



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2020, 4:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, Ald. Mark Steuer, Justin Balsley, Ron Dehn, Ian Griffiths, and David Siegel

Present: Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Mark Steuer, David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, and Justin Balsley

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the October 7, 2020, Special meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the October 1, 2020, Special meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Susan Ley to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 20-14) Consideration with possible action on a design review for siding at 127 N. Broadway (rear).

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Mark Steuer, No- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Justin Balsley, Abstain- None

2. (COA 20-26) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a clerestory window addition at 110 S. Adams Street.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Susan Ley to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, Ian Griffiths. No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Susan Ley to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, Ian Griffiths. No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- Ian Griffiths

3. (COA 20-29) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a rear deck located at 131 S. Washington Street (rear).

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve with the condition:

1) This project shall meet all inspection and safety codes

Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on the selection of a firm to complete Phase I of the Intensive Historic Survey Report update for the City of Green Bay.

The Commission may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons. The Commission may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by David Siegel to go into closed session at 5:04 p.m. Motion carried.

Paul Martzke read the closed session language.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- Paul Martzke

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ron Dehn to return to regular order of business at 5:18 p.m. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- Paul Martzke

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Susan Ley to approve Legacy Architecture to complete Phase I of the Intensive Historic Survey Report update for the City of Green Bay. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- Paul Martzke

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff Update.

None.

2. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, October 21, 2020.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ian Griffiths to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

VERTABIM MINUTES

- This is the Wednesday October 7th meeting of the Landmarks Commission. First item we'll start with is the roll call. Susan?
- Here.
- Alderman Steuer?
- [Mark] I am here.
- Justin?
- [Stephanie] He just logging on.
- Ron?
- Present
- Ian? Ian David?
- [Ian] Present.
- I see Justin just logged in, and it looks like Ian is now logged in as well.
- Here. Sorry about--
- All members are here and accounted for. Our next item on tonight's agenda is the approval of the agenda. Does anybody have any comments, corrections, or changes to the agenda?
- No.
- Hearing none, I'd ask for a motion to approve.
- [Woman] So moved.
- Second.
- Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Any opposed? Motion carries, the agenda has been approved. Next item is item D, approval of the minutes from the October 1st 2020 meeting of the Landmarks Commission. Those minutes are in your packet. Did anybody have any corrections or comments regarding those minutes? Hearing none, I'd ask for a motion to approve.

- [Man] So moved.

- Second.

- Now all in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries unanimously. We are on to item E, which is regular business. The first item is Certificate of Appropriateness 20-14. This is consideration with possible action on a design review for siding at 127 North Broadway. Jason, would you like to take us through this item?

- I can do that. This building came to the Landmarks Commission a month or so ago, or maybe a little over a month now, has it been two months, three months?

- [Stephanie] It was like June, July, Jason.

- I lose track of stuff. We're looking at the backside of the building on the right, there the white stuff, and this is the building where they requested to put vinyl siding over the brick. And I don't like vinyl siding, but upon investigation of this, it's clear that this brick, the damage is largely already done, most failing particularly bad where you see that conduit running horizontally about a foot and a half or so below the top of the wall. The paint on the brick has done it no favors. It is spalling quite badly from moisture trying to escape the building. My recommendation to you some months ago was to not allow vinyl siding. With some soul searching and having gone there and been inside the apartment, I'm concerned that, without some sort of remedy to stop the moisture, the situation will continue to deteriorate. It seems that the proper by-the-book remedy would be to gently remove the paint and have somebody come and thoroughly do a good masonry repair. But I don't know that that's entirely practical and that you're necessarily getting the big bang for the buck given that it's on the back of the building. Also noting too, very importantly, that the other side of the back already received vinyl siding years ago. So if you look at it as a work in progress, and the Landmarks Commission kind of came into being in the middle of that work in progress, it's a little hard to say. You know, we need to hold their feet to the fire and make sure the Mason comes out and does a thorough mason job on that wall. So as an interim measure for the next 10-20 years, I would not be averse to seeing vinyl siding on the back of that building.

- Discussion?

- Yes.

- Go ahead, Alderman Steuer.

- Okay, thank you, Paul. Jason, you know, the front of the building looks great, you know, not a problem. The back, I did, you know, I followed you on all of that and I've seen the back of that building as well. I guess like you said, the bang for the buck, I think one of the issues is that what it would be, it seems like it would be cost-prohibitive, pretty much, for them to try to replace all the entire back. It's in the alley. It is not, you know, I'm not sure what our specs are for a lot of buildings. You know, the street view, et cetera, it would be nice if they could redo the brick, but to me, it seems like it would be a gargantuan project, it would be very expensive, and it would be cost-prohibitive. So I'm leaning toward your recommendation at this time. So that's all for me right now.

- I wanna follow up though, and say that cost is never something that really factors into what I say. It's generally accepted that any deterioration is kind of the fault of the owner and the cost associated with that is self-inflicted. But you know, we've got a relatively young preservation ordinance with teeth, and frankly, this alleyway is not well-traveled. You have to go looking for it if you want to see the back of this building. So I think that the bandaid of vinyl siding is better than nothing at this point.

- Can it be made that it is to be considered a temporary solution with a sunset?
- If you're asking me, I don't know that the ordinance really permits that. You know, we could have some institutional memory, I suppose, and I can put that in our file for this property noting that this was discussed and felt that eventually a proper mason repair job was appropriate for the building.
- I mean they've obviously spent some money of the front of the building, which is their revenue producing piece of it. And, you know, I, yeah, it sure would be nice to have a plan that longterm it would be fixed as opposed to vinyl siding going on now and, you know, 15 years down the road, a second layer of vinyl siding went on because the first one's deteriorated. So I guess it's just, when you open the door, how far are you opening the door?
- You know, what I'd like to see is the brick given an opportunity to dry out, and it's currently just never going to do that with that paint on it and without the proper repairs to the mortar, and without a lot of bricks... Putting the siding over it would be like an umbrella in the wind. I guess it'll keep the water off of it, hopefully, and it should dry out.
- I've got a couple of points to make. Ian, I concur with what you're alluding to about setting a precedent. Putting vinyl over brick, that sits poorly with me initially. But also I've got a question for you, Jason, about advocating, protecting the brick. Will the vinyl necessarily protect the brick or has the water gotten in there, been trapped by the paint, and that freeze/thaw cycle is gonna continue regardless of it being exposed or not?
- You know I look at this a little bit like a science experiment. I walked through that upstairs apartment on the inside and it's clear that the moisture isn't just escaping through the outer permeable layer of the brick, but it's also escaping into the apartment. So we have interior damage that's coming as a result of this moisture intrusion. My hope is that the interior damage would stop with the vinyl siding. And I'd go one further and, you know, doubly cross my fingers and hope that the brick itself would have a chance to dry out. This winter I would expect more spalling to occur even behind vinyl siding, but that's gonna happen either way.
- I would offer up that, while I don't feel the vinyl siding is the appropriate way to repair this, I think it's a mistake, noting that this is not viewable by the main street and it's only offer of the back alley, I'm inclined to move forward with approving this because I don't see another alternative presented at this point in time and I think stabilization of the building is probably more important than pressing harder for the right solution. I guess I would present a motion to approve this as it's been presented to us.
- Second.
- More discussion on that motion?
- I'd go along with the motion, generally. I think we should have somewhere in the approval that we see this as a fix for now, but that it isn't the correct approach to the longterm integrity of that building. It's gonna keep happening.
- What is the life expectancy of vinyl siding anyway? 20 years, 25?
- My house, it's three days but, you know,
- It depends, it depends on the quality, it depends on--
- I'd also say that this isn't an untraveled area, or a non-visible area. I mean there's a wide open space there. There's the community theaters there. You know, I go down that alley often. I think the alleys of Green Bay are neglected, sadly, and a lot of people use these alleys for photo shoots, and you know, they could be

beautified. I'm not saying I'm opposed to the vinyl siding, but the idea that, because it's not visible, I think is wrong.

- I'm actually opposing this for those reasons, but also in particular, we haven't heard any alternatives. There hasn't been an examination of the existing brick to determine if what Jason suggested can be done reasonably? I don't like this as a precedent-setting situation for us. As Justin just said, it is not entirely out of the way, and I see other building owners coming to us and saying, well, how about doing this on mine because you allowed it here? So I actually am going to oppose this request.

- And you know, that's an excellent point. I will say though that, with half of the back already having been vinyl sided, you start to see similarities with, say, the Berners and Schober's Architects Building, where we had seen some windows already replaced, and then of course, granted approval to continue to replace windows into the future. Now I know we've taken a positive view of replacement windows, and we have not taken a positive view of vinyl siding, but the pictures here don't show that the opposite side was already clad in vinyl many years ago.

- Any other discussion? So there's a motion on the floor, it's been seconded, I guess, I'm going to call for a vote on this.

- I would vote, yea. Susan?

- Yea.

- [Paul] Alderman Steuer?

- Yes.

- [Paul] Justin?

- I'd say nay.

- [Paul] Ron?

- Yay.

- [Paul] Ian?

- [Ian] No.

- [Paul] And David?

- [David] No.

- So by my math, the motion was defeated.

- [Stephanie] carries, it's four, three.

- Sorry, the point in the day... Glad somebody else is keeping track. Okay we're onto item Two, Certificate of Appropriateness 20-26, consideration with possible action on a design review for a clear story window addition at 110 South Adams Street. Jason?

- So the architects here have provided a revised line of sight drawing, and to be very brief, the revised drawing created for me some lack of confidence in the first drawing, and that lack of confidence spills over into the

second drawing. On the outside, the architect proposed building a plywood mock up of the clear story window on top of the building so that you could inspect that. And given my lack of confidence in the drawings, I suggest that you request that the architect build that plywood mock up, and then either you or I can walk around and I'll take pictures and we'll see what there is to see.

- [Woman] I would like to add that that request was sent to the petitioner once they offered up that option. They are here with us, so I'm not sure if that has been installed. I have not received an email noting that it was installed. So if you'd like to open up the floor and have a discussion to figure that piece out, you're more than welcome to.

- I'll make a motion open the floor.

- Second.

- All in favor of the motion?

- [Group] Aye.

- Any opposed? And the floor is open for comment.

- [Dean] Hey this is Dean Kroll from RODAC. We did make a mock up yesterday, and pictures were taken and emailed in earlier today, I want to say like 10 o'clock or so, somewhere around that time. The view, as we went around, we actually moved the clear story back one bay, which would make it even less visible. Since you don't have the pictures up, it's tough to see it. But the only view where you could, when you see the pictures that were taken and submitted, the only view that you could actually see at the very top of the clear story was when you were across the street, standing on the opposite sidewalk, and it was, what you saw was very similar to when you look to the west of how much you saw the air handler. So it was very similar in profile to that. Apologize that you guys don't have those uploaded here, but pictures were taken.

- [Stephanie] Dean those photos were not received by me. If you would like to share your screen to show those or send them over to me to share, we could do that as well.

- [Dean] Let me see if I can find them here, hold on. Let me hunt them over, so let me see here.

- I didn't receive any them either. I didn't see them.

- While we're waiting for Dean to see if he has those photos, can I ask for clarification as to what we're actually reviewing? And I apologize because I know I was absent at the last meeting when this project was first presented, but the drawings that are in our packet to me indicate that there's work being proposed for the facade, the existing stone facade, on Adams Street. Is that something that's actually being proposed?

- [Dean] That is incorrect. The only work that is being done is on the clear story itself. There is no facade, no windows. I shouldn't say that. The only thing that was being done that was approved on the last meeting was an entrance door. I think it was about 16 inches of brick, but within three brick courses, and that was approved at the last meeting to make that as wide as the window opening. There is nothing being done along Adam Street.

- Okay thank you.

- I drove by last night when I was aware that mock up was gonna go in, and I drove by again this morning, and driving by, I could not see the mock up on the roof, which is a good thing, I guess. I think the position of it is--

- How large is the model? the final size will be?

- Yes.
- [Dean] It was the same height, but it was only one sheet of plywood wide in each direction. It was an L-shape representing the corner.
- Where is the visible corner?
- [Dean] Yep, think I got it here, if you can see my screen.
- [Man] Yep.
- [Dean] So you can see we took the pictures in the exact same location, I'm trying to zoom in. You can see our workers up on the roof right here. But when you look on the north side of Walnut, you can see the plywood basically by the second car to the left, and if you look just left of the Initiative One sign, you can see the air handlers sticking up halfway up the window, which is about the same height. That is the only, and that would be the, excuse me, northeast corner of the clear story, and it would go one bay, you know, to the next dark line of the building.
- Can you point to that, Dean, with your hand on the--
- [Dean] Sure, right there, you see that? Here's the air handler.
- And the plywood would extend--
- [Dean] Plywood would extend from, it goes from this brick line to this brick line.
- So maybe you can pan to the other images.
- [Dean] Sure. You can see from the parking lot there, that really doesn't come in the case. It's right here-ish, and then going the other way. This is along, this is right at the corner. It's right here, but you really can't see it. And then... Here you can't see it at all. Like I said, we moved at one bay back, so from the previous submittal, it was moved 12 feet back. I'm trying to, any other pictures?
- No I think that covers.
- [Dean] Okay.
- So it was moved but the dimensions were not changed? It's the same size as it was, initially?
- [Dean] Correct, it's the same height that was moved back. I'm going to stop sharing my screen unless someone else wants to keep looking.
- Why is the screen added?
- [Dean] Right now, it's a space that's not being used. The corner that faces Adams Street is a vacant area,. They are expanding into that space, and it's overall large area, assembly area, and they're trying to get as much natural light in there as possible. So that's what they're, that's the reason for it.
- Okay.
- The original drawings I was sent at the last meeting had the incorrect, excuse me, incorrect parapet height.

- [Dean] Right.

- And so the visual of what you could see was exaggerated. That was corrected on the set of drawings. So you know, the applicant, in this case, didn't help themselves by having the incorrect drawings the first time around. That's subsequently been revised, and the drawings are better, and the mock up, if that corner is the actual height, it's pretty invisible from just about everywhere except on the far side of the road on a setback.

- [Dean] Correct, that is the actual height. We actually have a picture that I can send you, a mock up in the shot with a tape measure on it. So we can send you that too if you'd like that.

- Okay.

- Well, I had considerable objections to what was initially presented last time, and I think that what you've done here is address all of that, and I am impressed and I absolutely approve this. I would be making a motion to approve as presented. I don't need to see anymore, I'm impressed.

- I concur.

- Well, I make a motion to close the floor.

- Thank you, Ron.

- Second.

- Aye.

- All in favor of closing the floor.

- [Group Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries. David, I think you were about to say something?

- Yes I'd like to make a motion to accept as presented.

- I'll second that motion.

- Discussion? I'm just gonna throw out an editorial comment. I am well aware that this is one of the last examples of art deco architecture left in Green Bay, is that facade. And so my hope is that the building owner understands the value of that, and hopefully, we don't have to deal with anything in the future as far as that goes because it's a great example of a style of architecture that just isn't around that much anymore. Any other discussion on the motion?

- Can we get some vinyl on it.

- That's what I'm trying to avoid. Okay, I would call for a vote then. Susan?

- Yes.

- Alderman Steuer?

- Yes.

- Justin?

- Aye.
- Ron?
- Yes.
- Ian?
- I'm going to abstain as I did last time.
- David?
- Yes.
- And I also vote yes, so motion carries. Thank you. Next item on our agenda is Certificate of Appropriateness 20-29, consideration with possible action on a design review for a rear deck located at 131 South Washington Street. Jason could you take us through this one?
- Yes, 131 South Washington Street is Al's Hamburger. The request comes from the neighboring Kittner's Pub. You see it on the left there. Behind Al's Hamburger, there's a courtyard with a tree growing in it in the photograph, and here's the tree growing in it from an aerial view. And further behind in the alley, there's a one-story garage. The request is to add a needed deck between Al's restaurant and the garage. I think it's about nine feet, some odd inches above the ground level. If I squint just right, should be invisible to everything except for drones and satellites. There's an existing opening in the side of Kittner's Bar. They'll be fitting that with a door, and the recommendation is to approve this as it has no impact on the historic integrity of the buildings or the district.
- I'd like to make a motion to approve.
- Go right ahead.
- I am. And I'll make a motion to seconds.
- Any discussion on that motion?
- I guess I only have a question: Is there a requirement for a second means of egress from that space?
- One means of egress out to Washington Street, and the second one would be through Kittner's, I guess.
- [Stephanie] So this also had to go through protection and policy, I believe, for the extension of that liquor license, and it also goes to your site plan approval at the inspection level. So they will catch all that health safety stuff.
- Okay. I just wanted to point that out that we don't want to create a condition in here where a person can't get out.
- Ron, I think your comments are well-taken. You know if this drawing we're looking at right now is accurate, well, it's not accurate, actually, the door that's shown on Washington Street is not an allocation and it swings inward. So there's hopefully somebody when this thing goes before planning, takes note of that, because I would agree that it doesn't feel like it's set up very well for an emergency situation.

- I believe we should add that, our motion, and that our approval would be contingent upon that, the fact that it meets those requirements.
- That'd be fine for me.
- Yeah, because you're all absolutely right. From here, it doesn't look like there may be another way out of there.
- [Stephanie] So it's a friendly amendment to meet inspection and fire safety codes?
- Correct.
- Alderman Steuer, do you agree with that motion?
- Yes I am, I'm fine.
- Big catapult back there?
- Okay. We should put a vote on this motion.
- Susan?
- Yes.
- Alderman Steuer?
- [Mark] Yes.
- Justin?
- [Justin] Yeah.
- Ron?
- Yes.
- Ian?
- [Ian] Yes.
- David?
- Yes.
- I also vote yes, so motion carries unanimously.
- Did we have a second on that one?
- I was the second, I believe.
- I thought it was Ron.
- Okay, I missed that, sorry.

- I think Justin, I actually seconded at the exact same time, I heard his voice at the same time.
- I heard catapult, that's all I heard.
- Alright, next item on the agenda for tonight is consideration with possible action on the selection of a firm to complete phase one of the intensive historic survey report update for the city of Green Bay. We met last week and we had presentations by the three firms that were shortlisted, and I think the intention was that we were going to recommend one of those firms tonight for award of that project.
- [Stephanie] Yes, so we will convene a closed session. We just need a motion and a second and a vote to that effect, and then the chair will meet, will read the commission on closed session language, and then we will move anyone who is not a part of our commission or staff to a waiting room. The meeting will be paused for open discussion. Then when we go back into open session, we'll take another vote to convene back into open session, and then from there take a vote to select that firm.
- Motion to close the floor, or motion to close the session.
- I'll second.
- All in favor.
- [Group] Aye.
- We are closed.
- [Stephanie] So if you could read the language on the agenda about convening a close session.
- Certainly. The Landmark Commission may convene a closed session pursuant to section 19.85, i.e. Wisconsin statute for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons. The commission may thereafter reconvene an open session pursuant to section 19.85, paragraph two, Wisconsin statute to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.
- [Stephanie] All right, we are back.
- So does anybody, would anybody like to make a motion based on our discussion in closed session?
- I'll make a motion that we accept the proposal of Legacy Architecture to do the intensive resource survey report for the city of Green Bay, Wisconsin.
- I second.
- Any further discussion on that motion?
- Just one point. What was enlightening, was talking about limiting the survey to what hasn't been done. Do we need to include anything to that effect in this motion or is that more of a staff-level interaction?
- [Stephanie] This is something we can discuss during contract. Thank you.
- Okay.

- I guess my only discussion point is I would wanna go ahead and thank all three of the firms that submitted on this. I think that the presentations were very professional by all three of them, and quite frankly, they're all outstanding, I think, in their capabilities and what they do on behalf of historic preservation efforts. So I think that, you know, everybody would agree that this was a difficult decision moving forward. So any other discussion? Then I would call for a vote on this motion. Susan?

- Yes.

- Alderman Steuer?

- Yes.

- Justin?

- Yes.

- Ron?

- Yes.

- Ian?

- Yes.

- David?

- Yes.

- And I'm abstaining from this vote. Motion carries. Well, congratulations to Legacy Architecture.

- Okay.

- The next item on tonight's agenda is an item informational, so the first thing will be a staff update.

- [Stephanie] I have no update. Jason? Big head nod there.

- Okay, next item would be the date of the next meeting. It says on the agenda our next meeting is Wednesday, October 21st. Stephanie, are you anticipating that we're gonna have applications for that meeting?

- [Stephanie] I love you all, but I hope not. I feel like three meetings one month is too many, and Ron's getting a little stir crazy already. I haven't gotten any applications yet, but that window does not close until next week. So if we don't, you know, if I don't get any applications in, we will be canceling that meeting, and I'll sent out a notification next week.

- Okay, wonderful. I thank everybody on the commission for attending all these meetings. It's been a busy month, probably the biggest one we've had since we started. So no more 12 minute meetings, David.

- It was 13 if I remember right.

- Hearing nothing else I would make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

- I second that.

- All in favor.
- [Group] Aye.
- Motion carries. Thank you. everybody, and have a good evening.
- Bye.