

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
PUBLIC MEETING  
Town Hall  
Provincetown MA

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2018**

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman, Pilgrim Monument Rep; Marcene Marcoux (MM), Vice Chair, Chamber of Commerce Rep.; Laurie Delmolino, Historical Commission Rep.; John Dowd (JD), PBG Rep.; Hersh Schwartz, Alternate; Michela Carew-Murphy (MCM), Alternate.

Others Present: Annie Howard (AH), Building Commissioner.

TB called the meeting to order at 3:40pm.

**1. Work Session: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN**

**a) Vote to approve 2019 HDC Schedule.**

TB referred to the meeting schedule and the upcoming HDC-hosted FEMA meeting on Tuesday, December 11<sup>th</sup>; suggested scheduling a work meeting to catch up on minutes and decisions before the end of the year.

TB made a motion to accept the 2019 schedule. HS seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, HS, MM, JD, MCM.

**b) Update on potential violations reported to the Building Commissioner.**

AH reported the substantial amount of rain since September has resulted in a fair amount of leaking roofs and that she has issued some emergency repair work permits, such as at the Harbor Lounge.

TB asked after the work done at Pat DeGroot's house. AH said she spoke to the people who have done the work, such as stripping off the front entry and using Azek corner-boards. TB said he wouldn't want to see them having to re-do work already done because they haven't appeared before the HDC.

TB cited a violation at 350 Bradford in that a bronze plaque indicating the site as a former Howard Johnson's that was previously a condition of the HDC'S approval of a demolition delay is not up and AH said she still has not issued any Certificate of Occupancies nor has she closed any permits; said there are still some Planning Board requirements to be fulfilled and that the Open Houses they're conducting are still permissible regardless of these issues.

TB noted that a coupe of windows had gone up at Ciro & Sal's. AH said she received notice from the abutter as well as from MM, but it is as yet unclear if the trim is wood and how long the 1-over-1 window on the gable end has existed; reported that the owner said he hadn't changed the window.

**c) Determination as to whether the applications below involve any Exterior Architectural Features within the jurisdiction of the Commission; with Full Reviews to be placed on the Public Hearing agenda of Dec. 5 2018, and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.**

TB made a motion to consider the following as Administrative Review:

ii) 16 MacMillan Wharf; iii) 379 Commercial St.; iv) 381 Commercial St.; v) 151 Commercial St.; vi) 18 Pleasant St., #3; viii) 49 Bradford St., #11; ix) 49 Bradford St., #9; xi) 1 High Pole Hill Rd.

JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, LD, HS.

i) 99 Commercial St (*continued from the meeting of November 7*) – To repair window glass and replace roofing and siding shingles.

Thor Baum presented; said the idea is to replace everything like-for-like, all windows wood and rubber roof to remain rubber.

MM said she felt the application is vague without specs and an indication of exactly what is being repaired. JD said that if an applicant is claiming to be replacing in kind, then it should be approved; said he had this unit for five years and that it was in trouble in the face of the elements ten years ago.

MCM said she is abstaining from voting, but said she contacted the owner as she is representing the majority Trustee and has requested but not received details on the scope of the work and noted that there are outstanding violations.

LD confirmed with Mr. Baum that the replacements were all in kind and said that if this is the case then the HDC can condition the approval.

HS noted that this is the same paperwork the HDC received at the last meeting, to which AH said is why Mr. Baum is present – to answer questions.

TB led the review through each elevation, asked of the wood window on the east elevation, to which Mr. Baum said yes to a wood replacement if it was determined to need it, as with the wood door; said he expected the portal windows to remain as is; water side replacements to be replaced and hinged in the same way, if needed, and hardware would be re-used where possible; glass behind the plywood replaced and no plans to replace anything on the north side.

TB said there is no information on the west elevation, which MCM said is currently covered in plastic.

MM said she felt the application should be considered as Full Review due to the vagueness of the plans submitted in that it remains as an unknown specifically what is being replaced in kind and what materials are to be used. Mr. Baum responded that his intention to honor his word in terms of what he has stated is a replacement in-kind.

TB took a poll to continue or vote today then broke the tie; said that he felt the job would truly be in kind and that with winter coming upon us the application should be considered as an Administrative Review.

TB made a motion to consider as Administrative Review. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 3-2: TB, LD, JD in favor; MM, HS opposed.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that any door or window that is to be replaced would need to be in-kind, in wood, and plans submitted per specifications. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 3-2-0: TB, JD, LD in favor; MM, HS, opposed.

- ii) 16 MacMillan Wharf – To install anew rubber roof.

No one presented.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, LD, HS.

- iii), iv) 379-381 Commercial St. – To replace 2 doors in kind; re-side and to replace trim./To replace roofing shingles. Bull Ring, double-lot.

No one presented.

MM noted Azek. AH said 371 is actually 381 Commercial St.

TB made a motion to approve as presented with the condition that the trim is wood. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, LD, JD, HS.

- v) 151 Commercial St. – To replace roofing shingles.

No one presented.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, LD, HS.

- vi) 18 Pleasant St., #3 – To replace siding shingles.

No one presented.

JD asked, per the photo submitted, which section was under approval garage or main section. TB said it appeared that shingles would be the back building.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, LD, JD, HS.

- vii) 256 Bradford St. – To replace 9 windows in kind.

Brad Sprinkle, contractor, and David Maril, owner, presented.

Mr. Sprinkle said they may have misspoken in stating “in-kind” in that they are hoping to put in vinyl window replacements, not wood; said the house is vinyl-sided with aluminum cladding.

Mr. Maril said he planned to move to town year-round next year and that the building is the original post office; said windows to be modernized to keep out the wind are replacements from about 20-25 years ago and that they are looking to remove the storm window and hope to preserve the house into its third and fourth centuries; added that most of the windows to be replaced are not visible from the street as there is a 10’ hedge around the property.

TB noted that the 6-over-6 configurations to be replaced are currently wood. MM said her concern was putting in vinyl on an important building. Mr. Maril replied that about ten years ago the HDC approved replacing the wood exterior of the house with vinyl.

Mr. Sprinkle said they would apply simulated divided lites and TB said the remaining question was if the vinyl would be acceptable. MCM said she would accept wood or clad. TB, MM and HS all said they were a bit torn on the window replacement request in this case and TB added that there's a chance the windows will outlast the siding, so they need to think down the road.

Mr. Maril said that since his father, an artist, bought the house in 1958, a studio has been added, the roof raised several times, windows changed out and an expanded bathroom installed, so that the house has been re-vamped five or six times from when it was on Long Point, to which TB responded that a part of the HDC'S mandate is to push the property back in the right direction when modifications may have been made inappropriately; said he would recommend clad windows.

HS said she is against the request in principle, but as the building has been altered as such through the years, she could approve in this case. LD remarked that none of the current windows are the originals and JD said he was fine with it as long as the muntins are exterior-applied and not sandwiched. MM noted the visibility of an old, historic house regardless of the hedges and the change to vinyl from wood as problematic.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that the windows be simulated divided lite and to allow the vinyl. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: TB, LD, JD, HS in favor; MM opposed.

viii) 49 Commercial St., #11. – To repair cedar shingles.

No one presented.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, LD, JD, HS.

ix) 49 Commercial St., 9 – To replace cedar shingles.

No one presented.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, MM, JD, HS.

x) 8 Cottage St. – To replace all windows and a kitchen door.

Mark Kinnane of Cape Associates presented on behalf of Cathy Cote; said the replacements would be the Anderson A-series clad, that they will be custom-sized so the bottom sill will remain in place and the muntins look kept intact.

JD asked if the muntins will be preserved for the Gothic integrity. Mr. Kinnane said restoring the original windows is not an option for the owners as they're not energy-efficient; said door will be exact, in-kind.

TB suggested the application be a Full Review as it is not exactly in kind. JD said the fact that the storm windows would go away is a benefit. Mr. Kinnane said the head casings would be original, as well, the trim re-attached, that the replacements are the exact same size and the window shades had already been ordered at a cost of 11k.

LD recused herself as an abutter.

TB made a motion to approve as presented, but couldn't get a second and discussion continued. JD asked how many windows were not

original. Mr. Kinnane there are 35 windows on the house and concurred with JD that all the lesser-quality ones would be replaced with wood. Mr. Kinnane said every single window would be replaced, including the dormer windows but that Ms. Cote may wait six months to a year to replace the cottage windows depending on how bad off they are.

TB noted the dormer windows are not trimmed out properly, and Mr. Kinnane said they would be down-sized.

TB made a motion to approve as presented. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 4-1-0: TB, MCM, JD, HS in favor; MM opposed.

xi) 1 High Pole Hill Rd. – To replace steel doors.

Deb Paine and Dr. David Weidner, Executive Director of the Provincetown Monument and Provincetown Museum presented.

Ms. Paine said there are rotted steel doors on four locations, three of which are not public; set of blue doors are a part of the public area; all will be the same including the trim.

MM said the only problem she had is the tiny copy of the photos when the application is viewed online.

TB made a motion to accept as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, JD, MM, LD, HS.

Ms. Paine offered that for future determinations, and as they pertain to the case prior to this one on today's agenda, the HDC might ask if the glass size would change with the applicant's proposal for a replacement.

TB made a motion to consider as Full Review the following:

xii) 200 Commercial St.; xiii) 111 Commercial St., Wharf; xiv) 18 Cottage St.; xv) 14 Standish St., #1; xvi) 286 ½ Bradford St.; xvii) 259-263 Commercial St.; xix) 5 Fishburn Ct.

MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, LD, JD, HS.

After review, and with no one present to answer questions, TB made a motion to consider xviii) 518 Commercial St. as a Full Review. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, LD, JD, HS.

**d) Any other business that shall properly come before the Commission.**

345A Commercial St., Unit D

Bobby Nee, co-owner of Unit D presented; said they were seeking to install 11 Anderson replacement windows, 8 with double-hung, 1 awning window as existing, 2 picture windows as existing, and replacing and relocating a door and removing two windows.

TB said he felt it would be a Full Review, and Mr. Nee said he was appearing today to ask what was required by the HDC. TB and the commission talked Mr. Nee through the procedures and protocols required to submit acceptable site plans for review.

TB advised Mr. Nee to see Permit Coordinator, Ellen Battaglini at Town Hall to coordinate necessary paperwork and get on the HDC'S

hearing agenda. AH spoke with Mr. Nee regarding the specific elevations to address and suggested he could be on the agenda for the first meeting in January.

LD added that, as a general rule, the closer an elevation is to the street the more important it is and the less the HDC welcomes change. Mr. Nee replied that none of the changes are visible from the street. LD suggested the HDC conduct a site visit to determine visibility before Mr. Nee spends time or money on plans.

TB made a motion to continue the determination to the meeting of Dec. 5, 2018 following a site review. LD seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, LD, MM, JD, HS.

### 5 Conwell Street

Robert Silva, owner, presented; said he drew up the plan 10 years ago but didn't have room then and now that the septic has to be improved, he needs to put in a pit and thought he might as well put in a Title 5, which would make it year-round and provide a total of two year-round homes; said he'd just do the basement and bottom floor

AH said Mr. Silva's appearance is to ascertain if the HDC would approve the building's raise, prior to a Full Review. Mr. Silva said he'd like to put in a couple of new windows. JD questioned whether it made historical sense to keep current fenestration if the whole building is changed from the lift.

TB suggested more information is needed on the plans to address questions such as a roof line, but got the consensus from the commission that a two-story cottage would not be disapproved; requested Mr. Silva submit the specs and elevations of the current existing cottage.

AH said Mr. Silva's key questions are, 1) can he move a dwelling from another building and convert it back to a shed and possibly raise it and 2) Is this something he can possibly demolish and have the two dwelling units in one building and will this conflict with the cottage and/or demolition policies.

MM said that more historical references are needed and MCM said that she felt that as it was not that historic, demolition could be more cost-effective, to which JD concurred. LD said the HDC did need to stand by the demolition policy. AH read the demolition bylaw at LD's request.

AH canvassed the board to determine that if Mr. Silva came back with a demolition request, would they consent and the commission responded as such: MCM, JD saying yes; MM and HS saying no; and TB and LD unsure.

Mr. Silva was directed to appear at the Dec. 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, following a site visit.

## **2. Public Comments**

None.

### 3. TB opened Public Meeting at 5:09pm.

a) **HDC 18-279** (continued to the meeting of February 6, 2019)

Application by **Regina Binder**, on behalf of **199 Bradford St. LLC**, requesting to replace trim, siding and roofing materials, to add a covered porch and balcony on the south elevation, to reduce the size of the window openings on the west elevation and to replace windows on the south and east elevations on the structure located at **199 Bradford Street**.

AH reported that the walls for the foundation had been poured on Monday; cited a need to have to strip the walls and damp-proof and then set it back down, at which point openings and proposed changes can be presented to the HDC.

TB noted the house is sitting at the exact same grade and AH said it is also sitting in the same footprint, and that the time-waiver is in place.

b) **HDC 19-007** (continued to the meeting of December 19<sup>th</sup>)

Application by **Peter Markauer**, of **LDA Architecture & Interiors**, on behalf of **Thomas Tannariello**, requesting to add a second story residential unit, including extending the brick façade upward, to add an interior elevator, preserve a south entry portico and add a roof deck on the structure at **170 Commercial Street**.

Time-waiver was determined to be in effect.

c) **HDC 19-047** (continued from the meeting of November 7<sup>th</sup>)

Application by **Ted Smith, Architect, LLC**, on behalf of **Joshua Ronnebaum**, requesting to lift a structure pursuant to FEMA guidelines, install new windows, including skylights and sliding doors, rebuild a front porch, add a dormer on the east elevation and infill a corner area on the north elevation of the structure located at **122 Commercial Street**. **Lester J. Murphy, Jr.**, attorney for the applicants, and **Kaye McFadden**, representing the builders, presented.

Mr. Murphy spoke of the revised plans from Ted Smith who could not be present, with attention given to the front door detail with plasters and lintels shrinking down the second floor door and larger windows on each side; said the other major change was for the east side dormers which would be shortened by one foot on each side.

Ms. McFadden noted the number of steps had been brought down to accommodate the base flood elevation by a 2' increase as opposed to 3'2" or thereabouts previously proposed; stated the plans for review are dated Nov. 11, 2018.

MM said it was a positive look regarding the streetscape with the 1' reduction in elevation, which TB concurred. HS said she had nothing to add. MCM said she was happy with the front facade but that it still appeared as a lot of massing on the dormers. LD agreed with MCM, said she was anticipating a more significant reduction of the size of the front dormer, less with the rear dormer, but that it still reads like one long dormered roof.

Mr. Murphy said the plans had been revised based on what was expected. TB said he felt the design had come a long way and that while

he would agree with LD that sometimes dormers are approved that are too big, he would be on board with this design.  
TB made a motion to approve as presented. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 3-1-1: TB, JD, MM in favor; LD, opposed; MCM, abstained.

TB announced a short break.

- d) **HDC 19-059** (continued from the meeting of November 7<sup>th</sup>)  
Application by **509 Commercial St., LLC** requesting to demolish an existing building and build a new structure using plans previously approved in **HDC 18-107** at the property located **509 Commercial Street**. **Lester J. Murphy, Jr.**, attorney, presented; said the request to withdraw the demolition is still on the table but that more importantly, and as indicated at a meeting with Town Planner, Jeffrey Robiero, the process seems not to be clear but that the bottom line is that if they can get a building permit in the next 30 days for the original plans that were approved without a raise or moving the building, that is how the client would want to proceed.

AH said she has submitted an official interpretation from the Board of Building Regulations and Standards and that she's received a couple of scenarios, one being that if the foundation is affected 50% or more then the building has to comply; referenced Chapter 1, R105 3.1.1 which is the substantially damaged or substantially improved section; R105 3.1.1.1 concerns foundations, which does not have the exclusions in it as stated in the previous section; said she is unclear when that response will arrive, but that the Building Code is the driving force behind all this protocol, which is a State building code.

Mr. Murphy said the Town Planner believes there is some kind of a disconnect regarding the interpretation of a contributing structure. MM stated that the key point according to FEMA is that if a home is in the Historic District or in the National Register of Historic Places and is a contributing structure then it is exempt from the 50% of substantial improvement; asked if confusion exists in terms of raising a structure regardless if the work on the foundation is more than 50%.

MCM said either way the structure does not need to be raised whether by the applicant's original application or by the applicant's own admission in that the moving and raising of the building cannot be facilitated in its current state which resulted in the demolition request.

TB suggested the HDC and the applicant are closer to an understanding than it might appear, but asked Mr. Murphy if the determination AH is awaiting takes six months, would the applicant want to go back to raising the building, to which Mr. Murphy said they may not have a choice as the building would have to survive another winter, to which MCM said no one is forcing the client to leave the building open to the elements.

AH said she would be in front of the Board of Building Regulations and Standards on Dec. 6<sup>th</sup> on another case and hopes to get some input on 509 at that time. MCM suggested any decisions be put on hold until the upcoming FEMA meeting, which she encouraged the full board to attend, in order to have a better understanding of procedure and make an informed ruling.

AH corrected MM'S statement pertaining to the number of contributing structures; said there are 1,161 buildings and 1,300 structures that are contributing, but that not all of the buildings within the District are contributing. Everyone then agreed that 509 is considered as a contributing structure.

MM asked Mr. Murphy what he would propose if the foundation is not an issue and the building needn't be raised. Mr. Murphy replied that the owner would look to renovate per the originally approved plan of March 20, 2016 through the Certificate of Occupancy that was exercised.

LD said this plan, employing dormers, was approved and that is still valid, even as the COA has expired.

MM disagreed based on the lack of clarity in what will make the building a contributing structure. LD disagreed and TB asked if the HDC would be in agreement with the building going up a foot or two for flood mitigation and all agreed. TB referenced the tweaked design that was based on the recommendations of the Cape Cod Commission which stated the front elevation more or less remain as it is and efforts be made to reduce the massing. LD said none of these changes will change its status as contributing.

MM read the recommendations from Sarah Korjeff of the Cape Cod Commission in a letter dated June 14, 2018 which, MM said, the HDC had incorporated these changes into the third set of plans and these changes should be maintained going forward. MCM cautioned on approving changes that would trigger a raise when the consideration is for maintaining the status as a contributing structure and that these should be confirmed by the Cape Cod Commission.

Mr. Murphy said he felt the first question to ask is if the original design can be employed along with these changes. TB suggested the next step is to check with Sarah Korjeff to determine if the Cape Cod Commission would clear these changes to keep the building contributing. MCM said Mr. Murphy's client can protect the building regardless of the decision.

JD advised that the HDC get the determination that the building will be kept at ground level and then work on window placements and such. TB took a poll to allow to the demolition withdrawal and stated that without the HDC'S approval, a demolition may result in a requirement that the building be re-built as is. MM said she felt it made sense to continue without allowing the withdrawal today and MCM agreed.

TB made a motion to allow the applicant to withdraw its demolition request. JD seconded the motion and it passed, 3-2-0; TB, JD, LD in favor; MM and MCM, opposed.

TB said the next step would be to ensure that the building is kept as a contributing structure whether it is raised or not, and to determine if the double-hung windows with the building on the ground would render it non-contributing, in which case modified fenestration might be employed.

MM said the third application is still open as the HDC is awaiting those revised plans that incorporate Sarah Korjeff's recommendations for maintaining its contributing status.

**e) HDC 19-084**

Application by **Todd Perry** requesting to add a dormer with three windows on the west elevation and a new second floor deck on the south

elevation with a door and a bay window, add an egress stair with a landing on the north elevation and add three skylights and 4 small windows on the east elevation on the structure located at **361 Commercial Street, #C-U4.**

**Todd Perry** presented; said he was seeking to add an egress stair to the second floor loft of the Hammock Shop and a dormer on the west side with a balcony deck on the bay side; replace windows and doors which are 15 years old and in bad condition.

HS said she didn't like the cable system.

MM said her concern is that it's an accessory building and noted that in the cottage building policy the height is at 1 ½ stories and not two stories.

Mr. Perry said it probably would be a 1 + ½ story in that it won't have a dormer on both sides and the roof system comes down to the floor on the second floor.

LD noted cable railing as an issue, said skylights should not dominate in the way that these seem to; said the dormer seems to change the classic historic look. Mr. Perry said the reason he wanted to bring it down was for the view. LD said typically they look for dormers to be set back.

MCM said she agreed with HS and LD and because every corner of the structure is so visible that wood is more appropriate in terms of a wood railing system, which Mr. Perry said was fine by him. MCM added that she was okay with second floor decking if it had wood railing; asked if two smaller dormers at the back would be possible, but Mr. Perry said per his condo association he is not allowed to have the double dormers, that it would not be a living space and that his original plan was to put solar panels in at a future date.

JD said this building is one of the only ones on the water that is most like an intact 19<sup>th</sup> century original building and that nothing in the re-vamp serves to preserve the building as it exists..

MCM responded to JD in saying she agreed but can also understand how someone with such minute space wanting 2' more space when . dormers get approved on giant structures. JD said he agreed with MCM in that he is in favor of progress, but this is simply not an example of a redesign with an historic appreciation, to which LD concurred, saying as it exists the building is a cherished structure

TB said what is proposed is not a dormer but rather just adding more to the second floor and that he felt the footprint should be retained.

Mr. Perry said the reason for the additional 2' is that the building is essentially falling down due to the rafters.

MCM asked if a French door would be more compatible, but Mr. Perry said a French door would probably not be possible with the space dimensions. JD asked if the stairway is needed to the second floor. AH said that with a dwelling unit two modes of egress are required, but for a commercial space it is unlikely and she would consult the rulebook as it can vary from case to case.

JD said he didn't want to appear unduly hard on the applicant but that the building is authentic and real and perfect as is; cited too many examples of buildings being commercialized out of their historic integrity.

LD noted simple architecture that is obscured by an overblown

revamp; said the HDC looks to minimize the number of skylights or reduce them so they don't dominate the roof; and an understated dormer.

Mr. Perry asked if a staircase would be preferable on the back or water side.

TB suggested the water side and the size and shape should stay the same and requested some options for appropriate dormers on the west side; advised that the elevation be consistent on future drawings.

Mr. Perry said he'd try to come back next week with updated plans including some different dormer options.

JD encouraged the HDC to consider the building directly behind this one which was allowed to expand its mass and now does not look historic.

AH clarified that the HDC would prefer a waterside stair unit.

TB made a motion to continue the decision to the meeting of Dec. 5, 2018. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, LD, JD, HS.

AH noted that the plans would not make the usual deadline based on the close proximity of the next meeting.

**d. Any other business that shall come before the Commission, continued:**

AH reminded the HDC to consider the flood zone materials guide she distributed when they are approving certain materials to be used and where on the property; e.g., old growth wood, quality of lumber. JD asked of steel, which AH confirmed is among the considerations.

TB made a motion, to reaffirm one he had previously made, requesting to remove the list of unfilled decisions that appear on the HDC agenda for each meeting. MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MM, LD, JD, HS.

**4. Review and approval of Minutes.**

MM made a motion to approve with changes the minutes of October 3, 2018; October 17, 2018; November 5, 2018 and November 7, 2018.

MM raised an issue on the Oct. 3, 2018 minutes of a private street that begins with a "V" which was not articulated by the applicant during its presentation regarding public visibility. Access to the street could not be verified by the HDC so MM deleted her addition to the minutes.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:40pm. MCM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0; TB, MCM, LD, JD.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jody O'Neil