



# HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov)

**Commissioners:** Raymond Pohl (Chair), Diane Coombs (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, Abigail Camp, Vallorie Oliver,  
**Associate Commissioners:** Stephen Welch, Terence Watterson, Jessie Dutra

~~ MINUTES ~~

**Tuesday, February 5, 2019**

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room – 4:30 p.m.

Called to order at 4:31 p.m. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: John Hedden, HDC Compliance Coordinator; Kadeem McCarthy, Administrative Specialist; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker  
 Attending Members: Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch, Dutra  
 Absent Members: Camp, Watterson  
 Late Arrivals: Dutra, 4:40 p.m.  
 Early Departures: Coombs, 7:20 p.m.

Agenda adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

## I. PUBLIC COMMENT

**Paul Charron**, 48 Walsh Street – His house was built in 1984, until recently the only flood claim was the No-Name storm. In the past 4 to 5 years, flood claims have been about \$75,000. We have to raise the house. Flood premiums have gone way up. The abutter has built a garage 10 feet from the property; everything we propose has to skew toward the front. We’ve considered some comments that have led to improvement. He has to lift the house up above the garage to the rear bringing it to a height of 33’ and some inches. There are an abundance of shingled decks in the area. He’s talked to two neighbors who support the project.

## II. CONSENT

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Nant. Island Resorts – <b>71837</b>	14 Swain Street	Replace deck	42.4.1-82	Thomas Graham
2. Flannery, Lawrence – <b>71838</b>	14 Midland Avenue	Roof change to arch	59.3-171	Sherburne Mngt
3. Prevete, Raymond – <b>71839</b>	5 Hawks Circle	Rev. 71473, wind, deck	74-37.6	NAG
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 4-0//McLaughlin abstain	Certificate #	<b>71837 to 71839</b>	

## III. OLD BUSINESS

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Maloney, Rosalie ( <b>NB</b> )	15 Old North Wharf	Rev. 71058: lift/stairs/fenst.	42.3.1-26	McMullen & Assocs.
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Nathan McMullen</b> , McMullen & Associates – Presented project; the letter of historic determination would preclude its having to be raised the full six feet as required by the Flood Code. In the first meetings, the HDC asked that the north elevation stairs and landing be removed; the stairs and stoop would encroach on Town property.			
Public	<b>Sarah Punnect</b> , 11 Old North Wharf – Asked about the west elevation encroachment on the property line.			

Concerns (4:33)

**Pohl** – Read HSAB comments: Incomplete application; wants it back; amount of work compromises historic integrity. Read into the record a letter from Mr. McMullen requesting a letter of historic determination as to the structure’s significance. We have in the past written letters like this for new construction within the old historic district (OHD).

**Oliver** – We’ve been requiring a certification from an expert about how high a structure must be raised. She thinks HSAB didn’t realize much of this had been previously approved. She has no problem with this application; it’s only six inches and the south elevation landing and the stairway harkens to the existing configuration and the west elevation railing is similar to previous approval.

**McLaughlin** – The walkway between the west elevation and the abutting property must be maintained.

**Welch** – He agrees with HSAB; the work compromises the historic integrity and the historic integrity of Old North Wharf. The height is dramatically disproportionate to the width and outside the guidelines; and, it has a full third floor in an area where that is not common for building width. North elevation, the door is floating three feet above grade; that is absurd and impossible to reconcile. He doesn’t understand the lack of a front stair. We are going to be dealing with more of these. His concern is this is going up in height for flooding and to add livable space; there is a full 2<sup>nd</sup>-story of height add-on. There needs to be some give-and-take consideration with more give on the applicant’s part. The structure, as proposed, is going to be lifted and put on a new foundation; if the exterior shower and trash bins proposed at the rear were eliminated and the entire structure shifted back, there would be no encroachment of the front stair, no encroachment into Old North Wharf bulkhead, and no effect on parking and the requirement for the exterior 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor stairs would go away.

**Coombs** – This is too big; she would like to see a picture or drawing of this at the proposed height with the houses surrounding it. She doesn’t understand the need for a 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor staircase; one exists on the south elevation.

**Pohl** – You only need one means of egress to the first floor as long as the first floor has two means of egress. West elevation, there’s two feet between the entry stairs and the abutting structure. Agrees with Mr. Welch about the north elevation floating door.

Motion  
Vote

**Motion to Hold for further information and revisions. (McLaughlin)**  
Carried 5-0 Certificate #

2. Roos, Geraldine 56R Madequecham Valley Rd Fenestration revisions 88-65 JB Studios

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Dutra

Alternates None

Recused Oliver

Documentation None

Representing None

Public None

Concerns (5:07) Not opened at this time.

Motion **Motion to Hold for representation. (Coombs)**

Vote Carried 4-0 Certificate #

3. K22S, LLC 65 Center Street Demo garage 42.4.3-16 Linda Williams

Voting Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Dutra

Alternates Welch

Recused None

Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.

Representing **Linda Williams** – The house dates to 1821. This garage crosses the property line and appeared at the earliest in 1923; The NACR survey says it’s non-contributing. It’s concrete and cracking; nothing can be done with it.

Public None

Concerns (5:09) **Pohl** – Read HSAB comments: this could be an original garage for Nantucket given its date and could be restored.

**McLaughlin** – It’s inappropriate to the neighborhood. He supports the demolition. Suggested a view.

**Coombs** – It can be fixed; if it’s date is 1923, we should protect it. She’d like to see an engineer’s evaluation of the structure. The garage doors could go back to what they originally were. The front doesn’t look to have any cracks; she’d like to view this.

**Oliver** – She doesn’t think this has any historic integrity; windows and doors are all more modern.

**Dutra** – He would be okay with the demolition.

**Pohl** – This sort of violates every HDC guideline. Pointed out the framing sits right on the concrete.

Motion **Motion to View. (McLaughlin)**

Vote Carried 5-0 Certificate #

Motion to Hold Ms Oliver’s items to the end of the OB agenda. (Coombs) Carried 5-0

4.	Millard, Jessica E. Trust	5 Cudweed Road	Pool	82-145	CWA
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Landscape design elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b> , Chip Webster Associates – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:21)	No concerns due to lack of visibility.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Oliver)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	<b>71840</b>
5.	Seidner, Marc	15 Wood Hollow Road	Pool house	72-24	CWA
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.				
Representing	<b>Chip Webster</b> , Chip Webster Associates – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; ground cover is about 1600 square feet.				
Public	<b>Ray Pohl</b> – The footprint for this is larger than the main house. <b>Val Oliver</b> – She took photos from Chuck Hollow and the whole thing will be visible.				
Concerns (5:27)	<b>Dutra</b> – It looks better with the reduced height and length; he had concerns with the fenestration on the first floor but doesn't think it will be visible. Calling this a pool house is semantics; this is a second dwelling. <b>McLaughlin</b> – The bushes there are 8 feet tall. <b>Welch</b> – Appreciates the changes; reducing the height makes a difference making it more appropriate to the location. As a secondary dwelling, there is a metric it needs to meet; otherwise we set a precedent for a 24' tall 52' long pool house. <b>Coombs</b> – It's coming in at 24'2" and is visible from all four sides. She asked last time that the south elevation windows be separated and remove one of the doors. It will be visible from Chuck Hollow. West elevation, the first floor is a long ridge. Would like to view with a height pole.				
Motion	<b>Motion to View with a three height poles, one for the garage and two for the 2<sup>nd</sup>-floor gables. (Welch)</b>				
Vote	Carried 4-0			Certificate #	
6.	Ainslie Lee Trustee	9 Howard Street	Relocate HVAC	42.3.3-54	Mike Freedman
Voting	Coombs (acting chair), McLaughlin, Welch, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	<b>Mike Freedman</b> – Took more photos to show issues with running lines straight down.				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:40)	<b>Coombs</b> – Read HSAB comments: should be adjacent to cornerboard and boxed in cedar. <b>Welch</b> – The difficulty with this is that, at the right, unlike to the left where we came up with a remedy to drop the enclosure vertically from the 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor and cross horizontally under a false water table, you can't just go straight up and in at the 2 <sup>nd</sup> -floor because there is no eave space there. Suggested a vertical, natural-to-weather, cedar enclosure to the right of the door going up as far as possible then open up the wall and bury the line interior vs. angling it on the exterior. This work was done before the guidelines were approved. The problem here is two on one side with one line set forward. There is dead space instead of an eave because there is an interior stair and a dryer vent. Another alternative would be to go up to the rake with cedar enclosure and into the building, in the rafter bay, then dogleg over to the interior wall. <b>McLaughlin</b> – He thinks visibility will be low. Mr. Welch's suggestion is good. <b>Dutra</b> – Agrees with Mr. Welch.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff per Exhibit A. (McLaughlin)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	
Motion	<b>Motion to Reopen. (Welch)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	
Motion	<b>Welch</b> – Wants to add that if there is future work on the condenser it should come back under a new <b>Motion to Approve through staff per Exhibit A; future work on the condenser would require a new application to relocate the line set. (Welch)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	<b>71841</b>

7.	Sullivan Krueger Fam Tr	6 New Lane	Move-demo	41-294	BPC
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Dutra, Welch				
Alternates	None				
Recused	None				
Documentation	None				
Representing	None				
Public	None				
Concerns (5:52)	Not opened at this time.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for representation. (Coombs)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	
8.	Lemberg, Ed	1 White Whale Lane	New dwelling	66-18	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, correspondence, and photos.				
Representing	<b>Victoria Ewing</b> , LINK – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns; asked for landscape screen for the air conditioner (A/C).				
Public	<b>Barry Rector</b> , for The Independent Order of Odd Fellows Lodge 66 – Asked that the motion include the buffer and that Lodge 66 be notified about the hardscaping application.				
Concerns (5:53)	<b>Pohl</b> – Read into the record a letter from Neville Richen for The Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Lodge 66 asking for an evergreen buffer along the adjoining lot line and asking the Lodge to be notified of future applications on the property. Visibility over the Odd Fellow property from Cato Lane puts this within our purview; that request can be included in our approval. <b>Coombs</b> – Appreciates the changes; she did everything we asked. This is good. <b>McLaughlin</b> – The A/C must be boxed in. <b>Dutra</b> – Okay with the proposed changes.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with a 5-foot-wide evergreen hedge on the western property line. (Coombs)</b>				
Vote	Carried 4-0			Certificate #	<b>71842</b>
9.	Lemberg, Ed	1 White Whale Lane	Second dwelling	66-18	LINK
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Dutra				
Alternates	None				
Recused	Oliver				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, correspondence, and photos.				
Representing	<b>Victoria Ewing</b> , LINK – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.				
Public	Barry Rector, for Lodge 66				
Concerns (6:05)	<b>McLaughlin</b> – No concerns. <b>Dutra</b> – No concerns provided the A/C is screened and moved. <b>Coombs</b> – All the windows are ganged; especially in the dormer, there is room to separate the windows in the rear dormer by at least one foot. <b>Pohl</b> – On the front elevation, which faces the cul de sac, the A/C on the left needs to be moved to the right side; we'll request screening for that since it will show up from the front elevation.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the rear dormer windows separated by 18 inches and relocate the A/C to the right side of the front elevation and screen with evergreen vegetation. (Dutra)</b>				
Vote	Carried 4-0			Certificate #	<b>71843</b>
10.	Heydt, Candice	20 Brant Point	Addition/roofwalk/chimney	29-153	Topham Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Welch				
Alternates	Dutra				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.				
Representing	<b>Joe Topham</b> , Topham Design – Presented project; roof walks are allowed on 1½-story houses.				
Public	None				
Concerns (6:14)	<b>Oliver</b> – Would like photos of the existing house. The addition is acceptable, but the house doesn't meet the criteria for a roof walk and with the exterior access it's a no go. The roof walk is too large, and the exterior access is inappropriate. <b>Coombs</b> – We don't allow roof walks on a house that isn't 2-stories tall. We allowed a roof walk on a Walsh Street house, which was less than two stories; she doesn't think HDC should repeat the mistake. <b>Welch</b> – He thinks a 1¾-story house is on the edge of proper for a roof walk. Considering the size of the roof walk, the exterior stairs, and the nature of the building, he doesn't support the roof walk. <b>McLaughlin</b> – This will be highly visible. The exterior access to the roof walk is inappropriate. <b>Pohl</b> – If the second floor has at least a 5-foot plate, a roof walk is acceptable.				
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)</b>				
Vote	Carried 5-0			Certificate #	

11. Haley, Victor	94 Orange Street	Addition	55.1.4-47	Concept Design
12. Charron, Paul	48 Walsh Street	New dwelling	29-101	Robert Newman
Voting	Pohl, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	Robert Newman, Sandcastle Construction Inc. <b>Paul Charron</b> , owner – Upset that it can't be heard.			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:23)	Not opened at this time. Discussion about Ms. Coombs and/or Mr. Dutra are to review the January 22 hearing and Mullen back on.			
Motion	<b>Not opened due to lack of quorum.</b>			
Vote	N/A		Certificate #	
13. Heller, Jeff	7 East Lincoln Avenue	Move/demo dwelling	42.4.1-8	Robert Newman
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Dutra			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Robert Newman</b> , Sandcastle Construction Inc. – This is circa between 1930 and 1940s. Mr. Colin discussed the need for an independent engineer. This has clearly been flooded many times. Our concept is to have a design that nods to the original cottage with same details and colors. Doug Colin, caretaker			
Public	<b>Stephen Welch</b> – Typically the Town has an engineer on a consulting contract; if this is within that firm's area of expertise, they would be engaged. Suggested the applicant hire a local historical consultant to evaluate the age of the house.			
Concerns (6:42)	<b>Hedden</b> – This was held for him to research hiring an engineer. Director of PLUS Andrew Vorce said normally the applicant would hire their own engineer and the Town would hire an engineer so that there would be a peer review. Some clarification on the original approval might also be useful: was it a demolition or massive expansion. <b>Pohl</b> – The point of hiring an engineer is to hear a neutral voice. He disagrees with Mr. Vorce about having the applicant hire a separate engineer; he believes a Town-hired engineer is sufficient. Someone has to make an unbiased decision on which engineer to hire; that would be Mr. Vorce. Asked for a motion that Mr. Vorce select an independent engineer. Wants to see the minutes from the 2008 approval. <b>Oliver</b> – The NACR survey states this is contributing. There was a prior approval from 2008 to demolish this structure. If this house isn't as old as some claims indicate, she doesn't see any sense in hiring an engineer. <b>Coombs</b> – We are asking for an engineer to evaluate the mold, rot and structural integrity; you can get rid of mold. <b>McLaughlin</b> – Provided some historical information about the 1923 Sanborn maps.			
Motion	<b>Motion to have Mr. Hedden request Mr. Vorce to commission a professional consultant to evaluate the building to determine how it was compromised regarding structural integrity, hazardous mold and mildew, mechanical systems, and habitability due to flooding with cost of the consultant to be borne by the applicant; and for Mr. Hedden to provide the minutes from the original approval, COA. 52012, March 8, 2008. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	
14. Heller, Jeff	7 E. Lincoln Avenue	New dwelling	42.4.1-8	Robert Newman
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Oliver, Dutra			
Alternates	Welch			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold to track. (Coombs)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0		Certificate #	

15. Wepler, John	8 Fair Street	Rev. 67571: arbor gate	42.3.1-107	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, McLaughlin, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b> – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:08)	<p><b>Pohl</b> – Read HSAB comments: as built; hardware on wrong side and looks bad. If everyone is okay with lowering the arch, Mr. Dutra is right that cutting the posts would be way more cost effective.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – The height of the upper arch relative to the gate makes it oblong; if it were more round, it would look better be more typical and look better.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Suggested putting the hardware on the back side and having it swing in.</p> <p><b>Dutra</b> – It would be very easy to bring the arch height down, cut the posts between the cap and lattice.</p> <p><b>McLaughlin</b> – Usually these are 7 to 7.5 feet; asked the height of this.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the arch dropped to the height of the lattice and reverse the hardware with the gate on the back posts. (Dutra)</b>			
Vote	Carried 5-0	Certificate #	<b>71844</b>	
16. Wepler, John	8 Fair Street	Rev.67572: lattice/pipe/brackets	42.3.1-107	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b> – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:14)	<p><b>Welch</b> – Asked about a north elevation window that looks like a transom over a door. The privacy lattice looks odd and is visible from a public way.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Read HSAB comments: remove roof walk brackets; why is there a wrought iron Juliet balcony; copper leader needs to go down. He’s willing to approve this with the removal of the natural-to-weather, red-cedar lattice.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the north elevation red-cedar lattice removed. (Dutra)</b>			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	<b>71845</b>	
17. Gibbs, Matthew	4 Galen Avenue	Boat house/garage	29-37	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.			
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b> – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:22)	<p><b>McLaughlin</b> – The garage doors measure out at 10 feet tall. There is no window schedule.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Suggested making the garage look more like the house, by using regular height doors and vertical boards below, rather than having 10’ tall doors and shingle-type sidewall that covers 3’ of the foundation.</p> <p><b>Dutra</b> – Mr. Welch’s suggestion results in stumpy doors and what would happen with the wall shingles.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Thinks a wrapped base would make the structure look better proportioned.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the base of the garage doors to match the interior floor with the wall shingles to come to the bottom of the garage door and the bottom to match the main house. (Welch)</b>			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #	<b>71846</b>	
18. Brown, Christina	69 North Liberty Street	Alterations/deck/doors	41-142	Val Oliver
Voting	Pohl, McLaughlin, Welch, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historic documentation, and advisory board comments.			
Representing	<b>Val Oliver</b> – Presented project.			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:28)	<p><b>Pohl</b> – Read HSAB comments: need history and photos; what does current front door look like; was demo of front approved; should be stoop; need images of neighbors; HSAB wants back.</p> <p><b>Dutra</b> – Wants to view.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to View and Hold for additional information. (Welch)</b>			
Vote	Carried 4-0	Certificate #		



19. Malone, Barb                      6 Hiawasse Lane                      New dwelling                      56-471                      Val Oliver  
 Voting                      Pohl, McLaughlin, Dutra  
 Alternates                      None  
 Recused                      Oliver  
 Documentation                      Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.  
 Representing                      **Val Oliver** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.  
 Public                      None  
 Concerns (7:31)                      **McLaughlin** – No concerns.  
    **Pohl** – The sidelights should stop at the lock rail with a panel below.  
    **Dutra** – Agrees with Mr. Pohl.  
 Motion                      **Motion to Approve through staff with the front door sidelights to come down to the door lock rail and a panel below. (Dutra)**  
 Vote                      Carried 3-0                      Certificate #                      **71847**

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

Approve Minutes	January 22, 2019: <b>Motion to Approve.</b> (Welch) Carried unanimously
Review Minutes	January 29, 2019
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion and update of Vineyard Wind project.  <b>Welch</b> – If HDC has objections, we need to provide a letter detailing those objections to the project; he will draft a letter and distribute it prior to the February 7, 2019, Organizational Meeting.</li> <li>• Discussion of HVAC units and mini-split line sets.  <b>McLaughlin</b> – They should not be on the front and all go straight up next to the corner board then across. They should also be on the inside.</li> <li>• Discussion of upcoming organizational meeting.  <b>Hedden</b> – The agenda is posted and on the Town website; the items of discussion are listed.  <b>Welch</b> – Wants to talk about the warrant article to increase the height due to flood requirements within the context of how HDC should address the streetscape of these raised homes.</li> </ul>
Commission Comments	None

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. February 7, 2019 Organizational Meeting agenda.
2. Article 63 (Zoning Bylaw Amendment: Clarification of Height Limitations in Certain Flood Zones)

Adjourned at 7:46 p.m. by unanimous consent

Submitted by:  
 Terry L. Norton

Historic Structures Advisory Board    Madaket Advisory Board