegrino said they were not, but rather replacement windows.

Member Bergenholtz asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward to speak, Member Bergenholtz asked for a motion.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application #26-122 as presented for the replacement of windows which are not original to the building; Seconded by Member Lima.

Voting Yea: Camara, Lima, Page, Bergenholtz, and Millard

Opposed: Church

Motion carries 5 to 1

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Bob Camara

Member Lima asked Ms. Pellegrino to place the permit in the front of the house where visible. Ms. Pellegrino said she would put it on the front door.

5. Concept Review

6. Monitor Reports & Project Updates

Member Page advised the Commission that Blithwold was doing a great job on the greenhouse, and everyone should go by to look at it.

Member Lima had questioned the height of the greenhouse but looked at a book she had about Blithwold, and it showed the original greenhouse and it was that big.

Member Page stated they were doing a great job and it was going to be great.

7. HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates

Mr. Toth advised the Commission that he was working with Attorney Teitz on 224 Hope Street to resolve that issue. He said 1200 Hope Street was also going to receive a violation. Member Lima asked what 224 Hope Street was about, and Mr. Toth said it was the window trim issue on the brick house.

7A. Purchase of Tablets The Town is working to purchase tablets for commissioners to use during meetings.

Mr. Toth advised the Commission that the Town was going to be purchasing tablets for the Commissioners. Member Bergenholtz asked if the Commission had a say in it and Mr. Toth said no. Member Lima said she didn't need one. Mr. Toth said the Town was spending far too much money on preparing packets for everyone. The Commission members were not in favor of the idea but were going to see how it played out. Mr. Toth said it was for all of the Boards. Attorney Teitz asked if the Town could try to purchase the largest size tablets they could get so it was easier to read. Member Church asked if everyone would get a tablet to take home. Mr. Toth said the

tablets were to be shared by all Commissioners so the tablets would not be taken home by anyone. Member Lima asked if they could use their own iPad instead and Mr. Toth said yes. She didn't have a problem with using a tablet but spending a significant amount of time at home working on it when they're volunteers was pushing the envelope. Attorney Teitz suggested that since the applications are submitted electronically, the Commission should utilize the display screens available in Town Hall to display the application packages during the meetings for everyone to see. He said that displaying it on the bigger screens would help everyone see what the applicants were requesting easier.

Member Church advised Mr. Toth again that he needed to be very specific to applicants about everything the applicant needed to submit electronically. Mr. Toth said he was doing his very best to guide applicants but there was only so much he could do. He said Planning and Zoning have similar problems with their applications not being complete. Mr. Toth stated he couldn't make an applicant make a good application but rather make a complete application. Member Lima said when an application gets postponed or continued or denied, then an applicant would shape up. She stated it wouldn't take much for an applicant to sit up and take notice. Member Lima said if an applicant wasn't completing the application the way they should and the Commission didn't vote on it, then people would learn quickly that they need to do it correctly in order to get the desired results. Attorney Teitz said tablets and the use of the big display screens would make it easier for everyone to see the finer details of the plans and application.

8. HDC Coordinator Approvals

9. Other Business

Mr. Toth advised the Commission that the Town received a 2026 CLG grant in the amount of $9,000 to do the Standards Guide design. He said it was going to be out to bid and hopefully it was going to be Arnold Robinson again. He stated it was to do the outline, graphics, and everything to make it pretty. Mr. Toth said the next CLG will be in the spring which would be for mapping on the Town Common to figure out where all of the bodies were buried.

Motion was made by Member Lima to adjourn; Seconded by Member Page

10. Adjourned at 8:17PM