

VIEUX CARRE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

LaToya Cantrell
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Bryan Block
DIRECTOR

NOTE: The below minutes are a summary of actions taken. They are not a verbatim transcription of the meeting.

Minutes of the VCC Architectural Committee meeting of Tuesday, February 28, 2023 – 1:00 pm.

Committee Members Present: Stephen Bergeron, Rick Fifield

Committee Members Absent: Toni DiMaggio

Staff Present: Bryan Block, Director; Renee Bourgogne, Deputy Director; Nicholas Albrecht, Senior Plans Examiner; Erin Vogt, Senior Plans Examiner; Marguerite Roberts, Inspector; Nora Goddard, Inspector

Others Present: John Williams, Sam Levison, Katherine Harmon, Tripp Morris, Erika Gates, Miles Martin, Ralph Long, Nikki Szalwinski, Michael Reid, Jeff Collins, Thai Nguyen, Dixon Jelich, Ralph Long, Julia Hodgins, Lorey Flick, Paul Migliore, Gabriel Virdure, Sam Welty

MINUTES

Old Business

1009 Burgundy St: Michael Reid, applicant; Jeffery C Collins, owner; Review of proposed revisions relocating approved generator to rear of property, per materials received 04/12/2022 & 02/14/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=924103>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Reid and Mr. Collins present on behalf of the application. Mr. Collins stated that there was currently a gas line running from the street, along the fence to the gas grill, so they would only be extending it another 30' or so. He went on to say that it would be about 2' above the planter with about 8' of brick above that. Mr. Fifield asked if the line was currently visible. Mr. Collins stated that there was landscaping hiding it, bamboo. Ms. Vogt requested a diagram showing where the line would run in elevation. Mr. Reid stated that this was similar to another project he had completed on Madison Street, where the line was run along the top center of the wall. He added that they were planning to install the generator here as Phase 1, and that construction of the shed would be in a separate phase, in future. Mr. Fifield asked if the diameter of the gas line would be increased; Mr. Reid responded yes, and that the line would be a black powder coating since paint would flake. There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron moved for **conceptual approval** of the location, with additional materials to be submitted to staff. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Reid noted that the changes were done to accommodate the neighboring property owner's concerns regarding the generator.

815 St Ann St: 21-21655-VCGEN; John C Williams, applicant; 815 St Ann Holdings LLC, Sandra L Sachs, Lisa P Sinders, Sandra Sachs, owner;

Review of construction documents for previously approved proposal to demolish and reconstruct the front masonry wall, per application & materials received 07/27/2021 & 02/03/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=894862>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Williams present on behalf of the application. Mr. Williams stated that the wall shoring was now mostly in place. Regarding the replacement brick, Mr. Williams noted they could work something out.

Mr. Bergeron noted that there were no dimensions noted on the second floor.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron moved to conceptually approve the proposal with the applicant to work with staff on any further details. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

241 Bourbon St: 22-30621-VCGEN; John C Williams, applicant; 241 Holdings LLC, et al, owner;

Proposal to renovate building (in conjunction with 235-237 Bourbon St.) including a proposed change of use on the third floor from vacant to short term rental, per application & materials received 10/11/2022 & 02/15/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=948295>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Williams and Mr. Levinson present on behalf of the application. Mr. Levinson stated that they were seeking feedback on the proposed doors and noted that the fire marshal was requiring the door for the second-floor balcony. Mr. Williams stated that as far as the structure was concerned they had no objection to handling the under the balcony section a different way. He went on to say that they did not want to delay the project so they would use traditional methods for structural work. Mr. Fifield steered the conversation to the new vestibule door. Mr. Levinson stated that they had designed it to match the other doors on the Bienville elevation but that they wanted it to be a celebratory door as it was the entrance to the hotel. Mr. Fifield stated that he agreed with staff, it was not original so it should not mimic an historic condition.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron asked “so no original material in the new faux window/door? Mr. Levinson stated that there would not be. Mr. Bergeron asked, “so it can’t be reused?” Mr. Levinson stated no. Mr. Bergeron asked if all the windows would be converted. Mr. Levinson stated no, only one. Mr. Bergeron asked staff if they wanted to defer the structural. Mr. Albrecht stated yes.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion for the conceptual approval of the proposed work excluding the structural work. Mr. Fifield asked to amend the motion to state, “revisions on the Bienville street door.” Mr. Bergeron agreed to the amended motion. Mr. Fifield seconded the amended motion and the motion passed unanimously.

730 St Peter St: 22-35393-VCGEN; John C Williams, applicant; St Peter FQ Holdings LLC, owner; Proposal to demolish courtyard structures, modify millwork, install mechanical equipment, and modify roof to connect the front and rear structures, in conjunction with a **change of use** from *vacant* to *restaurant (standard), cultural facility & arts studio/educational facility (vocational)*, per application & materials received 11/30/2022 & 02/14/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=955033>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Williams and Mr. Nguyen present on behalf of the application. Mr. Williams stated that he was happy staff was recommending that the application move forward, and that they would be submitting 726 today for review at the next meeting. He stated that they had found previous openings in the courtyard wall that had been infilled, and that it was their opinion that this would be defined as a cultural facility. Mr. Williams added that after discussing with staff, they had decided to spread out the HVAC equipment so it was not too much in one place. He explained that the louvers in the wall would function similarly to the approved HVAC installation at 714 St. Peter. He added that this proposal would increase their open space since they would be performing demolition of the non-historic courtyard structures, and that he appreciated willingness to support an open space waiver, if needed.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he was grateful for the work to improve the proposal. Mr. Fifield agreed with staff that option 2 was the best proposal for the roof. Mr. Williams stated that they would work with staff to ensure it would be code compliant and discreet. Ms. Bourgoigne reminded the applicant that this proposal would have to return to Committee for design development and construction document review. Mr. Williams thanked staff for their effort to move this forward.

Mr. Bergeron moved for **conceptual approval** of the work and to forward it to the Commission with a positive recommendation, with a preference for option 2 at the roof. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

937 Dumaine St: 23-00999-VCGEN; John C Williams, applicant; 937 Dumaine Street LLC, owner; Proposal to install intercom at front entrance, per application & materials received 01/11/2023 & 02/10/2023.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=958961>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Jelich and Mr. Williams present on behalf of the application. Mr. Jelich stated that he had met with staff on site and that they believed this would be a successful location since it would be flush mounted. He apologized for not providing this information earlier in the project but he believed this would be the last piece for wrapping up the renovation, which they had worked very hard on. Mr. Bergeron asked if the outside would be flush with the plaster; Mr. Jelich responded yes, about 1-1/4" deep. Mr. Bergeron stated that it would be great if it ended up not requiring brick removal. Mr. Jelich responded that they would try to avoid that. Mr. Block stated that he had gone out to the site as requested by the Committee, and that the fixture had a very thin flange, and that he thought this followed the Committee's previous recommendation to find the best solution.

Mr. Bergeron moved to **approve** the proposal. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

434-40 Bourbon, 732 St Louis St: 23-00612-VCGEN; Diane Hickman, applicant; MDK 440 Bourbon Real Estate LLC, owner; Proposal to demolish Brown rated structures and construct new three-story building with double gallery, in conjunction with a **change of use** from *bar* to *bar/residential*, per application & materials received 01/09/2023 & 02/14/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=958572>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Long present on behalf of the application. Mr. Long thanked staff for their time and effort, but stated that he was disappointed with the recommendation for deferral since he would continue to develop the details. He stated that he had provided multiple items to get guidance from the Committee. He stated he was ok with bringing the front elevation forward. Regarding Zoning, he stated that he tried to schedule with their department but noted staff was requesting this happen before review at Commission. He asked if he could modify the proposal to get on the Commission agenda. Ms. Bourgogne responded that the problem was not with the doors, it was that the building is currently legal non-conforming, and that staff was concerned that they would go far down this road only to be told that open space was an issue and this could not be done. She added that staff would support a variance but that we needed verification that this would not be an issue.

Mr. Fifield stated that the Committee was discussing the architecture only. Mr. Bergeron agreed with staff that Option 2 was a more appropriate arrangement. Mr. Fifield asked why Mr. Long was proposing two different planes for the front elevation; Mr. Long responded because of door swings and pedestrians. Mr. Fifield stated that this did not fit the building typology, and that it would need to be a different style for that to work, but that the applicant had chosen a 19th century "look," and that if the ground floor needed to be different he might need to consider a different typology. He asked if the applicant had considered this, which Mr. Long stated he had not. Mr. Block encouraged not recessing the openings.

Mr. Fifield wondered why the first floor in Option 1 did not maintain the rhythm of the bays; Mr. Long noted that it was common for first floors to differ and not be married to the bays, but more adapted to the use. Mr. Fifield stated that this was a vocabulary showing modifications, and wondered how the first floor would be used. Mr. Long stated that he could mix the different floors from the different options. Mr. Block stated that revisions were needed and the questions for Zoning must be addressed before going to Commission. Mr. Fifield stated that he wanted to see the stucco scoring and control joints be rusticated; Mr. Long responded that staff had discouraged this, and Mr. Block added that he had thought it too historic for new construction. Mr. Fifield explained that he was interested in seeing it in future reviews, along with the articulation of the cornice, adding that they "needed to be detailed well even if not historic."

Mr. Bergeron stated that he was caught up on the proposed demolition, stating that he wanted to see as much historic fabric retained as possible. Mr. Block noted the ghosting of former openings and that it would be great to keep as much as possible in an ideal world, but that the interior was not enough to warrant retention, in staff's opinion, but that Commission consideration of the demolition would be required.

Ms. Szalwinski addressed the Committee on behalf of French Quarter Citizens, stating that any historic fabric

should be saved when possible and that what was being proposed was too massive. She added that she wanted to see open space restored and was concerned about surrounding structures.

Mr. Long stated that it was not massive and fit into the context of the whole block, noting that it was smaller than others. He added that it would be pile supported. Ms. Vogt added that the observed brown rated horizontal members were newer, and that very little vertical materials remained. Mr. Bergeron stated that it was challenging to disagree with staff's assessment. Mr. Fifield stated that it appeared there was no remaining architectural integrity and no suggestions of remaining historic fragments.

Mr. Bergeron moved to forward the proposal to the Commission with a **positive recommendation**, with revisions to be made to mix options 1 & 2 at the front elevation, contingent upon establishing Zoning/CZO compliance in advance. Mr. Fifield requested an amendment to include "to return to the Committee for design development." Mr. Bergeron accepted the amendment and Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

500-40 St Peter St: 21-04902-VCGEN; Kidder Blake, applicant; El Churasco Chapin LLC, owner;

For recommendation only: Proposal to install thirty rooftop and wall mounted intake vents of various sizes to ventilate attic and stairwells, per application & materials received 02/23/2021 & 02/13/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=873987>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Ms. Hodgins and Ms. Flick present on behalf of the application. Ms. Hodgins stated that she understood staff's concerns and that the additional scope is to protect existing conditions. She explained that the ventilation is for each space and there are significant moisture issues, and that they really think this is the best intervention to address that. Ms. Flick stated that the work done in the 1990s made these issues worse and that they had likely tried to avoid installing units on the roof, but that there was no way to control the humidity currently. She explained the stairwells used to have more airflow but had been enclosed and now had no movement, leaving the spaces humid and moldy. Mr. Fifield asked if they considered conditioning the spaces; Ms. Flick noted that they were not completely enclosed at the moment, and were still somewhat exterior space. She added that there was no place to put that equipment, and that they were going for more movement to prevent growth, and that there would be humidstats at the ceiling to control the ventilation. Mr. Fifield asked if there was any danger that the vents would draw in moist air; Ms. Flick responded that if it was moving it was unlikely. She added that if they could not vent they would need to seal the ceilings, but there was currently nowhere for the air to go. She explained that the vents would be 3-5 air changes per hour, and that they wanted it to move slowly so it wasn't a wind tunnel. She added that the larger the vent wheel, the slower the movement, and that they would use 18" ducts.

Ms. Bourgogne suggested the installation of vents in one unit to test the work before putting in all of them. Ms. Flick stated that the owners were adamant that a solution must be found but that there were many constraints and that they needed to try something different. Mr. Fifield asked Ms. Flick to confirm that air would not come in the attic; she agreed, they would not share humidity. Mr. Fifield stated that he was concerned that the roof would look like a bunch of restaurants; Ms. Hodgins stated that they had tried to avoid views from the right of way and courtyards.

Ms. Szalwinski addressed the Committee on behalf of French Quarter Citizens, stating that this was a result of too much enclosure and that the problems were with the infill and mechanical equipment, and that she hoped there was a better solution.

Mr. Bergeron asked about the age of the roof; Ms. Bourgogne stated it would be new, and was currently tarped. Mr. Bergeron noted that the structure should not be altered if the duct is only 18", so it would be reversible if needed. Mr. Fifield asked if it was possible to test in one unit as Ms. Bourgogne had suggested; Ms. Flick stated that she could not speak for the owner but that she found it reasonable. She added that she expected this solution to work since the fans would run off the humidity. Ms. Bourgogne noted that it would save a lot of money if they tested one unit and found it did not work before installing throughout. Mr. Fifield added that this situation was complicated and that the building is precious.

Mr. Bergeron moved to forward a non-binding **positive recommendation** to the Commission for a test case in one unit. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

New Business

518 St Peter St: 23-04318-VCGEN; 518 St Peter St: Hodgins Julia, applicant; The City of New Orleans, owner;
For recommendation only: Proposal to install new mechanical equipment in courtyard, per application & materials received 02/13/2023.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=962321>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Ms. Hodgins and Ms. Flick present on behalf of the application. Ms. Flick stated that they were fine with installing the unit at grade. Mr. Bergeron moved to forward a **positive recommendation** to the full Commission, with the proviso that the unit be at grade. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

616 St Peter St: 22-37643-VCPNT; 616 St Peter St: Paul Migliore, applicant; Petit Theatre Du Vieux Carre Le, 616 St Peter St LLC, owner; Proposal to install removable outdoor heaters at front gallery, per application & materials received 12/20/2022 & 02/14/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=957305>

Ms. Vogt presented the report with Mr. Migliore present on behalf of the application. Mr. Migliore stated that they had never intended to mount the heaters on a permanent basis but that they were trying to find a solution for heating the gallery seating that was better than propane heaters, which were not as safe and difficult to transport. He stated that these units were electric and removable on a daily basis. He added that they could probably be painted. Mr. Fifield stated that he had supported the gallery roof originally but that he was concerned about how much was being added. He stated that they could choose not to use the seating on days that were too cold to be comfortable. He said he found the roof approvable but the heaters were “a step too far.”

Ms. Szalwinski addressed the Committee on behalf of French Quarter Citizens, stating that she had heard lots of complaints about the gallery roof being added, and that this would overcrowd and clutter it.

Mr. Bergeron noted that heating is not needed on many days out of the year. Mr. Fifield repeated that they were not required to use those tables on those days. Mr. Bergeron moved to deny the proposal, with the applicant to explore non-mounted alternatives. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

726-728 Barracks St: 23-01467-VCGEN; Loretta Harmon, applicant; John K Miller, Daniel L Clifton, Walter Bortz, Adam Corley, Edward W Gernon, owner;

Proposal to renovate building including proposal to infill existing gable vents, install cap flashing, and install tie rods, per application & materials received 01/17/2023.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=959508>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Ms. Harmon present on behalf of the application. Ms. Harmon stated that she agreed with recessing the bricks into the vents and they had no problem with the round tie rod plates. She went on to say that she was not aware until today that the cap flashing was new and unpermitted. She stated that they would come back with a proposal to correct it.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to conceptually approve the renovation with the rods to have round plates, the gable vent masonry infill to be inset in the wall, all documents requested to be provided to staff, and the denial of the cap flashing. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

926 Toulouse St: 23-02304-VCGEN; Juster Rita, applicant; The Jeff and Rita Juster Revocable, owner;

Proposal to install Azek synthetic porch decking on rear building and proposal to install new louvered shutters on the Burgundy elevation of the main building, per application & materials received 02/07/2023 & 02/15/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=960457>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Morris present on behalf of the application. Mr. Morris stated that the owner likes the Azek texture and color. Mr Morris continued that the bottoms could be primed and painted and

regarding the proposed new shutters, that the intent was to keep the shutters closed at all times. Mr. Fifield inquired if a different shutter style would be more appropriate. Mr. Block responded that it might draw more attention to the opening.

Nikki Szalwinski inquired if shutters could be installed in this location because it was an exterior fire escape. Mr. Fifield responded, noting that the fire escape was not legal egress and so the shutters could be installed. Ms. Szalwinski continued that the building needed extensive repointing.

Mr. Bergeron asked if staff had a recommendation for the wood, and if the applicant was ok with that. Ms. Bourgogne stated that she previously told the owner the synthetic decking would not be approved.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion for the approval of new wood decking and the approval of shutters with the configuration and type to be determined at the staff level. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Appeals and Violations

512-16 Conti St: 22-16190-VCGEN; Baroness, applicant; 512 Conti LLC, owner; Proposal to modify fountain installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application received 06/06/2022 & 02/07/2023. **[Notice of Violation sent 10/05/2021]**

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=929596>

Ms. Vogt presented the staff report with Mr. Welty present on behalf of the application. Mr. Welty stated that the owner had asked to try to keep the fountain but to make it approvable, and they were trying to resolve the violation. Mr. Fifield stated that it would be far better if they started over, and that he thought it would be appropriate to deny retention and have the applicant propose something new. He agreed that there were elements that could be approvable but that recladding would not make it substantially better.

Ms. Szalwinski addressed the Committee on behalf of FQC, stating that the fountain did not belong in the Quarter and that she supported denial. Mr. Bergeron stated that denial could be appealed, but agreed with installing a fresh fountain, not a modified one.

Mr. Bergeron moved to defer with the applicant to propose a completely new fountain design that meets the Guidelines. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

327 Bourbon St: 22-34992-VCGEN; Gates Erika, applicant; Karno 327 Bourbon Real Estate LLC, owner;

Proposal to renovate building including the reconstruction of previously existing rear enclosed gallery and the installation of new mechanical equipment, per application & materials received 10/13/2022 & 02/14/2023.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=954630>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Martin and Ms. Gates present on behalf of the application. Ms. Gates stated that she agreed with the staff report and that they had flushed out the HVAC the most as it was the most pressing design item and that they would be happy to address any other items. Mr. Martin stated that the HVAC was the most pressing issue as they advanced the pricing and MEP set and that they decided to propose the equipment without screening. He went on to state the other items were not their top priority.

Mr. Fifield stated that the problem was the height of the new equipment. He then asked if they had done a physical mockup. Mr. Martin stated, "not yet." Mr. Fifield then asked, "what about flashing into the roof instead of above?" Mr. Martin stated that dropping it in might be an option and they would explore this. Mr. Fifield went on to say that the ARC had looked at this option out of desperation but that now seeing the scale of the platform, it presents some concerns. He continued noting that this was an unusual installation and they needed to be cautious. Mr. Block asked if the attic was to be conditioned. Ms. Gates stated yes, it was usable space. Mr. Fifield stated that he still believed this was the best location but that he needed to see a mockup.

Public comment- Nikki Szalwinski stated that she had extreme concern over this being highly obtrusive. She continued that sinking it in would be a better option and that she had concern about fixing the roof if it is damaged after this is installed.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to defer in order to allow time for the applicant to work on HVAC plan. Mr. Fifield asked for an amendment to include a sight line survey. Mr. Bergeron agreed and amended the motion . Mr. Fifield seconded the amended motion. The motion passed unanimously.

429-433 Bourbon: 23-02941-VCGEN; Diane Hickman, applicant; MCM Acquisitons LLC Ralph Long, owner; Proposal to correct violations and structurally reinforce building, per application & materials received 01/31/2023.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=960932>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Long present on behalf of the application. Mr. Long stated that the engineers wanted to do it this way and unfortunately, they were not there to explain. Mr. Fifield stated that he was hesitant to ever approve epoxy as it was not reversible and that you can never repair the wall again. He then asked the applicant if the building was about to collapse. Mr. Long stated that there are cracks, that the upper floors are held together but the bottom was indeed bowing. Mr. Fifield suggested that a preservation engineer might be more appropriate. Mr. Bergeron asked the applicant if he could work with staff on the cap detail and resubmit something that abided by guidelines. Mr. Long stated yes, and he would bring that up to the owner and roofer.

Public Comment- Nikki Szalwinski stated that the building needs so much repointing and that she didn't think the epoxy would work.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion for the conceptual approval with the modification noted in the staff report. Mr. Fifield asked why. Mr. Bergeron rescinded his motion. Mr. Bergeron made the motion to defer in order for the applicant to work with the engineer on a more preservation-minded solution. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

200 Decatur St: 23-02947-VCGEN; Diane Hickman, applicant; 200 Levee Street LLC, owner;

Proposal to repair and structurally reinforce building, per application & materials received 01/31/2022.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=960951>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Long present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield asked if the mortar would be repointed traditionally. Mr. Long stated that yes it would be.

Public comment- Nikki Szalwinski stated that she cannot support the use of epoxy. She continued recommending that they repoint using traditional methods.

Mr. Bergeron stated that using epoxy to repair a crack is different than using anchoring bolts. Mr. Fifield asked if either building needed to be shored (referring to 429 Bourbon heard before this item on the agenda). Mr. Long replied no, not at this time.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to defer to allow the applicant time to revised the drawings based on staff's comments and today's discussion. Motion rescinded. Mr. Bergeron made the motion for conceptual approval of the work with revisions at the staff level including the parapet flashing detail revised to meet guidelines. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

At approximately 3:23 PM Mr. Bergeron made the motion for adjournment. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Next AC Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023