



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT  
Neighborhood Services Division

Courthouse Plaza One 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201  
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

*DRAFT*

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD**

**Wednesday, August 20, 2014  
2100 Clarendon Boulevard  
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joan Lawrence, Chairman  
Charles Matta, Vice Chairman  
Charles Craig  
Robert Dudka  
Tova Solo  
Mark Turnbull  
Nathan Uldricks  
Kevin Vincent  
Andy Wenchel

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Gerald Laporte  
Erin May  
Patricia Weichmann-Morris  
Richard Woodruff

**STAFF:** Rebecca Ballo, Preservation Planner  
John Liebertz, Preservation Planner

**ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:33 pm. Mr. Liebertz called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 23, 2014, HALRB MEETING**

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the July meeting minutes. Mr. Uldricks stated that he was incorrectly listed as seconding the motion to approve the May HALRB meeting minutes [Mr. Turnbull had approved the June minutes and Mr. Matta had seconded the motion]. Mr. Turnbull moved to accept the July meeting minutes with the mentioned corrections. Mr. Craig seconded and the motion passed 5-0-2. Mr. Dudka and Mr. Uldricks abstained. Ms. Solo and Mr. Vincent had not yet arrived.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)**

The Chairman stated that she would readdress the public hearing procedures prior to any discussion items.

The Chairman said there were six cases on the Consent Agenda, but pulled CoA 14-12 for discussion. She asked for a motion on the remaining five consent agenda items. Mr. Craig moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Wenchel seconded and the motion passed unanimously, 8-0 [Ms. Solo had arrived].

**CONSENT AGENDA (CoAs):**

- 1) 1005 South Quinn Street  
Cameron & Catherine Saadat  
Harry W. Gray Historic District  
HALRB Case 14-12 (HP1400019)  
Request to: 1) construct a second-story on an existing one-story addition; 2) add a second-story deck; and 3) replace a non-historic window on the first story of the addition with a single leaf door.
  
- 2) 3624 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North  
Glen Vogel & Brooke Milton  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 14-14 (HP1400021)  
Request to: 1) demolish the rear covered porch; 2) demolish a shed; 3) demolish a pergola; 4) remove a small front-porch roof added ca. 1986; 5) replace the non-historic turned wood posts, railing, and decking on the front porch; 6) construct a two-story addition with a side porch; and 7) add a patio to the rear of the dwelling.
  
- 3) 2313 North Jackson Street  
Andrew Lewis & Theresa Maria Wyatt  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 14-13 (HP1400020)  
Request to: 1) demolish part of the existing one-story rear addition; 2) construct a two-story rear addition with an exposed basement; 3) demolish a masonry retaining wall to the south of the dwelling; 4) add a cedar arbor; 5) install a flagstone patio; 6) add masonry retaining walls at the rear of the addition; 7) replace and relocate the a/c units; and 8) extend a concrete driveway.

- 4) 2915 22<sup>nd</sup> Street North  
Carter & Christie Ham  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 14-08A (HP1400032)  
Request to revise CoA 14-08. Proposed work includes a revision to an approved pathway in order to retain an existing crape myrtle.
- 5) 2821 23<sup>rd</sup> Street North  
Clint Woodson  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 13-10D (HP1400029)  
Request to amend CoA 13-10C in order to add a band course between the first and second stories on the addition.
- 6) 3501 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North  
Brendan & Jody Devine  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 11-36A (HP1400035)  
Request to renew CoA 11-36 in order to replace the existing tin-shingle front porch roof with standing seam metal.

**ADMINISTRATIVE COAs (ACoAs): 1)**

- AHC, Inc.  
2230 North Fairfax Drive  
Buckingham Village Historic District  
ACoA 14-07  
Request to install a/c units.
- 2) Brian and Amanda Davis  
2165 North Lincoln Street  
Maywood Historic District  
ACoA 14-08  
Request to install wood picket fence.
- 3) Kevin Kayes  
2321 North Jackson Street  
Maywood Historic District  
ACoA 14-10  
Request to install a wood picket fence and privacy fence.

Mr. Liebertz presented a summary of the approved ACoA cases. The Chairman noted that ACoA 14-08, the application to install a wood picket fence, adjoined her property line. She noted the open communication between the property owners and requested that staff remind applicants to talk to their neighbors in order to avoid double fences and other potential issues.

**Pulled Constant Agenda Item: 1005 South Quinn Street, CoA 14-12**

The Chairman welcomed Cameron Saadat, the owner of the property, and Carter Jones, the project architect. She commended the applicant on his ongoing renovation work. She stated that the item was pulled from the consent agenda due to the discussions between the DRC members and staff at the DRC meetings and the overall importance of the dwelling to Arlington County.

Mr. Jones introduced the project. He noted that the applicant presented at three DRC meetings with various designs. The design submitted is a second-story addition on an existing one-story rear addition. He noted the applicants' preference for retaining the second-story porch proposed for infill, and therefore, added a second-story deck to the proposal. This created additional open space, allowed for a porch under the deck, and lightened the overall massing of the elevation. He added that the DRC recommended approval of the submitted open-porch design as they requested it not be screened in. Mr. Matta added that the shed roof on the model is not the roof submitted [a flat roof]. Mr. Jones agreed and stated that the model was built prior to the change in roof form. He suggested that the flat roof further differentiated the roof from the historic dwelling. Mr. Jones listed the different materials utilized on the project.

Mr. Liebertz provided background information and a brief history of the dwelling. He noted that Harry Gray constructed the Italianate-styled dwelling in 1881. Gray, a former slave and skilled brick mason, utilized his knowledge of row house construction to complete his dwelling, resulting in a row house form in a farmland area. The house represents the shift from slavery to freedmen after the Civil War.

Mr. Liebertz discussed relevant prior alterations to the property. The first story of the side porch was enclosed ca. 1960 resulting in its current form with a second-story balcony. The current property owner completed a number of renovations to the dwelling, including remodeling the enclosed first-story side porch. He added that the current proposal calls for a small addition/infill of the second-story balcony. The DRC and staff agreed that the proposed addition is sited in the most appropriate location and recommend approval of this aspect of the proposal.

Mr. Liebertz added that the DRC and staff disagreed regarding the appropriateness of the second-story deck. He stated that staff believed that the deck's prominent visual location at the intersection of South Quinn Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Street South conflicted with the uniqueness of the house in regards to its design, massing, and historic context. He suggested that the addition of the deck resulted in a false sense of developmental history due to the need to redesign the first story of the addition to read as a porch (the applicants replaced one of the existing windows with a 2'-wide door). Mr. Liebertz noted that the narrow door width is atypical for such historic dwellings. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the second-story addition and removal of the proposed deck.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the DRC and staff agreed to leave the item on the consent agenda; however, procedural issues (along with the issues noted by the Chairman) resulted in its removal from the consent agenda. He noted that staff failed to have the DRC recommend to the HALRB which Secretary of the Interior's Standards the project adheres to. Since staff did

not make a finding of compliance in their staff report, the HALRB will need to cite specific standards in their motion.

Mr. Dudka presented the DRC report and provided background information. He stated that the DRC recommended against any proposals that expanded the footprint of the addition. He contended that row houses typically expanded to the rear of the dwelling due to their limitation by other buildings to their sides. This dwelling, a detached row house in a field, allowed for expansion to the side of the building. The DRC wanted to limit the amount of massing on the side. The DRC contended that the proposed second-story deck and first-story open porch lightened the large addition/massing, allowed the owner to maintain a deck, and limited the addition within the existing footprint. He added that the DRC stated the porch must remain with no screens or windows to retain its sense of openness.

The Chairman opened the item for discussion. Mr. Craig asked staff if changing the proportions of the door and window on the first story of the enclosed porch would change staff's position. Mr. Liebertz noted that the proportion of the proposed 2'-wide door appeared narrow in relation to the historic building, but noted that the existing interior floor plan limited widening the door or adjacent windows. Mr. Jones added that the proposed door led to the cellar that contained the HVAC and other equipment. Mr. Craig asked staff if changing the style of the door would lessen staff concerns. Mr. Liebertz responded that staff had no issue with the style of the proposed door, but greater concerns regarding its overall impact on the design and massing.

Mr. Wenchel stated that the original structure is brick masonry and the addition is wood-clad siding. This differentiation clearly distinguishes the building from the historic structure. He added that the addition and deck clearly meet Standards #9 and #10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The Chairman read the guidelines and noted that these two guidelines appear to be the most appropriate for this case. She asked for further clarifications from staff regarding their opposition to the second-story deck. Mr. Liebertz confirmed that staff's objections were limited to the second-story deck and contended that the deck's prominent location at the corner of the property conflicted with the design and massing of the historic dwelling.

The Chairman stated that she visited the dwelling and believed that the size proposed is not extravagant. She noted that the addition to the historic building presently exists and believes that the proposal falls within Standards #9 and #10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Ms. Solo agreed with the Chairman and added the applicants should consider the future landscaping/development of the elevation facing South Quinn Street. She raised questions on the orientation of the dwelling towards 10<sup>th</sup> Street South (a secondary road) instead of South Quinn Street. Mr. Liebertz stated that Harry Gray orientated the dwelling to Columbia Pike. Ms. Ballo confirmed and added that: 1) the building was setback and orientated to Columbia Pike; 2) the Pike was the only road that existed at the time of construction; and 3) the Gray house was situated on a substantial sized lot. The descendants of Harry Gray later platted the surrounding subdivisions. Ms. Solo thanked staff for the clarification. She added that the east elevation with little landscaping or fenestration had the potential to turn into a waste area due to its lack of windows. She suggested the future addition of windows, consideration of

additional massing, and/or other design features to enhance this space as it is the elevation seen from the main street [South Quinn Street].

Mr. Matta stated that the HALRB and staff need to further discuss the implementation of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Arlington County’s Historic Districts. He added that the project potentially also meets Standards #4 and #5. Mr. Dudka added that the new first-story porch and second-story deck recall the presence of the former historically significant porch that existed ca. 1960. In this way, the porch itself recalls the historic nature of the site.

The Chairman asked for a motion. Ms. Solo moved to accept the project. The Chairman amended the motion: “The HALRB moves to approve the proposed changes to the Gray House at 1005 South Quinn Street and finds that the projects meets at least [Standards] #9 and #10 of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Rehabilitation.” Mr. Dudka further amended the motion to include a statement that the porch should remain open. Staff re-read the amended motion: “The HALRB moves to approve the proposed changes to the Gray House at 1005 South Quinn Street, finds that the projects meets at least [Standards] #9 and #10 of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Rehabilitation, and stated that the porch will remain open.” Mr. Vincent asked if there was a particular number of standards required for legal approval. Mr. Liebertz responded that there is no minimum. The Chairman added that the guidelines must be considered and utilized in the decision making process. Mr. Vincent seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Discussion Item #1: 2400 Columbia Pike (Rappahannock Coffee site) Columbia Pike Form Based Code Project**

The Chairman welcomed the applicants. Ms. Ballo provided background information on the project and noted that the HALRB previously heard the project at its kickoff. This project is being reviewed under the Commercial Form Based Code. There are two historic facades that will be preserved, requiring a review under a CoA. For the past few months, this project has been reviewed by the DRC. The applicants and the DRC agreed that the plans progressed to a sufficient point to return to the HALRB for a check-in regarding the proposal’s treatment of the historic facades, mass, scale, design, and how it relates to other buildings on Columbia Pike including Arlington Village garden apartments and Arlington Village Shopping Center. The goal after this meeting is for the project to return to the DRC for further refinement of the materials, design, etc., and then return to the HALRB for a conditional CoA approval in the fall. The Chairman reiterated that the HALRB will be providing feedback on the proposed design.

Temple Washington, the project architect, presented the proposal. Mr. Washington showed the location of the building on the model and offered material samples. He provided background information including the historic buildings’ date of construction ca. 1951. He noted their character-defining features and how the proposal maintained these items. Mr. Washington discussed the developmental history of the surrounding area and how it related to/impacted the two remaining historic buildings. He added that the Form Based Code’s treatment of the historic buildings was changed from full building preservation to facade preservation due to the lack of articulation on the side and rear elevations, and the date of construction.

Mr. Washington summarized the proposed building, discussing the overall design, height, setbacks, materials, treatment of the historic facades, etc. Regarding the historic facades, he

noted that the color of the buildings would remain their current scheme in order to further differentiate the two historic facades from the new construction. He added that the bands of color on the cornice of the historic buildings differ; one building is simply painted and the other building has attached wood trim that is painted.

The Chairman had a question regarding the color of the proposed mesh and building materials. Mr. Washington stated his desire to keep the color light due to its orientation and relation to the streetscape.

Mr. Dudka presented the DRC report. He stated that the two buildings were remnants of a streetscape that no longer exists. The applicants were tasked with integrating the simple historic facades into a large building, while appreciating them but not setting them completely apart. The first design distinguished the historic facades too much from the original building, the second design integrated the historic facades into the overall design to their detriment, but the current design is an appropriate balance. He added that an important aspect not fully covered by the applicant in this proposal is the signage. This will allow the buildings to express themselves individually within the larger framework. The two existing buildings should be allowed to have their existing signage and also more unified signage will be placed on the building around it. He added that the two-story base of the proposed building allows the design to relate to the surrounding garden apartments and shopping center.

The Chairman agreed with the DRC's assessment and reiterated that the facades are treated in a respectful way. Mr. Wenchel noted how well the project has progressed, appreciated the use of color in the application, and concurred with the importance of the use of historically appropriate signage.

Ms. Solo thanked the applicants for such a detailed and thorough presentation. She asked the applicants to consider adding an accurate perspective of the "site as seen from across Columbia Pike" in order to represent the building's location at a corner [the panorama skews the image].

Mr. Vincent questioned the HALRB's role in the implementation of facadectomy. He thanked the applicant and the DRC, but questioned whether facade preservation is an appropriate preservation tool and what the County is achieving with such projects. In this case, he noted that the facades preserved here have no context in the interior as all of the party walls will be demolished.

Ms. Ballo added that the facade preservation of the Virginia Hardware building (also on the Pike) is a successful project, but noted that long-time residents are disappointed by the lack of the sense that the interior once housed a hardware store. Similar arguments that facadectomy are stage set pieces are prevalent in the preservation community. The Chairman noted in Clarendon and at Penzance [corner facade] where the interior retail units behind the historic facades retain a sense of the original space. She contended that those examples are truer facade preservation than what is proposed for these buildings.

Mr. Dudka agreed with Mr. Vincent's point, but noted that the complaint is more directed at the formulation of the Form Based Code than with the current proposal. He asked the applicant to consider the retention of the original party walls to a certain extent when laying out the retail, while understanding that the DRC/HALRB had no jurisdiction to require such an action.

Mr. Washington stated that the divisions are currently hypothetical. Mr. Wenchel stated that the character-defining elements of the building demarcated by the green trim only extend approximately 4' – 6' to the rear of the building; therefore, the preservation of the interior party walls beyond this point may be unnecessary.

The Chairman stated that the DRC and HALRB agree that the design of the proposal is appropriately moving forward. Mr. Washington asked what information the DRC would like to review at its subsequent meeting. Mr. Dudka and staff suggested: signage, elaboration of the materials, and particulars of the facade preservation.

Mr. Dudka asked the applicants if there was a determination about whether the facades would be deconstructed or left-in place during construction. Mr. Washington stated that applicants have not yet determined the best course. Mr. Dudka urged the applicants to consider leaving the facades in place in lieu of complete deconstruction. He requested the applicants return to DRC with a better sense of the construction process.

The Chairman thanked the applicants for their presentation.

**Discussion Item #2: Benjamin Elliott's Coal Trestle: Review of Proposed Historic District Design Guidelines**

The Chairman introduced the proposed design guidelines and the process for public speakers. She stated that the guidelines are for the Benjamin Elliott's Coal Trestle Historic District, which the HALRB recommended approval as a local historic district in May 2014. The designation request was to move forward to the Planning Commission and the County Board without design guidelines due to the imminent demolition threat to the structure; however, that part of the structure was demolished in June prior to that review. With the threat of demolition no longer extant, the designation has returned to the HALRB in order to consider and recommend approval of applicable design guidelines so that the package can continue to move forward.

Mr. Liebertz stated that staff worked with the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NVRPA), who approved the draft design guidelines submitted to the HALRB. The design guidelines preserve the structure as it exists today, while offering future procedural guidance for the restoration and rehabilitation of the structure and the surrounding landscape. He reminded the board that the proposed district will contain only the trestle itself.

The Chairman welcomed the sole speaker, Bernard Berne, to the table. Mr. Berne stated that he had proposed designation of the trestle due to the retention of the original tracks. He noted that this aspect was removed on the southeastern end and that only a portion of the trestle remains. He expressed concerns that the trestle was no longer eligible as a historic district. Further, any designation should require the removal of the existing vegetation along the W&OD Trail in order to increase its visibility along the trail. If the removal of the vegetation is not required with the designation, it may not occur for a substantial period of time. Personally, he believes the structure no longer merits designation, but due to the amount of research and time that has been spent, it should be designated. He contended that Arlington's Department of Parks and Recreation should remove all of the invasive vegetation along the trail and the NVRPA remove any vegetation within the structure. Overall, he had no specific comments on the design guidelines.

Staff stated that the design guidelines cannot require the completion of work outside of the historic district. Most of the invasive species and vegetation are not located within the proposed boundaries of the district. Mr. Liebertz reiterated that the NVRPA is a willing owner who desires to work with the County to interpret the site. Mr. Liebertz then compared the design guidelines to those for the Calloway Cemetery Historic District. The Calloway Cemetery Design Guidelines call for the preservation of the cemetery as it stands; it does not require the church to restore headstones, etc. Similarly, the Benjamin Elliott's Coal Trestle Historic District Design Guidelines will not require the NVRPA to restore the remaining elements of the structure or clear the landscape outside of the historic district, but will require HALRB participation and offer guidance in the future rehabilitation of such structures. He added that staff is confident that the NVRPA will move forward with interpretation of the site in the near future.

Mr. Vincent reminded the board that the HALRB has an advisory function for the County. He stated that the HALRB can make recommendations to Arlington County outside of historic districts. Therefore, the HALRB can recommend ways that the NVRPA can complete landscaping along the W&OD Trail. Mr. Vincent agreed it is more important currently to designate the structure, interpret the site and explain its significance, and then clear surrounding view sheds to aid this interpretation.

The Chairman stated that in the proposed guidelines, staff and the NVRPA successfully outlined the requirements for a CoA and how the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation apply to this structure.

Mr. Matta requested the design guidelines have a consistent date of construction and asked staff to include a more detailed analysis regarding the demolition of the piers. He suggested including the number of those partially demolished and completely intact in order to assist in the analysis of future proposals. Mr. Liebertz responded that there are some small pieces remaining and that he would confirm onsite. Mr. Matta added that he would like to ensure that a later applicant did not attempt to remove a section of an intact pier.

Mr. Vincent requested that the Secretary of the Interior's Standard #8 be added to the design guidelines in order to cover any potential archaeological discoveries.

Ms. Solo asked if it would be appropriate to include the preservation of view sheds in the proposed design guidelines. The Chairman stated that the HALRB is limited to the boundaries of the historic district; however, she added that the HALRB can recommend to the County Board and the NVRPA how the treatment of vegetation on the adjacent trail should be completed in relation to the historic district.

Mr. Dudka commented that the remnants of the trestle should be evaluated in order to assist in its long-term preservation and to analyze the impact of the invasive vegetation to the piers. Mr. Wenchel made similar comments regarding the structural stability of the piers post demolition. He is concerned that potential cracks may lead to further damage, particularly with the upcoming winter and freeze/thaw cycle. He suggested a rehabilitation plan be completed. Staff stated they would confer with the NVRPA on completing such an analysis after the approval of the historic designation, but recommended against including such requirements in the design guidelines.

Mr. Vincent advised against including required additional costs/analysis as part of the design guidelines. He suggested that the HALRB recommend approval of the designation and design guidelines, then work separately with the NVRPA and staff to lobby the County for stabilization and clearing of surrounding invasive species. The Chairman concurred that the issues be separated.

Mr. Matta asked questions about potential soil contamination and remediation in case of future development in light that coal was stored there for a number of years. Ms. Ballo stated that such an analysis would not need to be covered in the design guidelines; just because the design guidelines do not include it does not prohibit its discussion as a CoA item. She reminded the HALRB that any future amendments to the design guidelines did not need to return to the County Board, but could be approved by the HALRB. Mr. Vincent added that the majority of proposed work would be completed on the adjacent development site. Mr. Dudka added that the design guidelines would require any such remediation to coordinate with the historic structure and receive a CoA from the board.

Mr. Turnbull moved to accept the proposed historic district design guidelines with the following changes: 1) corrections to the date of construction; 2) analysis of the impact of the recent demolition and number of intact and cut piers; and 3) addition of Standard #8 of the *Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation*. Mr. Dudka seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. The Chairman recommended designating the property, then returning with recommendations to the County Board and the NVRPA regarding their continued preservation, restoration, and interpretation.

### **Discussion Item #3: Distribution of HALRB Binders**

Staff distributed informational reference binders to all of the HALRB members. The binders contain relevant information that the members will need in order to make informed decisions regarding cases coming before them and other historic preservation matters. The binders contain such items as the: Secretary of the Interior's Standards, Arlington County Local Historic District Design Guidelines, current HALRB roster, Arlington County Zoning Ordinance sections relating to Historic Preservation, Historic Resources Inventory, and other relevant materials. Mr. Vincent suggested that a list of the County's historic markers be added to the binder.

### **REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES**

- A) Chairman's Report: The Chairman discussed her role in the Affordable Housing Working Group and reminded the board that September is Affordable Housing Month. She mentioned a number of activities that will be occurring in the upcoming month. She added that she continues to make the case that historic preservation can be a tool for affordable housing.
- B) Survey: Mr. Liebertz stated that the proposed Broadview Historic District Designation, which is an 1881 Queen Anne-styled dwelling, will be heard at the next HALRB meeting.

Ms. Ballo noted that the Fenwick Court Design Guidelines will be reviewed by the County Board at the September 20<sup>th</sup> hearing.

- C) Site Plan Review: Mr. Uldricks discussed his attendance at the Envision Courthouse public workshop held earlier this summer. He stated that additional details about different options were shared with the public and he discussed the preservation or reuse of the existing buildings within the Landmark Block. He noted the positive responses from the attendees. Mr. Liebertz noted that the planners for Envision Courthouse will present at the HALRB meeting in September.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Key Boulevard Apartments site plan will have a third SPRC meeting on September 25<sup>th</sup> [this has since been changed to the 29<sup>th</sup>]. The applicants plan to move forward to the Planning Commission and County Board, but first will come to the October HALRB meeting. This is required since the buildings are listed as Important in the Historic Resources Inventory.

Ms. Ballo added that the Park Shirlington site plan will not be returning and no additional SPRC meetings have been scheduled.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Wendy's site plan had its first SPRC meeting. There was interest in the preservation easement for Wakefield Manor and Courthouse Manor as these will serve as the main public benefit for the project. The easement will include language that the HALRB will review any major exterior changes or alterations to the historic garden apartment buildings.

Regarding the WRAPS study, Mr. Laporte has attended the meetings on behalf of the HALRB and lobbied for preservation considerations at the Wilson School site and Queens Court Apartments. The next meeting of the Working Group will be held on September 24, 2014. Staff will be making a brief presentation regarding preservation, but will not be advocating for a particular option.

Ms. Ballo discussed two Arlington Public Schools projects at Abingdon Elementary School and McKinley Elementary School, which will include Phase 1 archaeological investigations. Staff intends to coordinate with schools in order to offer educational enrichment opportunities to the students.

- D) Staff and other Reports: Ms. Ballo reminded the board to consider attending one of a number of upcoming lectures, seminars, or conferences in order to meet the training requirements mandated by the state. Mr. Matta requested staff continue to look into coordinating a lecture for the HALRB, potentially on a month that contains five Wednesdays.

The meeting adjourned at 9:27 pm.