



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

Wednesday, October 18, 2023, 6:30 PM

This was a hybrid public meeting held both in person and through electronic communication means.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aiken, Vice Chair
Omari Davis, Chair
Andrew Fackler
Alex Foster
Gray Handley
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Rebecca Meyer
Kaydee Myers
Andrew Wenchel
Dick Woodruff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Carmela Hamm
Mark Turnbull

STAFF PRESENT: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Program Manager
Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Planner
Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Planner
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Specialist

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chair explained the in-person and electronic Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures. Mr. Davis described the logistics of participating virtually in the hybrid meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSIONER

Mr. Andrew Fackler introduced himself as the newest HALRB member and an architectural historian with the State Department.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST 2023 AND SEPTEMBER 2023 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for any comments on the draft August 2023 minutes. Upon hearing none, Mr. Aiken moved to approve the August minutes and Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 8-0-3; Mr. Fackler, Ms. Foster, and Mr. Woodruff abstained. The Chair

asked for any comments on the draft September 2023 minutes. Upon hearing none, Mr. Aiken moved to approve the minutes and Ms. Meyer seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 7-0-4, with Mr. Fackler, Mr. Handley, Ms. Lawrence, and Mr. Woodruff abstaining.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM: BARCROFT GARDEN APARTMENTS SECTION 4 RENOVATION

Ms. Farris introduced the informational item for the proposed Barcroft Apartments (Barcroft) Section 4 renovation project and provided a staff summary:

Barcroft is identified in the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Area Plan (or Form Based Code) (N-FBC). Barcroft also is one of three multi-family residential complexes identified as a Conservation Area in the N-FBC. The Jair Lynch project team most recently worked with the County on a pilot renovation program focused on Section 3 of Barcroft; the HALRB reviewed that project at its July 19, 2023, hybrid public hearing. The next phase of renovation will occur in Section 4 of the complex (buildings 32, 33, and 34). This new phase will involve the Jair Lynch project team applying for affordable housing tax credit financing from Virginia Housing.

The Jair Lynch project team first presented the project at the HALRB’s September 20, 2023, hybrid public hearing. The majority of the discussion centered around two topics: 1) the ramp guardrail options proposed at the rear of Building 33; and 2) if the HALRB recommended a modern designed entrance canopy with tie backs to the traditional canopy design that was approved in the Section 3 renovation.

The Jair Lynch project team is presenting the Section 4 renovation scope to the HALRB as an informational item; there are no HALRB motions/actions needed at this time. The project team did not attend the October Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting because in September, the HALRB stated that the project team did not need to attend the October DRC meeting because they were just interested in getting more feedback from the full commission.

Ms. Farris advised the HALRB on the usual approaches to sharing their recommendations with the County Board, either by a letter or allowing staff to provide a summary of the HALRB’s review via the staff report to the County Board. She reminded the commission that Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards requires applicants to meet with the HALRB a minimum of twice before the County Board can consider the project; the applicant was here for the second review of the Section 4 proposal.

Ms. Farris explained the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff’s recommendations, focusing only on what had changed since the HALRB’s review in September. She noted that the project team made adjustments to the access to the new ADA-compliant units proposed in Building 33 by working with the existing grade and pathways to reduce the walkway slopes and eliminating the need for any guardrails or railings. Concerning the entrance canopy designs, Ms. Farris said the HPP staff recommended the continued use of the traditional design option that the HALRB preferred in the Section 3 renovation proposal [and that the County Board later approved in the Use Permit]. She explained that since staff and the HALRB are receiving these renovation proposals in separate phases, it is challenging to propose where it could be appropriate and/or creative to introduce an additional modern designed canopy. Therefore, she said the HPP staff agreed the traditional canopy option was a way to keep new decorative elements consistent throughout the entire Barcroft complex.

Land use attorney Ms. Lauren Riley of Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, along with David Hilde and Gregory Ward of the Jair Lynch Real Estate Partners project team, provided an overview of the Section 4

rehabilitation proposal. Ms. Riley detailed the timing of the project and other County Commissions they plan to meet with. She explained the location of the project area, which buildings would be renovated, and a summary of the proposed renovations (similar to the Section 3 rehabilitation). For the items that have changed within the scope since September, Ms. Riley explained that the project team reduced the slope of the ramps from 8% to less than 5%, therefore allowing them to work with the existing grade and eliminating the need for a guardrail and handrail altogether. Ms. Riley next addressed the entrance canopy design options, showing both a traditional and modern option.

Ms. Meyer stated she did not mind either option for the canopy and would be comfortable with the traditional option. Ms. Foster asked if there was a height requirement for the canopies; the project team confirmed that the canopies needed to have a minimum 30-inch overhang along the front and 12 inches along each side of the door. Ms. Foster questioned the functionality of the traditional-style canopy and if it would work well for the rear entries on Building 33 since the canopy needed to be placed above the arched brickwork.

Mr. Handley asked about the types of doors at each building and their design. The project team explained that usually each building has two different door types and acknowledged it would be challenging to find a canopy that fits all of the different door types and surrounds [throughout the complex]. Ms. Riley stated the project team agrees with the HPP staff's recommendation to determine the canopy design on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Foster asked if the HALRB's decision this evening would determine all future canopies. Ms. Riley replied that proposals for future canopies could still come to the HALRB since it would depend on the project location within Barcroft, as there are many different door types in the complex that may warrant different canopy designs. Further discussion occurred between the project team and the HALRB about the design of the new ADA-entrances into the ADA-units. Ms. Liccese-Torres clarified for the HALRB that the project team will be requesting a waiver from Virginia Housing for the canopy requirement [as they did with Section 3].

Ms. Lawrence asked about the material of the traditional canopy; the project team responded that it would be standing-seam metal. Mr. Laporte thought that the rear entrance canopies were functional and appropriate in design. He did not see a reason to request a waiver but was concerned about the functionality of the facade canopies and that they did complement the architecture. He next asked if gutters were going to be incorporated into the design; the project team confirmed there would not. Mr. Laporte agreed with the need to create ADA-entrances for units, and suggested an arched canopy on the rear entrances if there was going to be an arched brick element. Further Board discussion occurred about the ADA-entrances on the rear elevations and how to design the canopies to the door surrounds.

Mr. Woodruff asked about the rationale for the fiberglass doors for the accessible units. Ms. Riley explained that this material is a requirement of Virginia Housing because of its weather durability and minimal maintenance. She said this material also would help distinguish new elements from the historic fabric. There was no further discussion about the proposal. The project team mentioned it would return to the HALRB in the future regarding the Master Financing Development Plan and other renovation phases.

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)
DISCUSSION AGENDA**

Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 21-17A 4201 Fairfax Dr. and Robert Ball, Sr. Family Burial Ground Marker Review

Ms. Farris introduced the CoA item at 4201 Fairfax Drive involving the Robert Ball, Sr. Family Burial Ground Local Historic District. She provided a staff summary:

In 2016, the Ballston Station Housing Corporation (then Bozzuto Development Company and Monticello Partners) proposed redevelopment of the Central United Methodist Church (CUMC) building for construction of an eight-story residential building. The project went through the site plan review process and was known as Site Plan #443. The redevelopment proposal included incorporating a new church with on-site childcare and a preschool on the first two floors, a mixed income housing component with almost half committed as affordable housing, and below grade parking for residential and church uses. The project site involved the existing CUMC building and the adjacent Robert Ball, Sr. Family Burial Ground. The applicant proposed to restore, maintain, display, and provide public access to a Tiffany-stained glass window that the County received from the demolished Abbey Mausoleum (this window restoration is now nearing completion). In 2017, the County Board approved the site plan, and concurrently to that process, the burial ground became a local historic district (LHD). On August 18, 2021, the HALRB approved CoA 21-16 to remove the existing gravestones and markers to be protected during the construction process.

The current applicants, the Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH), along with their partners/representatives (KCM Group, DCS Designs, Bean Kinney & Korman), are requesting approval to reinstall the six known gravestones and markers in the LHD. The applicant has hired Worcester Eisenbrandt, Inc. (WEI), a historic building restoration contractor, to reinstall the gravestones and markers; their proposal states they will follow the photo documentation utilized from the removal of the objects. One gravestone that had been previously removed and stored within the church also will be reinstalled. The location of that one gravestone will need to be determined by the HALRB, as the actual location of the grave is unknown. In preparation for the stone reinstallation, WEI will utilize GPS coordinates and measurements to establish the locations of the five gravestones and markers. The entirety of each grave marking (head and foot) will be removed from their fabricated plywood crates and reinstalled into their documented location. They will use two to three people to lift the stones from their crates and gently place the stones back to their documented locations. The CoA was not required to go to the Design Review Committee (DRC).

Ms. Farris said the HPP staff recommended approval of the CoA. She stated that WEI is a professional firm in this field and would not use heavy machinery or equipment that could cause damage to the stones or the burials. She said the documentation provided, including photographs and labeling of the six gravestones and markers, would ensure their correct reinstallation. Lastly, Ms. Farris mentioned that since the stone marker that was previously removed and stored within the church is related to the gravestone of Francis E. Dyer (it contains the initials FED), the HPP staff recommends placing that marker approximately three to five feet east of the Francis E. Dyer obelisk.

Mr. Woodruff asked if burials still existed, and Mr. Handley asked if the project team had found any other burials. Ms. Farris explained how the applicants have worked with the County by conducting archaeological monitoring during the demolition of the church and other areas that were identified during previous archaeological surveys. During these efforts, she noted that there were no discoveries of burials or funerary objects. Ms. Farris explained that it is believed some burials might have been moved or destroyed during the widening and straightening of Clements Avenue and N. Stafford Street. She said it would take an exhaustive level of resources to identify the location of existing burials and if the markers aligned to the correct individuals. She acknowledged that the HPP staff sees the burial ground as a reminder or remnant of what was there before.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the boundary of the LHD was disturbed during construction. Ms. Farris confirmed that the area had been protected and fenced off from construction and the project team limited the level of interference. Mr. Handley asked if any ground penetrating radar (GPR) was performed. Mr. Scott Shatrowsky of the KCM Group said that previous archaeological studies occurred around the LHD to confirm they would not encounter any human remains, and GPR was conducted along what had been a long grass strip adjacent to N. Stafford Street, including the LHD area. Ms. Farris explained that WEI also did some probing of the area to determine if any markers needed to be removed. Mr. Handley acknowledged that it was common for many graveyards in the 1950s and 1960s to be covered over and [grave] markers moved when roads were expanded.

Ms. Bolliger stated a public comment had been submitted and circulated. It has been copied below for the record:

Written Public Comment #1

CoA 21-17A, Request to re-place the historic headstones

The HALRB discussed this project and CoA 21-16, 21-17 and 21-18 during its August 18, 2021, meeting. These three CoAs, which the HALRB voted to approve at the meeting, established many of the conditions for this historic site. CoA 21-16 permitted the applicant to construct a fence that surrounds the historic site.

The historic site is not within the property's public easement. Therefore, the public has no intrinsic right to enter any part of the historic site.

The applicant stated at the meeting that the fence would contain a locked gate that the property owner would open only to maintenance personnel and to members of the Ball family. The applicant stated that nobody else would be able to enter the historic site.

Before the applicant removed the headstones, people were not able to read the texts on the headstones unless they entered the site, which was not fenced. Some of the stones were lying on the ground, while others were too far away from the sidewalk for the public to read.

Members of the public will therefore not be able to read the texts on any of the headstones if the applicant re-replaces the headstones at their previous locations. **Please therefore require the applicant to re-place the headstones in locations that are close to the fence.**

This will not affect the historic integrity of the site. As the text for the proposed new marker states, gravestones may have been moved during the construction of a new church in 1923.

Alternatively, amend one of the CoAs to permit members of the public to enter the historic site upon request, if the applicant agrees to do this. The applicant could then re-place the gravestones in their previous locations.

Proposed New Interpretive Marker for the Robert Ball, Sr., Family Burial Ground

The revised caption for the map at the top right corner of the proposed new marker states: "*1939 Realignment of Clement's Avenue to the east of the Burial Ground, which is shown as containing six markers.*" However, the street was named Clements Avenue, not Clement's Avenue. Further, the marker's text states: "*In 1922, Arlington County widened and straightened Clements Avenue*

on the east side of the burial ground, resulting in the current orientation of North Stafford Street."

The HALRB therefore needs to ensure that the caption identifies the street as "Clements Avenue". The HALRB also needs to ensure that the caption will state that the map was published in 1939 (if this is correct) after Clements Avenue was realigned in 1922.

The marker's text states near its end: "*By the early-twentieth century, visible grave stones were situated within a fenced area.*" However, the area was not fenced before building construction began.

The fence was therefore removed after the early-twentieth century. To eliminate confusion, **delete that sentence or revise the text to explain that the fence was subsequently removed.**

Thank you.

Bernie Berne

—

There were two public speakers for this item. Ms. Farris invited the first speaker, Dr. Bernard Berne. He had some technical difficulties and temporarily left the call, so Ms. Bolliger invited the second speaker Mr. Neil Wills to comment.

Spoken Public Comment #1: Neil Wills

Mr. Wills noted another historic church, the Clarendon Presbyterian Church, was an important landmark in Lyon Village. He explained that [a proposed redevelopment project] was going forward for Phase 1 site plan review with the County. Mr. Wills urged the commission to be involved in the process in an effort to protect the church.

Spoken Public Comment #2: Dr. Bernard Berne

Dr. Berne reiterated the points outlined in his public comment (see above).

Ms. Farris responded to Dr. Berne's concerns about public access to the burial ground. She explained that there will be a fence around the LHD and that the HALRB previously approved a CoA for the fence. She noted that currently, the County Attorney's Office (CAO) and the Real Estate Bureau (REB) are working with the project team concerning their required public access easements. Ms. Farris had received confirmation that the site plan conditions state that the public can have access to the burial ground, but is the question remains if the public needs to request permission to access the burial ground. Mr. Shatrowsky clarified that the public access easement is for the Tiffany window and the north area on the interior side of its display. Due to the small area, he said the project team was not able to provide an ADA compliant ramp and that is why the burial ground fence will be locked for maintenance purposes only. Ms. Farris pointed out specific site plan conditions about the public access easements, but ultimately stated that these details are being finalized between the project team, CAO, and REB. She will bring Dr. Berne's concerns up during those discussions but reiterated that the HALRB does not have the authority to require a property owner to give access to the LHD or alter the requirements of the public access easement.

Mr. Laporte stated he did not agree with Dr. Berne's request to relocate the markers closer to the sidewalk for easier viewing; he agreed with the HPP staff's recommendation to relocate the markers in their

previous locations. He likewise agreed with the need to limit access to the LHD for maintenance and protection issues, but acknowledged it was private property and that the HALRB could not require access. However, Mr. Laporte thought that maybe this should have been a requirement in the site plan conditions. He reiterated that the HALRB [previously] discussed this project for many months during the site plan review process to determine the best way to be good stewards of the burial ground.

Mr. Woodruff requested to see the [approved] site plan condition language about the public access easement. Ms. Farris pointed out that the details could be found in condition #56.E, which states the public access easement to the LHD shall be open to the public 24 hours a day, seven days a week, but there were no details on how access would be accommodated. Ms. Farris read the condition language to the HALRB and explained that the public access easement is a requirement of the site plan and that it is tied into the project team receiving their Certificate of Occupancy permit.

Mr. Handley asked if there were any Ball descendants in Arlington County. Ms. Farris responded that there are local descendants, and they were informed of the project's process back in 2021 and she intends to update them soon about the latest developments. Mr. Woodruff asked about the ownership of the burial ground and the church's role when it took on stewardship of the burial ground. Ms. Lawrence wanted more information about the Tiffany window and where it would be placed in relation to the burial ground. Mr. Shatrowsky replied that the Tiffany window would be visible behind the burial ground inside the building and the public would have access to this area within certain hours and when the church is functioning. Ms. Farris mentioned that additional stained-glass windows from the demolished church also will be incorporated into the new church space. Ms. Bolliger noted the other locations of the restored companion Tiffany windows in Arlington County, including at the Westover Library and the Museum of Contemporary Art.

The Chair asked for any final comments. Upon hearing none, he made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-17A, request to re-place all historic gravestones per staff's recommendation.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously, 11-0.

Next, Ms. Farris invited the HALRB to comment on the draft interpretive marker for the burial ground.

Mr. Aiken commented on the marker's lack of accessibility given the heavy volume of text and small font sizing. Ms. Myers agreed that the marker was too text heavy and said she felt there was not enough context for some of the information including references to the locations of the graves. Mr. Aiken recommended reducing the number of photos and images, particularly of historic maps which seemed repetitive and did not communicate additional information. Ms. Lawrence noted an incorrect apostrophe and recommended including a photo of the church before demolition with stones in situ.

Ms. Farris asked if one historic map would communicate the context correctly. Ms. Foster agreed that the 1879 plat gave the most helpful context. Ms. Farris suggested including the 1900 map. Ms. Foster stated that if the applicant used the 1900 map, including more of the image would be helpful to add context.

Mr. Aiken suggested finding a simpler way to indicate the progression of the site, such as a timeline. Mr. Handley agreed that a timeline could help show the progression more clearly (from farmland, to its platting for sale, to an image of the original church once constructed). He noted that the map image showing the realignment of the street was not helpful to understanding the site.

Ms. Lawrence stated that the list of the interred and the history of the burial ground should remain. Mr. Aiken suggested a callout box for the names of the interred. He complimented Ms. Heather Crowell on the breadth of the research.

Ms. Farris noted that including some information about the time capsule discovered in the corner stone in 2021 could be an interesting addition to the marker. She offered to work with the applicants to summarize and implement the HALRB's comments for the next version of the draft.

SITE PLAN MARKER REVIEW: COURTHOUSE LANDMARK HISTORIC MARKERS

Ms. Farris invited Ms. Kim Daileader of EHT Traceries, a preservation consultant for the Courthouse Landmark [now called the Commodore] site plan project to give a brief overview of the approved site plan, which included retaining the facades of the First Federal Savings and Loan Bank building and the Investment Building. Ms. Farris explained that the site plan conditions included historic interpretation and the Courthouse Sector Plan Addendum gave some direction about documentation and interpretation for the site including the so-called "Lawyer's Row," which had been demolished.

Ms. Farris asked Ms. Daileader to indicate where the markers would be installed. Ms. Daileader pointed out the proposed locations and explained that the transparent etched marker design recommended by the HPP staff as a before/after visual likely would not be possible on this block due to placement limitations to provide sufficient perspective.

Mr. Laporte suggested that the location for the Investment Bank marker should be in the public right-of-way so more people could see it and turn around and look at the facade.

Mr. Davis suggested that the applicant could do the transparent etched marker design for Lawyer's Row on the 15th and Uhle corner looking at the demolished block (now the County jail). Ms. Daileader stated the applicant could be willing to consider that idea. Ms. Foster asked how this would be done. Ms. Daileader replied they likely would need an artist interpretation to fill in the blanks where historic records of the facade were not available. She explained the need for perspective studies to determine which location could work for this strategy. Ms. Farris proposed a transparent engraving marker for Lawyer's Row, or Courthouse, or both, as both have been entirely demolished and had been located across from this site plan.

Ms. Farris asked the applicant about their timeline. She suggested working on the standard marker design options in the short term to work toward satisfying the site plan conditions for interpretation; the etched marker could be investigated later [as an alternative option].

Mr. Handley asked about the art sculpture [that had been] in the median [along Wilson Boulevard]. Ms. Daileader explained that although it was part of the site plan project, some foundation issues were being resolved, but it was not part of the site plan conditions for the HPP.

Mr. Aiken asked if the historic markers would delay the project. Ms. Farris explained that she would be the final arbiter on whether the approved site plan condition had been met by the proposed interpretation.

Ms. Farris invited the commissioners to discuss the standard markers which had been proposed.

Ms. Daileader noted there were two versions of the Courthouse Neighborhood marker to consider. Mr. Woodruff asked for clarification about the use of "wing" in reference to the Courthouse as it was referring to the demolition of the main section of the building. Ms. Farris stated there was no image of the original Courthouse on the marker and she suggested finding one; regardless, the marker should explain which

iteration of the Courthouse was displayed. Ms. Myers suggested reorienting the photos (so it was clearer they showed two sides of the block) and using the Sanborn map to explain the perspective. Mr. Davis asked for additional clarification of the dates in the images since the map showed part of the building which was not meant to exist yet.

Ms. Farris suggested consolidating much of the information about the growth and development. Ms. Liccese-Torres recommended including the original name, as the County was not renamed Arlington until 1920, so when the first courthouse was built it would have been called the Alexandria County Courthouse. Ms. Foster suggested including that note in the first paragraph.

On the Investment Building marker, Ms. Liccese-Torres asked for a larger perspective of the street view which captured the end of the block. Ms. Lawrence and Mr. Aiken recommended removing the map background for clearer legibility. Mr. Woodruff noted a discrepancy in the description of the International Style on the two markers; Ms. Daileader agreed to resolve the discrepancy. Mr. Aiken asked for clarifications on details of the Sanborn map as it was difficult to discern the image. Mr. Laporte suggested removing the recurring articles before Investment Building and he noted discrepancies in capitalization. He recommended removing complimentary language about the redevelopment project as it was not related to the building's history. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that this had been included to explain the context of the redevelopment. Ms. Lawrence supported the retention of the preservation process context.

In the First Federal Savings and Loan marker, Ms. Myers suggested deleting the first paragraph of the reuse section. Mr. Laporte agreed. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested focusing closer onto the block in the Sanborn map image. Mr. Aiken suggested using the plain white background for this marker, too. Mr. Laporte asked if the term “adaptive reuse” was appropriate. Ms. Daileader clarified that professionally, she would call it a “facadectomy.” Mr. Laporte asked how converting a commercial historic building to another commercial use was adaptive reuse.

Mr. Handley gave his understanding of the general message from the markers about commercial architectural styles and their preservation in these [specific] places. Mr. Laporte disagreed that it was the County saving the architecture, but rather the developer. Ms. Daileader disagreed and stated that the sector plan was the mechanism protecting the facades. Mr. Handley suggested that in this instance, the story of protection, compromise, and community development was as important as the history of the buildings themselves. Mr. Woodruff agreed on the value of the preservation process information being retained. Mr. Davis pointed out that the callout box on the Sanborn map was in the wrong location. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested chronological distribution of the images.

Ms. Daileader asked for confirmation on whether she should continue editing the existing markers or if they should be redesigned with entirely new information (with an emphasis on the process rather than historic information). Ms. Myers and Mr. Aiken agreed that the markers did not have to change substantially, and that they preferred the idea of building-specific markers with information about the preservation process included. Ms. Farris planned to meet with Ms. Daileader to integrate the HALRB's comments for the next versions of the drafts.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Chair's Report

The Chair thanked the commissioners for their time and involvement.

Staff Report

Ms. Liccese-Torres updated the commissioners about the status of the draft of the Historic and Cultural Resources Plan (HCRP) update. She thanked Ms. Lawrence for representing the HALRB at the Planning Commission meeting for consideration of the Request to Advertise (RTA). She stated that the County Board approved the RTA on its consent agenda on October 14, 2023. She noted that the final public hearings (Planning Commission and County Board) for the HRCP are scheduled for November.

Ms. Liccese-Torres announced that a County press release had been issued last week about the twelve Historic Preservation Fund grant recipients. Ms. Farris gave a brief overview of some of the projects that will be receiving grant funding. Mr. Woodruff asked if it would be possible for the Historic Preservation Fund to be given additional money in the County budget. Staff responded that they hoped it would be possible, and that they were endeavoring to ensure that the newly funded projects would be completed by June 2024. Mr. Handley asked for more information about some of the projects. Staff replied they are considering a variety of creative ways to highlight the projects and outreach efforts by the recipients themselves.

Ms. Bolliger briefly mentioned some purportedly haunted sites in Arlington and promised to send more information via email before Halloween.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:10 pm.