

APPROVED MINUTES

August 11, 2016

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Fairfax County Government Center Conference Rooms 4 & 5, 6:30 PM

Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman
Richard Bierce, AIA, Vice Chairman
Robert W. Mobley
Michele Aubry, Treasurer
Elise Murray
Susan Notkins, AIA
John Manganello, PE
Christopher Daniel*
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA*

Members Excused:

John A. Burns, FAIA
John Boland

Staff Present:

Linda Blank,
*Fairfax Department of
Planning & Zoning*
Stephanie Goodrich
*Fairfax Department of
Planning & Zoning*
Casey Gresham,
Recording Secretary

**Arrived after the meeting began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the August 11, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:30 p.m. in Rooms 4 & 5 of the Government Center; Mr. Bierce read the opening statement of purpose.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Two modifications:

- Item #4 deferred to September
- Item #1: following action item, brief discussion on Huntley tenant house. Elimination of window openings and shutters that were previously approved and change to window lite configuration.

Ms. Aubry made a motion to approve the agenda, as amended. This motion was seconded by Ms. Notkins and approved on a vote of 7-0.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS: Mr. David Buchta, Historic Preservation Manager, Fairfax County, Park Authority. Will be overseeing the historic properties owned by the Park Authority. Branch chief for resident curator program as well.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: None proposed.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

1. **Revisions to previously approved plans** for the Huntley Tenant house, 6918 Harrison Lane, tax map #092-2 ((1)) 8C located in the Huntley Historic Overlay District. Huntley was established as a historic overlay district in 1976 and is identified as a historic property in that district. It was individually listed in the National Register in 1972. At its October 8, 2015 meeting, the ARB approved the adaptive reuse of the tenant house as a visitor center with museum displays, restroom facilities, and reception area with a new garage addition; **ARB-15-HLY-01**. The approved exterior rehabilitation included replacement of the standing-seam metal

roof with a copper roof. The proposed revision is to install an aluminum/zinc-coated steel roof rather than a copper roof. Ms. Monika Szczepaniec, Fairfax County Park Authority, represents the application. (Item **ARB-16-HLY-01**) **Lee Supervisory District**

Presentation by Ms. Szczepaniec:

- Amending tenant house application; originally, a copper roof was approved by the ARB for the house, but this had been rethought and the applicant chose to substitute an aluminum zinc-coated steel roof. There was no evidence that the roof had originally been copper so combined with the cost effectiveness this roof is being proposed for installation.

Discussion:

- Mr. Mobley asked what the color of roof on the main house is.
 - That roof is gray.
- Mr. Mobley asked if it was the same material as the tenant house.
 - No, that roofing material is wooden shingles.
 - He confirmed that the proposed roof would be field-formed seam, not batten.
 - Yes, that is correct.
- Mr. Bierce inquired about the weathering characteristics of the proposed material as he has not had personal experience with this material.
 - The material is pretty durable material with a 25-year lifespan.
- Mr. Bierce asked what the color would look like.
 - Ms. Notkins said it was a common material of choice for many houses in Florida. It would be a silvery aluminum finish with a little bit of a copper look to it.
- Mr. Sutphin asked what kind of lifespan the Park Authority was expecting from this roof.
 - As the warranty is 25 years, that would be their expectation.
- Ms. Notkins asked if a cost analysis had been completed comparing copper and this material.
 - Yes, and the applicant didn't think that copper was an appropriate application in this case.
- Mr. Bierce noted that it was available and used in the early 19th century.
 - The copper roof wouldn't have existed in a utilitarian house. If it was the manor house, maybe. But not this house.
- Mr. Daniel noted that there were some unknowns with the material, specifically on how it would look in a few years. But the ARB knew exactly what copper would look like. The cost concerns made sense, and he got the impression that the applicant's proposal was replicating the style the ARB had approved before. He was comfortable with moving forward.
- Ms. Notkins was very familiar with galium and noted it did not change much over time, as it was a very stable material.
 - Mr. Sutphin asked if it turned chalky white like aluminum did.
 - No, it did not.

Ms. Notkins made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-HLY-01 for revisions to

previously approved plans for the Huntley Tenant house, 6918 Harrison Lane, tax map #092-2 ((1)) 8C located in the Huntley Historic Overlay District for the installation of an aluminum/zinc-coated steel roof rather than a cooper roof.

Upon review of the materials, the proposal is found to meet requirements of Zoning Ordinance 7-200 HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel and approved on a vote of 9-0.

Presentation on Windows and Shutters:

The property is subject to a conservation easement with VDHR, so all buildings and structures have to go through VDHR review. There were three concerns: VDHR disagreed with the ARB's approval to enlarge the two window openings on the south elevation; they requested that the applicant change the windows from 6/6 to 1/1 and eliminate the shutters. The applicant managed to persuade VDHR that the windows had to be replaced, but VDHR asked the applicant to use 1/1 instead of 6/6. The applicant was tasked with providing physical evidence showing that shutters existed in the early 1800s when the building was built; at the time, the applicant did not have physical evidence.

- Mr. Sutphin asked how many windows would be affected.
 - It was just the south side, so two windows would be affected.
- Mr. Bierce asked what date it was constructed.
 - 1827
- Mr. Bierce asked if VDHR gave any reasons why they wouldn't allow the restoration of the window opening.
 - There was no evidence or documentation from that era showing that there were window openings.
- Mr. Bierce asked if the applicant had done any probing into the wall itself to find evidence.
 - They had not yet done this.
- Mr. Bierce also asked if there were 6/6 windows currently.
 - Ms. Blank provided a handout with the email response from VDHR. To clarify, the ARB was not being asked to take action on this evening. This was a start to the discussion.
- Mr. Bierce added that 6/6 windows were common all over the colonies during this time period.
- Mr. Daniel felt like there was a disconnect; the interpretations sounded very Draconian.
 - VDHR had been to the property itself repeatedly, and they had seen photos and physical evidence.
- Mr. Sutphin said there could potentially be physical evidence that the window openings were once larger. He suggested that the state contact the ARB to have a discussion with them.
- Mr. Bierce asked where the applicant was in the construction process and if they could look for evidence.
 - They were scheduled to begin in September.

- Mr. Bierce recommended probing prior to the commencement of construction to find evidence on the original opening.
- Mr. Daniel thought the 1/1 argument was disturbing. No matter what window is put in, it would still be a new non-historic, new window. The ARB was missing some information, and he would love to see some commentary that's been provided by VDHR.
- Mr. Bierce asked if there was physical evidence of the shutters.
 - No, there was not.
- Mr. Sutphin requested a PDF copy of the letter emailed to the ARB so they could digest the information. Were they being asked to review new permits?
 - VDHR held the easement, and the ARB needed to approve the permits. The applicant was requesting to have a conversation as to what needs to be done for both VDHR's and the ARB's approval.
- Mr. Bierce asked that any conversation with VDHR happen on site so that both VDHR and the ARB could see the evidence and engage directly in conversation.
- Mr. Daniel reiterated that the applicant should look into physical evidence of the window openings.
- Mr. Sutphin added that the ARB might end up approving smaller windows while not increasing the opening size.
- Ms. Blank asked about the general timeframe of the applicant regarding the VDHR and ARB member(s) meeting on-site.
 - Sometime next week, the applicant would start working on putting together a timeline.
- Mr. Sutphin asked for a PDF to be sent and for the ARB to provide Ms. Blank with comments and feedback for the applicant.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

2. **Proposal to improve an existing entry road** to the Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse Area, tax map #107-1 ((1)) 9 located in the Lorton Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District. The 2001 Lorton Correctional Complex MOA stipulates that the ARB review *undertakings* within the area eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that the area within the Eligible District is subject to review as stipulated in Section 7-200 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. Section 7-200 of the Zoning Ordinance stipulates that plans shall be referred to the ARB for its review. The proposal was discussed in a workshop at the March 10, 2016 ARB meeting. To be named Snowden Ashford Road/Drive, the road connects Lorton Road to the roadway at the southwest section of the Adaptive Reuse Area. The proposal is for reconstructing the existing two lane roadway to accommodate increased traffic demands of the new uses being developed at the Adaptive Reuse Area. Two options for the roadway have been developed both include an 8' wide shared use path. A portion of the road is identified as a contributing structure, RT-19, to the DC Workhouse and Reformatory National Register Historic District; a cultural resources inventory was completed at the project area. Mr. John A. Giometti, P.E. Asst. Transportation Director, Rinker Design Associates. P.C., Mr. Tad Borkowski, Project Manager, Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation and Mr. Michael Guarino, Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation represent the proposal. **Mount Vernon Supervisory District**

Presentation made by Mr. Tad Borkowski:

- As requested by the ARB, the applicant went back and looked at existing trees and provided drawings on where they were located, which ones would need to be removed, etc. Previously, they had proposed two options – this time, one option was proposed. They had met with VDOT and negotiated down the width of the travel lanes to 10 feet. They preferred the curb-and-gutter approach for maintenance purposes. He explained that the existing road bed would be reused.

Discussion:

- Mr. Daniel asked what had changed since last time.
 - Curb and gutter was proposed, and fewer trees would be lost. VDOT would support 10' wide lanes and curb and gutter. VDOT will only do maintenance with curb and gutter installed.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if there was any way to get a narrower pavement section.
 - Not in discussions with VDOT.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if the County could maintain the road.
 - The County did not have appropriate snow removal equipment.
- Mr. Plumpe was disappointed that the road couldn't be left the way it is. He asked how wide it would be.
 - 22 feet (or 11 for each lane with curb and gutter).
- Mr. Plumpe said it was an interesting drive right now and the last piece of Lorton Road that could still be considered "country." He would not support this proposal when it goes to vote, as he felt they were losing a piece of history. The pastoral concept that the road embodies right now will be lost once this becomes a main road leading into a subdivision. He asked if the trail alongside the road was necessary.
 - The trail was necessary, as it connected Lorton Road with the development. A County trail that goes to the golf course also connects to it.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if there would be a guard rail.
 - Yes, there would. Exhibits show that a guard rail is required due to the 2:1 slopes that are being proposed to limit the impacts to the trees, pond, and potential archaeological sites.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if there was any way to preserve trees and place the trail beyond the tree line to keep the feel more pastoral. He also asked what kind of guard rail would be proposed.
 - It would be a powder-coated guardrail.
- Mr. Plumpe continued to recommend the trail be pushed away from the road.
 - Could it be located over the existing water line?
- Mr. Daniel said that when it was time for a vote, the applicant needed to provide all of the information on tree analysis. He asked the applicant to look for a preservation balance. He also asked them to provide a planting plan.
- Mr. Plumpe would like to see a grading plan.
- Mr. Mobley asked why the trail would be put so close to the road. He also asked the applicant to coordinate drawings, as they were hard to read. The GW Parkway had trails that disappeared from the roadway. This can be used as an example.
- Ms. Murray said that with trails in Reston, hiding them in the trees increases the risk of

assaults. Many people are more comfortable if they can be seen from the road.

- Mr. Manganello said he was on the Reston trails all of the time, and he liked keeping the rural aspect by pushing the trail away from the road.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if the curb could be lower to allow for less grading.
 - The applicant said they could probably have a lower-shaped curve.
- Mr. Plumpe asked the applicant to make this grade as low as possible.
- Mr. Daniel said the applicant should come back with options as to what could be done with the trail, and they should show the ARB that these options have at least been explored in an attempt to reduce the impact on the landscape.
- Mr. Bierce asked what the driving objectives and criteria were for having the trail. He knew that the objective of the GW Parkway was to get the trail away from the road and to get suburbanites closer to nature on a multipurpose trail.
- Mr. Plumpe suggested another workshop. He requested grading plan and sections be shown to the ARB.
 - The applicant was at a very conceptual stage in the process, and they wanted to frame and scope their work with ARB input. They can do that later but right now only at 15%.
- Mr. Daniel thought it was wonderful that they were coming to the ARB early on in the process.
- Ms. Notkins agreed, and she also asked who owned the road currently.
 - The Park Authority owned it.
- Ms. Notkins asked why they couldn't keep the road.
 - The road is shown in the Comprehensive Plan to be extended north in the future beyond the Laurel Hill development. The current proposal for this access road is for it to serve as an entry from Lorton Road to the Laurel Hill development.
- Ms. Notkins asked if the road had to be turned over the VDOT.
 - Ms. O'Donnell (Planning Division) said that the Park Authority didn't plow the road now, and it only plows for revenue-generating properties. It is not maintained to the level that will be needed once the Laurel Hill project is completed. It will be a major entrance for people living there.
- Ms. Notkins thought it would be a loss to lose this rural area.
- Mr. Manganello asked if the county would maintain the trails.
 - VDOT would maintain the 10-foot trail, and they would widen the right-of-way to include the trail.
- Mr. Sutphin asked what this road contributed to the prison grounds.
 - A previous study indicated that this road was not a contributing factor.
- Ms. Notkins asked who previously used the roads.
 - It was used as an entrance to the prison.
- Mr. Sutphin asked if VDHR would be a part of this review.
 - Ms. Blank said that they would be reviewing this as would Lorton Heritage. VDHR will not provide comments until officially submitted.
- Mr. Sutphin said he did not think the ARB could support the current proposal as shown, and they would need more details on the project.

- 3. Proposal to rehabilitate** buildings W-2 and W-2A at the Workhouse Arts Center, 9601 Ox Road, tax map #106-4 ((1)) 58 located in the Lorton Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District. The 2001 Lorton Correctional Complex MOA stipulates that the ARB review *undertakings* within the area eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that the area within the Eligible District is subject to review as stipulated in Section 7-200 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. The proposal was discussed in a workshop at the July 14, 2016 ARB meeting. W-2 is identified in the National Register as contributing; W-2A is not identified separately in the nomination. The proposed building renovation, part of which will house the Workhouse Museum will include: restoration or replacement of the three windows and installation of a full glass door at the front façade; installation of three windows and one door insert in the four arched window openings located in the connector wall facing the colonnade between buildings W-2 and W-3; restoration or replacement of 63 windows at the side facades with retention of the vertical metal prison bars; restoration of 7 other windows at the side and rear façades; replacement of 4 doors at the side and rear facades with a new concrete pad at one side entry; installation of 3' high black steel railing at three rear entrances with existing concrete stairs to be repaired; and installation of gutter section at the east and 3 downspouts to match existing copper-like gutters and downspouts. Ms. Ava Spece, CEO/President, Workhouse Arts Center represents the proposal. **Mount Vernon Supervisory District**

Presentation:

- Primary focus is adaptive reuse intended to be museum gallery space, not a barracks or dormitory as it once was. Important elements in the back portion of Building 2 as it relates to the cellblock regarding restoration efforts. Series of drawings showing exterior renovations. Front door: very appealing to think about restoration for this door, but want to match the glass on remainder of doors. However, separate from this project, can create an art installation of sorts to show doors changing throughout history of the campus. Wooden doors were original (milled in sawmill), followed by steel door, followed by cell block and barred doors, then followed by modern glass doors. Intent to install heavy glass doors, only difference would be climate control and weather stripping would be better. Windows in front: would be cleaned up. Archways that currently have plywood – will be removed and replaced with glass arched windows, one has a door in it. Three total on campus. Some of the repair needed – cement stairs, would like to have them match what's on the rest of the campus (handrails replaced with code compliant railings). Concrete pad outside of the door – small and in bad shape, proposed a larger pad. Windows: there are a total of 53 windows, don't want it to match the rest of the campus, want to keep bars. Windows would follow the same pattern. Objective is to replace panes that are broken, painting what's there. If there's a window beyond repair, would replace with a six pane window. Variation of windows from building to building is remarkable. Series of windows on front portion where administrative officers were held. Currently covered with a mesh, intend to remove them and match the windows on the rest of campus. Doors in the back would be replaced with similar doors. Four of them, metal doors. Replace gutter and fix downspout with materials to mimic copper.

Discussion:

- Mr. Sutphin asked the ARB to focus on the exterior this time rather than the interior. He asked if the original door was currently on the exterior.
 - No, it's currently plywood.

- Mr. Sutphin asked if it was appropriate to put doors on that matched the remainder of the campus or to replicate the original door – he thought this should be the main point of the discussion. He asked if any other buildings had the proposed gutter materials.
 - The copper downspouts that had been stolen were replaced with a copper-mimicking material that was coated aluminum.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if they could bring an example of this material. He was concerned that over time, the copper would not match the new materials.
 - Only two downspouts were being proposed here, so it would not be extensive. They would get a darker color to match what an aged copper would look like.
- Mr. Daniel asked if the applicant’s intent was to come back for approval at the next meeting. He requested a full cut sheet and plan set, with details on the replacement windows including the manufacturer. As for the door, it was clearly a reuse area, and the inside was no longer what it used to be. For consistency’s sake, it seemed appropriate to use the same glass doors here. In regards to the gutters, if the applicant was only replacing a small section, he asked why they couldn’t go with copper since most of the campus was copper. He thought it would be best to adhere to the integrity of the site here.
 - One of the challenges with this building is that there were multiples moments in time that the applicant wanted to talk about and honor.
- Mr. Sutphin agreed with Mr. Daniel on the door. In regards to the gutters, he could support the direction with seeing material samples. He did not think that using alternative materials would impact the overall architecture in this situation.
- Ms. Notkins thought it would be less confusing for the public if the door was blatantly contemporary.
 - That’s one of the reasons the applicant was excited to resurrect the idea of the old door on the interior of the exhibit.

4. Proposal to reconstruct 7 buttresses and repair one buttress of the penitentiary wall at the Adaptive Reuse Area, tax map #107-1 ((9)) H located in the Lorton Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District. The 2001 Lorton Correctional Complex MOA stipulates that the ARB review *undertakings* within the area eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that the area within the Eligible District is subject to review as stipulated in Section 7-200 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. The penitentiary wall is identified as a contributing structure, PT-01, to the DC Workhouse and Reformatory National Register Historic District. The eight buttresses are located at the north and west sides of the wall. The buttress reconstruction and repair will use salvaged brick and matching mortar in accordance with lab analysis of mortar type. Mr. Mike Lambert, Assistant Director Fairfax County Real Estate Services, represents the proposal. **Mount Vernon Supervisory District**

Deferred to September meeting at request of the applicant

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

- **Review and action on approval of minutes:**
Authorization of payment to Recording Secretary:
 - Mr. Daniel – clarification on Page 13—“a meeting with Fred would be important to determine how we can appropriately advocate”

- Received comments from Ms. Aubry regarding St. Mary's Church statement.

Mr. Daniel moved to approve the minutes as revised and pay the recording secretary. This motion was seconded by Ms. Aubry and approved on a vote of 9-0.

- **Treasurer's Report:** Staff: \$13,365 – credit of \$325 to Ms. Gresham; updated balance was \$13,040

- **Discussion/Update Reports:**

- Designing Guidelines Special Meeting; October 15, 2016; 10 AM (staff)
Logistics: Richard Wagner, AIA Facilitator

Refreshments

Mr. Bierce will bring a proposed agenda to the September meeting with the objective, schedule, topics, and wrap up. Objective at the end of the day will be to know where we are. If you have thoughts, email Mr. Bierce. Will be working it out with Mr. Wagner and Ms. Blank. If nothing else happens, Mr. Mobley will provide brief and good discussion on design principles. Have got to have principal in guidelines.

Ms. Blank – discussion on hiring Mr. Wagner, needs to take action to authorize this payment. He will be there as a facilitator, his understanding and facilitation will be from that aspect. Can clarify things and do a write-up following meeting. Proposal is for \$2,000. Do need to make a motion to authorize this to be paid to him.

Mr. Bierce made motion that ARB approve retention of Mr. Wagner as consultant, facilitator, and recorder for the October 15 special meeting and authorize \$2000 to him. The motion was seconded by Ms. Notkins and approved on a vote of 9-0.

Ms. Blank added that they may need as much as \$75 for refreshments.

Ms. Notkins moved to approve \$75 for refreshments. This motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel and approved on a vote of 9-0.

- **Administrative:** BAC report (Staff):

- Ms. Blank received a number of comments, will be forwarded to the clerks' office. If you have more comments, please forward them to Ms. Blank. All ARB members are appointed at-large, not by district. Mr. Manganello is in an architect spot. When he was appointed by Supervisor Hudgins, a former architect had been in that spot. Needs to talk to the clerk's office, as ZO requires at least two architects. Thinks she can just move the spot (have 4 licensed architects).
- Mr. Bierce – has Supervisor Storck responded to questions about term limits? Has not heard back from him with any answers.

- Ms. Blank – Mr. Burns has set up an appointment with him on Sept. 1st. Staff is aware of this and will be contacting supervisors office. Have four architects, two of them are historical and are both up for reappointment at the same time. Loss of either or both of these two members is tremendous. Can't afford the loss of historical architects.
- Ms. Murray – two history commission members were reappointed for one more term by him.
- Ms. Blank – Supervisor Foust needs to appoint an attorney when Mr. Boland leaves.
- **Correspondence, Announcements:** 2016 Preservation Virginia Conference; Oct. 16-17:
 - Charlottesville – Ms. Blank will forward info to them. Down on the mall, Jefferson School. Theme: Value of Heritage Tourism in Virginia
- **Old Business:**
 - Report out on meeting with Dept. of Planning and Zoning Directors; Messers Sutphin and Daniel.
 - Met with planning staff – outlined what had been put in the letter to have a good discussion on capacity of the existing planning department. Operating with a full staff. Doing research on his own department to find any additional capacities. Expecting to reconvene next month. Really stated that the ARB is ready to start advocating for a full dedicated staff so deficiencies outlined in letter could be addressed. Have to lay out a very good case to get a new staff position funded. Unspoken rule of maximum full time employee count. Need a strong advocate on BOS. Starting to recognize that there's a big issue with lack of resources devoted to historic resources in county.
 - Mr. Daniel – thought it was a promising conversation, little disheartened. Some things proposed that county can help fight – inventory can be filled with part-time. Still need this. Fred suggested using existing resources to address ARB deficiencies. Staff reports would be huge, really need staffer. Until ARB makes enough noise, Fred can't do anything. Need a BOS member to engage Fred about why the ARB isn't being fully supported.
 - Mr. Sutphin – Former supervisor Frye was the logical choice.
 - Ms. Murray– McKay has expressed interest in previous cases. Might be someone to approach.
 - Ms. Notkins – Supervisor Foust's Planning Commissioner (Uldfelder) came to API.
 - Mr. Daniel – meeting with Fred scheduled again next month. Working to get data to back ARB claims and statements. Suggests reaching out in this time period to BOS.
 - Budget discussion; training and stipend (Mr. Sutphin and Ms. Aubry)

- Got more of a stipend this year – outlined deficiencies (i.e. recording secretary) and funding for training. Have had a reserved fund over the number of years – question is why would a board want to grow its budget request if there’s reserve sitting around. Comfortable with providing \$3500 for recording secretary, but encouraging to use funds for education and training. Thought was that can’t send everybody to state/national conference every year.
 - Mr. Daniel – either revise policy on three people a year getting focused amount of training or to use funds to bring a trainer to the ARB. Pay for them (like Mr. Wagner) to facilitate training for ARB. Could maybe extend this opportunity to other professionals in the county.
 - Ms. Blank – Ms. Aubry suggested possibility of organization to be paid directly. So SSN wouldn’t need to be involved in getting reimbursed. Will be following up on this.
- **New/other business:** API Building; HABS documentation, Mr. Sutphin and Ms. Murray on behalf of Mr. Burns.
- Ms. Goodrich – was out there earlier this week to meet with HABS. Laser scan of entire building to do inside and outside, have thirty days to do this. The data is then put into data cloud. Will have to erase some things like birds, trees, traffic from the lasers. That’s phase I to cleanup. Phase II would be putting it into AutoCAD and making line drawings. Fly through will be done too so you can place yourself in building digitally to see what it will look like. Fee is \$20,000, developer is contributing \$10,000. Mr. Burns thought the ARB should make a motion that the Planning Department redirect any funding that was going towards feasibility study of building towards HABS documentation. Also, could vote to contribute ARB funding towards documentation.
 - Mr. Daniel was against the latter. ARB should not be giving money.
 - Mr. Bierce would also not support funding any of this.
 - Mr. Sutphin – not sure if there’s been any more folks around Reston mobilizing.
 - Ms. Riordian – happy to do crowdsourcing. What would be helpful to get an explanation of what’s being done that could be presented in a crowdsourcing effort. Also in trying to figure out what dollar amount is needed. Would need a brief summary on exactly what’s being done and an idea of when it will be done.
 - Ms. Goodrich – quote on project: Phase I was paid for by John Sekas, \$10k. Phase II is an additional \$10k. Phase I will take the month, and

Phase II could take months.

- Mr. Sutphin – got letter from AIA, don't know if they would have interest in donating towards this.
- Mr. Manganello – not in favor of asking DPZ for money. Besides just documenting the building, is anybody taking the furniture?
 - Ms. Blank – members of the Reston Trust have been engaged with Mr. Sekas and going through the building. He has offered to store for one year whatever they would like to store.

Mr. Bierce stated that because DPZ looked at setting aside the money for a feasibility study that they should look towards putting that money to the Phase II of the HABS.

- Mr. Daniel – best thing is to advocate for DPZ to consider to dedicate funds.

Mr. Bierce made a motion to request in strong terms that DPZ provide the funding to fully fund the phase II of the HABS study currently underway. This motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel and approved on a vote of 9-0.

Ms. Aubry made a motion to adjourn at 9:30 p.m.