

CORRECTED 5.22.2013

1 MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

2

3

4 - - - - - X

5 HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT - :

6 8017 Hamden Lane :

7 - - - - - X

8 Master Plan Evaluation :

9 Naval Ordnance Laboratory :

10 Administration Building :

11 10603 (sic - 10903 is correct) New Hampshire Avenue :

12 - - - - - X

13

14

15

16

17

18 A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
19 February 22, 2012, commencing at 7:30 p.m., in the MRO
20 Auditorium at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland
21 20910, before:

22

COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

23

Leslie Miles

24

25

COMMISSION MEMBERS

26

M'Lisa Whitney

27

William Kirwan

28

Paul Treseder

29

Craig D. Swift

30

ALSO PRESENT:

31

32 Scott Whipple, Staff Supervisor

33 Anne Fothergill, Staff

34 Josh Silver, Staff

35 Sandra Youla, Staff

Deposition Services, Inc.

12321 Middlebrook Road, Suite 210

Germantown, MD 20874

Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338

info@DepositionServices.com www.DepositionServices.com

APPEARANCES

<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Mark Kramer	5
Michael Stevenson	29
John Tino	34
Brian Peper	32

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MS. MILES: Good evening. Welcome to the
3 February 22nd, 2012, meeting of the Historic Preservation
4 Commission. My name is Leslie Miles. I am the chair. I'm
5 going to ask all the members of the Commission and staff to
6 introduce themselves starting at my left.

7 MS. WHITNEY: M'Lisa Whitney, Burtonsville.

8 MR. KIRWAN: Bill Kirwan, Silver Spring.

9 MR. SWIFT: Craig Swift, Rockville.

10 MR. TRESEDER: Paul Treseder, Bethesda.

11 MS. FOTHERGILL: Anne Fothergill, Historic
12 Preservation planner.

13 MR. SILVER: Joshua Silver, Historic Preservation
14 planner.

15 MR. WHIPPLE: Scott Whipple, Historic Preservation
16 supervisor.

17 MS. YOULA: Sandra Youla, Historic Preservation
18 staff.

19 MS. MILES: Thank you. And welcome to the public
20 and to our graduate students from Maryland. We're going to
21 begin with those matters that we believe can be handled on
22 an expedited basis. Have these historic area work permit
23 applications been duly advertised?

24 MR. SILVER: Yes, they were advertised in the
25 February 8th, 2012, addition of the Washington Examiner.

1 MS. MILES: Thank you, Josh. If anyone is here in
2 opposition to any of these work permits, please indicate so
3 by raising your hand. Is anyone here in opposition to the
4 permit for 25 Holt Place in Takoma Park; for 5815 Cedar
5 Parkway in Chevy Chase; or for 14 West Kirke Street in Chevy
6 Chase?

7 MR. KIRWAN: Madam Chair, hearing none, I move we
8 approve the following historic area work permits in
9 accordance with staff reports, based upon the record before
10 us, and in consideration of the recommendations of the local
11 advisory panel when those have been provided.

12 I move we approve HPC case number 37/03-12D at 25
13 Holt Place in Takoma Park; HPC case number 35/13-12D at 5815
14 Cedar Parkway in Chevy Chase; and HPC case number 35/13-12E
15 at 14 West Kirk Street in Chevy Chase.

16 MS. MILES: Is there a second?

17 MS. WHITNEY: I'll second.

18 MS. MILES: All in favor, please so indicate by
19 raising your right hand? Very good, the vote is unanimous.
20 These historic area work permits are approved. If this was
21 one of yours, please call staff tomorrow to find out next
22 steps. And thank you very much. We are now going to hear
23 case D for a slate roof replacement at 817 Hamden Lane in
24 Bethesda. Would the applicant please come forward, and do
25 we have a staff report?

1 MR. SILVER: Yes, we do. 8017 Hamden Lane is a
2 contributing resource in the Greenwich Forest historic
3 district. The proposal before you is for the wholesale
4 removal and replacement of the entire slate roof, which
5 includes slate shingles on the dormers, as well as the one
6 and a half story section.

7 The applicant is proposing to install a 50-year,
8 300-pound specification architectural fiberglass shingle,
9 and again removal and replacement of the slate shingles on
10 the front and rear dormer walls of that one and a half story
11 section in installation of a fiber cement siding product.

12 And that is, staff is recommending approval of the
13 application as submitted.

14 MS. MILES: Thank you. And are you the applicant?

15 MR. KRAMER: Say that again?

16 MS. MILES: Are you the applicant?

17 MR. KRAMER: Yes.

18 MS. MILES: Okay. Would you please press the
19 large button until it is lit and then let go. Just let go
20 and it will light. There you go. If you would, please
21 state your name for the record. I was going to say, you can
22 either have seven minutes to just speak, or you can respond
23 to questions, whichever you prefer.

24 MR. KRAMER: Well, I can answer your questions if
25 you would like at this point.

1 MS. MILES: Okay. If you would, just state your
2 name, for the record?

3 MR. KRAMER: Mark Kramer.

4 MS. MILES: Thank you. Does anybody have any
5 questions for staff, to begin? Does anyone have any
6 questions for the applicant?

7 MR. KRAMER: Can I just ask a couple questions?

8 MS. MILES: Why don't we begin with, does anybody
9 on the dais have any questions? I have a question.

10 MR. KRAMER: Okay.

11 MS. MILES: My question is, did you consider using
12 artificial slate rather than using asphalt?

13 MR. KRAMER: I did. The issue with the -- are you
14 talking about the rubberized slate?

15 MS. MILES: There are a variety of different
16 materials, but any artificial slate?

17 MR. KRAMER: Yes, I did think about that, but
18 chose not to use it. A lot of the houses in the
19 neighborhood already have the fiberglass on it, and I just
20 felt it would be a good choice in this particular house.

21 MS. MILES: Okay. Thank you. If you have
22 questions for us, we'll consider responding, depending on
23 the question, I would have to say.

24 MR. KRAMER: Well, it's just that this is the
25 first house in Greenwich Forest that, because it's a new

1 historic resource, so I just wanted to know what we can
2 expect in the future relating to changing roofs in the
3 neighborhood?

4 MS. MILES: Well, that's not a kind of a question
5 I think we can actually answer. We do handle all of our
6 cases on a case-by-case basis.

7 MR. KRAMER: Is it really? It's just a case-by-
8 case situation?

9 MS. MILES: Absolutely.

10 MR. KRAMER: Because I'm sure other residents are
11 going to look to this sort of just to understand the
12 situation.

13 MS. MILES: All of our cases are handled on a
14 case-by-case basis.

15 MR. KRAMER: I'll tell them that.

16 MS. MILES: Okay. If there are no questions for
17 either staff or applicant, I'd like to begin deliberations.

18 MR. TRESEDER: Actually, I think I could have one
19 question of the applicant. Can you explain your thinking
20 behind the siding of the dormer? The siding you're
21 proposing is Hardie Plank clapboard, I believe.

22 MR. KRAMER: It is, with a wood grain.

23 MR. TRESEDER: With a wood grain.

24 MR. KRAMER: Yes.

25 MR. TRESEDER: The current siding is, are the same

1 slate shingles that are on the roof.

2 MR. KRAMER: Correct.

3 MR. TRESEDER: Would you consider a material that
4 would be more similar to the existing slates, or Hardie
5 Plank shingles --

6 MR. KRAMER: Yeah.

7 MR. TRESEDER: -- or some other material that
8 would be --

9 MR. KRAMER: I'm really not a big fan of the
10 Hardie Plank shingle. The front of the house already has a
11 siding on it. I think it shows in the photographs. So what
12 I was doing is really trying to stick with that, because
13 it's already there on the front.

14 It's a painted beige siding. So that's what we
15 were going to duplicate. So it's sort of a repetition of
16 that siding.

17 MR. TRESEDER: Right, but it's not at all a
18 repetition of the existing dormer.

19 MR. KRAMER: It's not. I mean, I just didn't
20 think the painted shingles would be sort of a good copy of
21 what was there already, because the original shingles are
22 real slates, and they're gray and you know, the Hardie, I
23 can't imagine painting it in the gray color. It wouldn't
24 really look very much like slate at all, whereas the other
25 one looks like the siding that would be on the front.

1 MS. MILES: Mr. Kramer, would you mind bringing us
2 up the asphalt and showing us which one you intend to use?

3 MR. KRAMER: Yes. I brought you both pieces.
4 It's a 50-year, which is the highest.

5 MS. MILES: I'm just going to repeat what you say,
6 because you're not on the record. You said a 50-year, which
7 is the highest grade of asphalt shingle.

8 MR. KRAMER: And what you're looking at is the
9 bottom portion, which is the gray.

10 MS. MILES: And so the gray, right at the top, of
11 course, is subsumed under the layer above, so this would be
12 a gray asphalt shingle. Thank you.

13 MR. TRESEDER: What's the name of that?

14 MR. KRAMER: This is Certainteed.

15 MR. TRESEDER: What's the color? What color do
16 they call that?

17 MR. KRAMER: Mire black.

18 MS. MILES: Mire black, M-I-R-E? Thank you.

19 MR. KIRWAN: Here's a question for the applicant.
20 Did you consider a dimensional asphalt shingle, one that has
21 more depth? They often build these up.

22 MR. KRAMER: This is the dimensional.

23 MR. KIRWAN: Well, I've seen some that have a much
24 thicker profile than that does?

25 MR. KRAMER: This is 50-year, 300-pound. I'm

1 sorry. This is the 50-year, 300-pound shingle. This is
2 about the heaviest that's made by Certainteed at this point.

3 MS. MILES: If there are no other questions for
4 either staff or applicant if we could go into deliberations.

5 MS. WHITNEY: The neighborhood does have a great
6 deal of homes with the asphalt shingles, and so swapping out
7 your slate with the asphalt shingle would not be completely
8 inappropriate in the neighborhood. I do question the change
9 in material, what's on the dormers right now. Your comment
10 that you just didn't think it would look good is not the way
11 the house was built. So I do, I do question the change in
12 the material on the dormers, but I agree to the HAWP as it
13 stands.

14 MR. KRAMER: I can respond to that, if you would
15 like. If you feel that the use of the other product, which
16 is made by, you know, in concrete, I can do that. It's not
17 a problem. I mean, do I have to pick a color at this point.

18 MS. MILES: No, no. We're not asking you to
19 respond. We're in deliberations.

20 MR. KRAMER: Oh, I see.

21 MS. MILES: Thank you.

22 MR. KIRWAN: I mean, I do think there are better
23 asphalt shingle options than the one that you are presenting
24 tonight for this HAWP. But I think the question that
25 Commissioner Treseder raised about the side walls of the

1 dormer has raised greater concerns for me about the
2 appropriateness of the material.

3 I think when you go to the Greenwich Forest
4 guidelines, they definitely make a very strong reference to
5 replication of the original materials to the greatest extent
6 possible. And I think that certainly would apply to the
7 dormer side walls. And I can't imagine, really, as asphalt
8 shingle being appropriate material for the dormer side
9 walls.

10 And I do think there are some very good options
11 with synthetic slate that are more in line with this
12 compatibility issue that the Greenwich Forest guidelines
13 make reference to in roof replacements. So I do think
14 synthetic slate is possibly a better alternative to the
15 asphalt shingle.

16 MR. SWIFT: I agree with Commissioner Kirwan's
17 comments. I believe that under the, with moderate scrutiny
18 of this issue, and in consideration of the preservation of
19 the property, that a compatible new material would need to
20 much more match the scale, texture and detail of the
21 original materials, both as shingles on the roof and on the
22 siding of the dormers. And as such, I think a slate, a
23 replacement replicated slate is the most appropriate
24 material in this case.

25 MR. TRESEDER: If it weren't for the dormers, I

1 would vote to, I could see replacing using the heavy duty
2 shingles, although I think that the unfortunate aspect of
3 those shingles you've shown us is that they are designed to
4 replicate a cedar shake, a wood roof as opposed to a shingle
5 roof. And they have the randomness associated with a wood
6 roof.

7 And perhaps a study of other manufacturers, other
8 styles might come up with an asphalt shingle of the same
9 weight and cost that would have a little bit more of a
10 pattern and texture of slate. So I think there might be a
11 solution to that.

12 But I do think that the nature of these dormers is
13 very distinct. For one thing, there is no eave trim on
14 these dormers. The sidewall runs right up to the roof
15 slates, and there is no rake boards, there's no corner
16 boards. Your drawing shows rake boards. It doesn't show
17 corner boards.

18 I'm not sure, you know, of the exact detailing,
19 because the drawing we have doesn't really show the new
20 material. So I'm not, in a way, not even quite sure what is
21 being proposed for the dormers because it's not on all I
22 have.

23 Maybe I'm not, in my package I have circle 8, I
24 have existing right side elevation. Have I missed the
25 proposed right elevations? My package does not have a

1 drawing showing the propose elevations. Did I miss it?

2 MR. SILVER: They are annotated. What says
3 existing right, existing left, existing rear, it's then
4 drawn on there with an arrow, is that correct, Mr. Kramer?

5 MR. KRAMER: Correct.

6 MR. TRESEDER: Right, but what was drawn are
7 shingles, not the new proposed material. And the detailing
8 of these dormers, if you look at the photos, is really quite
9 distinctive. The way that they really, they are meant to be
10 part of the roof, and that's why the siding wraps up and
11 around.

12 They are a very utilitarian dormer, and they are
13 very, they are really a neat architectural feature, and I
14 could imagine coming up with a design using a combination of
15 asphalt shingles and maybe even asphalt shingles on the side
16 walls.

17 So I can imagine a design that will, using, you
18 know, readily available contemporary materials, that would
19 accomplish what you are trying to accomplish. But I have a
20 problem with this exact proposal. And I guess I would like
21 to see a drawing exactly of what's being proposed on the
22 dormers.

23 MS. MILES: I want to make it clear that no one on
24 the Commission has supported anything like replacing your
25 roof with a new slate roof, or requiring that you restore

1 your slate roof, or that you do anything to preserve the
2 slate roof that is there. Everyone is well aware of the
3 guidelines and applying, in my opinion, correctly, the
4 guidelines that require that we apply moderate scrutiny,
5 which is limited.

6 And to me the language that's appropriate to use
7 is as Commissioner Swift comment, the use of compatible new
8 materials, or materials that replicate the original, should
9 be permitted. And so I'm looking for something that
10 replicates the original.

11 For example, homeowners wishing to replace slate
12 roofs may use alternative methods that match the scale,
13 texture and detail. And I do not believe that the asphalt
14 shingles match either the scale, texture or detail,
15 particularly not the texture.

16 And I think that there is acceptable looking
17 artificial slate. And we did bring some examples with us
18 tonight of artificial slate, which is comparable in cost to
19 asphalt. And we think that that is a reasonable
20 alternative. So I'm going to entertain a motion on the
21 HAWP.

22 MS. WHITNEY: I move that we accept the HAWP
23 application as it stands for asphalt shingle slate,
24 shingles.

25 MS. MILES: Is there a second? There is not a

1 second. Do I have another motion?

2 MR. SWIFT: I move to deny the application as
3 submitted.

4 MS. MILES: Is there a second?

5 MR. KIRWAN: I second.

6 MS. MILES: Is there any discussion before we
7 vote?

8 MR. WHIPPLE: Madam Chair --

9 MS. MILES: Yes.

10 MR. WHIPPLE: -- before you call the question,
11 perhaps this might be an opportunity to offer the applicant
12 an opportunity to withdraw his application, and reconsider
13 based on some of the advice that you have given him.

14 MS. MILES: Precisely. Would you care to withdraw
15 your application?

16 MR. KRAMER: Sure.

17 MS. MILES: Excellent. We will look forward to
18 seeing you shortly.

19 MR. KRAMER: Thank you.

20 MS. MILES: Very good. Okay. Our next matter is
21 the evaluation for Master Plan for Historic -Preservation
22 and/or Locational Atlas for the Naval Ordnance Laboratory
23 Administration Building at 10603 (sic - 10903 is correct) New
24 Hampshire Avenue in Silver Spring. Do we have a staff
25 report?

1 MS. YOULA: We do have a staff report and --

2 MS. MILES: Is your microphone on? I don't
3 believe it is.

4 MS. YOULA: It is, and we tested it. Are you not
5 hearing me?

6 MS. MILES: Is it on? Okay.

7 MS. YOULA: Yes. We do have a staff report --
8 it's not on.

9 (Discussion off the record.)

10 MS. YOULA: Okay. We do have staff report.

11 MS. MILES: Please begin.

12 MS. YOULA: My name is Sandra Youla, Historic
13 Preservation staff and we're discussing -- yes, thank you --
14 and we're discussing the Naval Ordnance Laboratory
15 Administration Building. Staff is recommending that it be
16 designated on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and
17 in the interim added to the Locational Atlas.

18 This resource is located at 10603 (*sic - 10903 is*
19 *correct*) New Hampshire Avenue. It's located on a very large
20 parcel, as you can see. This was once called the Naval
21 Ordnance Laboratory, and it straddles the Prince George's
22 boundary. This is Rte. 29, New Hampshire Ave., and of
23 course the Beltway is down here.

24 Zooming in a little bit, you see this building
25 right here that I'm pointing to with my pointer is the Naval

1 Ordnance Lab Administration Building, which is now known as
2 Building 1 at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration
3 Consolidated Headquarters. These other buildings are mainly
4 new buildings that have been built recently for the new FDA
5 headquarters.

6 You can see that we're still under construction
7 over here, but the number of buildings have been built. And
8 in the front you see a large open space, which was once a
9 golf course, and I understand that's to be preserved as open
10 space.

11 This building, the Naval Ordnance Laboratory
12 Administration Building, which I'm pointing to here in the
13 front, was at the front door of the Naval Ordnance
14 Laboratory, and it was part of four interconnected
15 buildings. The Administration Building was built in 1946,
16 and most of the buildings on the whole campus, which was
17 over 600 acres, maybe 800 acres when it was first developed,
18 were built between 1945 and 1955.

19 So the buildings you see here are the prior campus
20 buildings, and not the buildings that are there today,
21 except for the Naval Ordnance Laboratory Administration
22 Building.

23 This is the plan for the FDA campus, and as I
24 said, it's being built out and one day it will look more or
25 less completely like this. Here is a better site plan for

1 you, and again, here is the Naval Ordnance Lab
2 Administration Building. This is Building 31, which is
3 built, and another building flanking it on the other side,
4 which is also built.

5 Now, once the Food and Drug Administration
6 building was, I'm sorry, the Food and Drug Administration
7 Headquarters started construction, people naturally started
8 questioning what was the future of the rest of the
9 neighborhood.

10 So currently, our planners have started the White
11 Oak Science Gateway Master Plan to look at this future, and
12 that is why we are examining this resource. It's going to
13 be designated or not designated by riding along on that
14 Master Plan.

15 And backing up for a moment, just a few
16 preliminary matters, too, I'd like to note that the
17 associated inventory numbers with this resource would be
18 MC:33-14, which is the White Oak Main Administration
19 building, and also MC:33-25, which is the Naval Ordnance Lab
20 Survey District.

21 Also, I gave out four handouts today, which were
22 testimony of John Tino, who is here to testify tonight in
23 support, email from the Silver Spring Historical Society
24 enthusiastically supporting, and then two handouts that
25 Mr. Tino brought regarding a dedication recently of a garden

1 and a newsletter.

2 Also, I'd like to point out a few errata in the
3 staff report. So on pages three, nine and 10, we mistakenly
4 say Federal Drug Administration, it should be Food and Drug
5 Administration, and on pages four and 16 we refer to a flag
6 pole which apparently was on the USS Maine, and I have since
7 learned from Mr. Tino that this is, I suppose, a White Oak
8 urban legend, and no, it's not from the USS Maine, but it is
9 from the period of significance in the 1940's. Okay. So I
10 wanted to make that correction.

11 Okay, so going back to my presentation here, so
12 the history of this building. Briefly, the Naval Ordnance
13 Lab started its life in 1919 in the Washington Navy Yard,
14 and it was an operation called the Mine Building. By 1929
15 it was joined by the Experimental Ammunition Unit, and it
16 became the Naval Ordnance Lab.

17 Given World War II demands, there was an increased
18 demand for weapons research and testing, and the operation
19 grew and grew. Here you see Ralph Bennett, who was the
20 first civilian technical advisor in the forties, and here
21 you see the original building, in 1948, the Navy Mine
22 Building.

23 And his quote here is telling you just how every
24 overcrowded they were. They had occupied 13 buildings. And
25 the long and the short was, definitely around World War,

1 towards the close of World War II, they needed to find
2 another site, a large site.

3 So they found White Oak for a number of reasons,
4 and Mr. Tino will speak to the technical reasons why they
5 moved there. But as you can see, it was a large open site.
6 This is a 1944 picture of mainly farm land. By the time
7 they developed the Naval Ordnance Lab Administration
8 Building, you could look out its front door, and once again,
9 you look at a barn across the street, which is what they
10 needed [i.e. open space] when they were doing things like
11 ammunition testing.

12 Eventually, they built out the front group of
13 buildings on this large parcel to look like this. This is
14 an undated photo, but I'm gesturing now to the Naval
15 Ordnance Lab Building, again, sitting right at the front
16 door and presenting its public face to the world.

17 All of the buildings -- the Naval Ordnance Lab
18 moved there completely by 1948. Most of the buildings were
19 built between '45 to '54. They were laid out in distinct
20 groups to allow for various kinds of testing. And Mr. Tino
21 will talk about it, but there was magnetics testing,
22 explosive testing, et cetera.

23 By 1997, the Naval Ordnance Lab at White Oak was
24 closed. However, research was done, and it was found by the
25 Maryland Historic Trust to merit listing on the, to be

1 National Register eligible. It's not listed but it's
2 National Register eligible. And this orange boundary is the
3 boundary of the historic district. Our building is right up
4 here.

5 So this is what the building looked like shortly
6 before it started being renovated a few years ago. It had
7 been vacated, and we have the architect here today. We have
8 several people besides Mr. Tino to talk -- we also have
9 Michael Stevenson, who was the project architect with Kling
10 Stubbins, and we also have Brian Peper from the FDA, and
11 they are here to talk to you if you would like to ask them.
12 And Mr. Stevenson will make a brief PowerPoint presentation
13 and tell us about how they renovated this building.

14 Again, here's what it was looking like. This is a
15 side view, and after renovation it looked like this. This
16 building is an example of what is called modern classicism,
17 or stripped classicism. As you can see there, the materials
18 are brick and limestone. There's a bilateral symmetry in
19 the building.

20 The classical elements that you would normally see
21 in classical buildings have been reduced and simplified to
22 an extreme degree. So for example you see a portico that is
23 suggested by this limestone projection, and you see columns
24 suggested by this stacked fenestration.

25 This is typical of this type of style, which was

1 very popular in this country in the thirties and forties,
2 especially for government buildings. It was felt to be a
3 very sober and economical type of building, and also quick
4 to build during war time.

5 This is a building on the left. It's a new
6 building that picks up the limestone and brick.
7 Incidentally, it's the very same brick from the same
8 brickyard. They found the same brickyard. This is a new
9 building to the south, which is also up and running now.

10 What you see here are parts of limestone from
11 probably the steps that were right in front of the building.
12 I think they use limestone from other elements that were
13 razed as well, but mainly the steps. And this is a Memory
14 Garden that was recently dedicated so that the history of
15 the Naval Ordnance Laboratory is not lost.

16 Again, another view of this Memory Garden, which
17 was recently dedicated. This is a south view and you see
18 this limestone cladding here. This was once a connector to
19 one of the, to the other interconnected buildings, but that
20 connector was removed. And obviously it's playing off the
21 limestone that's already there. They kept the Naval
22 Ordnance Laboratory in incised lettering.

23 Here you can see some of the details on the front
24 of the building, the three sets of doors, and again, the
25 stacked fenestration of the windows on the projecting front

1 ells.

2 And also notice here, this is glass in front
3 that's replacing the steps. And that is a security pavilion
4 that was put in so that you could enter into the lowest
5 level of the building, and you wouldn't have to destroy the
6 very beautiful lobby that we'll see picture of, with
7 security concerns.

8 This is looking out the front, these days towards
9 New Hampshire Avenue. Some of the details, there's the 1946
10 cornerstone. I'm going to ask the architect to talk about
11 the new windows that they very sensitively replaced -- the
12 old windows that were replaced sensitively with these new
13 windows.

14 This is the really beautifully restored lobby
15 inside with the rose colored and beige granite. You see a
16 lot of art deco touches, particularly in the inside of this
17 building. Here is another view of the lobby.

18 This is some of the beautiful fretwork that you
19 see on the grates and in the railings. There's an open
20 staircase that, of course, you wouldn't be able to build
21 today because of code. They had to add this extra railing,
22 but it was very successful, I think. This is what you see
23 when you look up into the very elegant interior stairway.

24 Now, what we're looking at here, this is the rear
25 of the Naval Ordnance Lab Administration Building, and we

1 are facing it and facing New Hampshire Avenue. And we are
2 in an enclosed connector that leads to building two, which
3 is a new building.

4 So if you look off to your left while standing
5 there, you can see the brick. That's to the left. And if
6 you look off to your right, you can see again the brick.
7 But they've connected it with modern construction to
8 Building 2, which is, if I turned around from where I was
9 just standing, what I would see.

10 And again, here are some interior photos of the
11 security lobby, and you can see why it was best to keep this
12 on another level.

13 So, in summary, what we're recommending is that
14 you add it to the Locational Atlas, and you designate it on
15 the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. We feel that it
16 has both high architectural value and significance, and
17 historical significance. It meets criteria 1A, which is
18 that it has character, interest and value, as part of the
19 development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the
20 County, State or nation.

21 And in this case, it's both the County and the
22 nation because this had a national role in our cold war
23 defense, and also, it promoted development of the County.
24 1C, it's identified with persons or a group of persons who
25 influenced society. Many important scientists worked here,

1 including German scientists who came over after World War
2 II.

3 It meets criteria 2A, embodies the distinctive
4 characteristics of a type, namely it's an excellent and very
5 representative example of this modern classicism. And 2E,
6 it represents an established and familiar visual feature of
7 the neighborhood community or County.

8 Indeed, the neighborhood grew around this new
9 Naval Ordnance Laboratory. So it is really a focal point
10 and still referred to today, and it's very prominent
11 visually. The open space is to be maintained in the front.

12 So, our recommended environmental setting is
13 basically a rectangle, and it runs along the rear of the
14 building excluding the connector and Building 2, and it runs
15 to the parcel line here. If there is any right-of-way that
16 is within the parcel, we'll exclude the right-of-way.

17 It includes the driveway. It includes the flag
18 pole, which as I noted, I've learned, dates from the 1940's.
19 So it is part of the original construction here.

20 And here is the text that we are recommending
21 [points to text on slide]for the environmental setting:

22 *Approximately 10.5 acres, as depicted on the map. The*
23 *setting is roughly rectangular, and runs along the*
24 *parcel boundary at New Hampshire Avenue (unless the*
25 *Master Plan right-of-way extends into the parcel, in*

1 *which case along the Master Plan right-of-way); along*
2 *the rear wall of the Administration Building, extending*
3 *in a straight line to the northwest and southeast;*
4 *along the southeastern-most wall plane of Building 21,*
5 *connecting to New Hampshire Avenue and rear*
6 *environmental setting boundaries in a straight line;*
7 *and along the northwestern-most wall plane of Building*
8 *31, connecting the New Hampshire Avenue and rear*
9 *environmental setting boundaries in a straight line.*
10 *The setting includes the Administration Building*
11 *{contributing}, the flag pole, [and here I'm modifying*
12 *the staff report to just simply say flag pole]; the*
13 *traffic circle, and axial entrance drive; open space to*
14 *either side of the drive, and a commemorative*
15 *installation along the southeast facade featuring*
16 *former entry steps to the building. Preserving the*
17 *vista from the street, open aspect, flag pole and front*
18 *facades are the most important for this resource.*

19 And I did want to tell you a little bit about the
20 architects as well. Let's go down a little bit. The
21 architects are a nationally prominent firm called Eggers and
22 Higgins. They were the successor firm to John Russell Pope.
23 Here you see Daniel Paul Higgins and Otto Reinhold Eggers
24 sitting in their office on 5th Avenue [in New York]. They
25 were one of the largest firms in the country. This is their

1 drafting room. Here are all their marble samples. They did
2 numerous commissions.

3 Now, when they worked for Mr. Pope, they first
4 worked with him and then they became partners with him, and
5 he was a very well known, as you know, Beaux Arts Classicism
6 proponent. So you'll see their earlier works look more
7 classical.

8 Here is the Jefferson Memorial. Here is the
9 American Institute of Pharmacy in Washington, D.C.,
10 Constitution Hall, which they finished for John Russell
11 Pope, National Gallery of Art, which again they finished for
12 John Russell Pope, who died in the 1930's.

13 They also did a lot of military installations.
14 This is in Maryland, the Bainbridge Naval Training Station.
15 And you can see some of these, some of this military
16 architecture is very utilitarian and plain.

17 They became, they did many, many campuses and they
18 became, for over 30 years, the campus architects for Indiana
19 University. And you can see this building, which is the
20 auditorium, is in their style that they became well known
21 for, which is this modern classicism.

22 Here is the Dirksen Senate office building, which
23 they designed and got approved in 1949, and it got built out
24 from '54 to '58, with a later interior section in '82. And
25 again, it's in this stripped classicism, but with a little

1 bit more of the classicism that you would see in their
2 earlier buildings.

3 This is Mr. Eggers, and I wanted to say that
4 Mr. Eggers was a renderer of some great, great skill, and he
5 was Mr. Pope's right hand man from the very beginning in the
6 early 1900's. And here is Mr. Pope.

7 Here are some of Mr. Higgins' renderings. I'm
8 sorry, Mr. Eggers' renderings. This is from Yale
9 University. This is a proposed mausoleum. Here he has done
10 a water color --

11 MS. MILES: You're no longer audible.

12 MS. YOULA: Okay. So I'll finish my presentation,
13 but he was a very skilled renderer, and his renderings were
14 an integral part, I have read, of the design process.

15 So in any event, we recommend that this resource
16 be approved with the environmental setting as discussed
17 today. And we have speakers as well. Thank you.

18 MS. MILES: Thank you. Does anyone have any
19 questions for staff? Okay. Mr. Tino, Mr. Stevenson, and
20 Mr. Peper, if you'd like to come forward and have a seat.
21 You'll each of five minutes to speak. If one of you doesn't
22 care to, you can allocate your time to another.

23 (Discussion off the record.)

24 MS. YOULA: Mr. Tino, do you want to start, maybe,
25 while we're getting this set up?

1 MR. TINO: I thought maybe the architect might do
2 better.

3 MS. YOULA: Okay.

4 MS. MILES: Mr. Stevenson, please state your name,
5 for the record, before you begin?

6 MR. STEVENSON: I'm Michael Stevenson. I'm the
7 design principal of Kling Stubbins. We're an architecture
8 and engineering firm in downtown Washington. I will try not
9 to be redundant. The previous presentation was very
10 comprehensive. I'll just try to fill in the blanks, maybe
11 give a bit of the design rationale and how we approach the
12 new campus and the restoration of building one.

13 You know the history of the Naval Ordnance Lab.
14 This is an aerial before the FDA work began. And then this
15 is the current master plan. I will just point out that
16 under the current plan there will be nearly 9,000 FDA
17 employees on the site, which is a consolidation of four of
18 the five FDA centers. The significance for them is that
19 they were consolidating from 46 locations onto one location.

20 This is the rendering, maybe from Mr. Eggers
21 himself. I don't know. But Building 1, actually was the
22 designation under the Naval Ordnance Lab building numbering
23 system, so we kept that. And there was a second building
24 which was kept, which is on the top of the screen, which was
25 the old firehouse. We restored that, became the central

1 energy plant for the campus. And then that is obviously
2 Building 1.

3 I wanted to point out in terms of the new campus
4 design, we were not able to keep most of the buildings, the
5 floor plates, the floor to floor heights. Presence of
6 asbestos and numerous other factors prevents those from
7 being converted into modern laboratory and office buildings,
8 but we saw that the overall campus design had an underlying
9 logic and character that we should preserve.

10 It has been pointed out, the axial symmetry, the
11 circular forecourt, and equally significant, the openness
12 and views to nature beyond on the courtyard on the opposite
13 side. So those fundamental principles we really wanted to
14 keep in the design of the new campus.

15 So here is the aerial view rendering of the new
16 campus, and as was mentioned, it's nearly built out. The
17 southeast quad on the right hand side is about halfway done
18 with construction.

19 You can see how we did keep the circular
20 forecourt, although somewhat reconfigured. I want to point
21 out that during the early stages of construction, the events
22 of 911 occurred, and after that we had to meet significantly
23 higher standard for perimeter security and building
24 security. And that all had to be incorporated into the site
25 and building design as well. And there is Building 1 which

1 is, was and is still the main front door to the campus.

2 This is a very early rendering, but our idea was
3 that Building 1 had to retain its visual prominence, its
4 centrality in the campus, as well as its functional purpose
5 as the headquarters building and as the main entrance to the
6 campus. And everything around the design for that building
7 and the buildings around it were done to reinforce that
8 idea.

9 And this is the finished building, as it's been
10 restored and renovated and with the alterations which have
11 been mentioned. This was an early rendering view of that.
12 It gives you, shows you in perspective Building 1 with the
13 two flanking office buildings and the amenities building
14 that connects to the back with the planted roof.

15 Here it is finished. You can see, for example,
16 how we tried to integrate the security, perimeter security,
17 vehicular barriers into the landscape concept, so that it
18 will be unobtrusive. And then you can also see at the
19 entrance to Building 1 itself, we had to reconfigure what
20 were front facing steps, make them side, go into the sides,
21 and in place of the steps, place in a security pavilion.

22 That was done because, as was mentioned, the
23 historic lobby, had we tried to make that the functional
24 entrance, it would have been effectively, aesthetically
25 compromised with all the security equipment it would have

1 had in place there.

2 This shows how that was resolved in sections. We
3 basically re-graded the front circle area so that one would
4 enter into the former basement level, which is now actually
5 an office level, and then that allowed the lobby just above
6 to be kept in its, and restored back to its original state.

7 So you enter now through this pavilion, and then
8 you enter into where the functional security screening
9 happens. And we were very conscious about, we wanted people
10 to be aware of, when they arrived, the connection to
11 building one. So the skylights were very purposefully
12 placed so that as you entered and you look up, you see
13 the -- I'm sorry.

14 MS. MILES: If you could just wrap up your
15 remarks. You did nothing wrong, don't worry. If you could
16 just wrap up your remarks.

17 MR. STEVENSON: Okay. I can stop.

18 MR. PEPPER: I would gladly give my time to
19 Michael.

20 MS. MILES: All right. Go ahead then.

21 MR. STEVENSON: I'll try to just pick up the pace.
22 So lobby before. Lobby after. You saw this picture of the
23 building before, building after renovation.

24 The scar on the back of the building where
25 building five connected, and then how we repaired that and

1 replaced it with a new connector, similar to the scar on the
2 south side. And then how we dealt with that, with the
3 limestone fascia piece.

4 We went to quite a bit of trouble, first to try to
5 reuse the existing steel casement windows. Upon
6 investigation, they were deteriorated to quite a severe
7 degree, and it was determined that to try to remove them to
8 restore them probably would have functionally destroyed
9 them. So we actually went and found a product that was
10 almost an exact match to the original.

11 They are steel casements. And we did paint
12 analysis to find the original color, which we matched.
13 There is a sample. And we were able to do that and actually
14 do insulated glass, so it's more energy efficient.

15 And so here is the finished building with the
16 forecourt. And our intent was to have it retain its
17 character and prominence. and I hopefully think, most
18 people agree that that was done. Thank you.

19 MS. MILES: Before we go onto the next witness, I
20 just have to say, I think that's an amazing reuse of that
21 building, and I think it's marvelous.

22 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you very much.

23 MS. MILES: Okay. Who else is going to speak?

24 MR. TINO: John Tino. Do I press the button?

25 MS. MILES: Yes, and when you let your finger off,

1 the light will come on, and please identify yourself, for
2 the record.

3 MR. TINO: My name is John Tino. I'm president of
4 the White Oak Laboratory Alumni Association. The time line
5 for the laboratory, as you heard, began in 1919. We served
6 our country for 50 years, from 1946 to 1997, during the Cold
7 War.

8 When it closed, we formed the White Oak Laboratory
9 Alumni Association, and immediately began working on
10 historic preservation. Our purpose was to preserve the
11 history of the lab and to continue the fellowship in the
12 community that the employees all felt working there for so
13 many years.

14 We signed an MOA with all the parties in 2002. A
15 Mr. Bush signed for Park and Planning. I don't know if he's
16 still with Park and Planning or not. We are very pleased
17 with what has happened.

18 On September 30th we had the dedication of the
19 Proud Memory Garden in the Legacy Wall which includes a
20 kiosk which has the legacy of the laboratory. Five
21 employees got together, took four years of their lives, to
22 publish the book, *Legacy of the White Oak Laboratory*. We're
23 very proud of this. I gave a copy to Sandra, who by the
24 way, I thank very much for allowing me to testify, and
25 helping me testify, and the excellent staff report she

1 provided you.

2 We also have the oral history of the wind tunnels.
3 They date back to Germany. The German scientists came east
4 to surrender to the allies. The scientists and the
5 equipment and the documentation all came to the laboratory.
6 My first supervisor was a German female scientist.

7 Our dedication, we had 375 alumni and guests
8 attend it. I gave you the program not to show you the
9 dedication so much, but there is some extra history in the
10 program. And we also publish a newsletter quarterly. I
11 gave you the newsletter that came after the dedication.

12 I'm not going to speak about the architecture, but
13 I did want to say one thing. This is the rendering which --

14 MS. MILES: Please speak into the microphone. You
15 won't be on the record. Thank you.

16 MR. TINO: This is the rendering which Sandra had
17 just talked about. In 1957 I was hired for the summer to
18 come to the laboratory to work. I was from Western
19 Pennsylvania. I'd never been out of Pennsylvania. Somehow
20 I found Maryland, somehow I found Silver Spring, which was
21 much different in those days.

22 I finally found the laboratory, got out of my car
23 and was overwhelmed by that building. It just grabbed me
24 for my whole career. I worked there from 1957 until I
25 retired in 1993. And I'm still with it, 20 years later,

1 with the Alumni Association.

2 It was a marvelous place to work. The people and
3 the successes we had are, I think helped to end the Cold
4 War. Sandra asked me to speak a little bit about what we
5 did. It was a shame because of the classification almost
6 nobody in the County knew what happened there. So I'm just
7 going to go through things very quickly.

8 Starting in Vietnam War, our Mark 50 mines were
9 dropped in Haiphong Harbor, and that is the event that
10 helped bring the North Vietnamese to the peace tables. So
11 we are very proud of that. Unfortunately, nothing was sunk,
12 but it did bring the North Vietnamese to the peace talks.

13 If any of you read Tom Clancy's *Hunt for Red*
14 *October*, the heavy weapons system on the U.S. submarines was
15 developed at the laboratory -- the SUBROC Missile, Mark 48
16 Torpedo, Mark 113 Fire Control System, and the mines that
17 were on the submarines.

18 I'm convinced that Clancy knew more than he should
19 have, because the weapons systems were portrayed very, very
20 accurately, and I'm also convinced that it disturbed the
21 Soviet Navy people a lot, again, helping to contribute to
22 the Cold War's end.

23 The CAPTOR Mine was the first autonomous weapon in
24 the U.S. Navy. You launched it. It sat there. It detected
25 the submarine, ignored surface ships, launched the torpedo,

1 and protected the GI-UK Gap, which is the gap that all
2 submarines had to come down. Again, I think the threat of
3 that mine helped change some of the strategy of the Soviet
4 submarines, particularly the ballistic missile submarines.

5 All the chemical compounds for explosives used by
6 the U.S. Navy were developed at the Naval Ordnance
7 Laboratory. Those explosives were used in mines and
8 torpedoes and missiles and warheads. The Mark 48, Mark 50
9 Torpedo Warheads were very significant. They were the only
10 torpedo warheads that could do damage and significant damage
11 to the Soviet double-hull submarines.

12 Again, I think those warheads contributed to some
13 of the strategy the Soviets had to change towards the end of
14 the Cold War.

15 I'm sure you've heard of SEAL Team 6. We
16 developed all the underwater weapons for the SEALs -- the
17 limpet mine, torpedo for a swimmer weapon vehicle, and a
18 whole tool box of toys that they could put together to
19 detonate their explosive charges. Those are fun weapons to
20 work on.

21 We mentioned magnetic silencing. Two of the
22 reasons that we --

23 MS. MILES: Go ahead. Just wrap up. Thanks.

24 MR. TINO: -- we came out to the laboratory where
25 it was very quiet magnetic area so we could do magnetic

1 testing on magnetic sensors and magnetic degaussing systems.
2 Also, we were in the middle of nowhere, so we were going to
3 do explosive testing. And you know what happened 50 years
4 later, explosive testing was very difficult.

5 We talked about the wind tunnels. They're world
6 class. The Air Force still runs Tunnel 9. It's doing very
7 important work for NASA, the Army, and the Air Force.

8 All the fuzes, safety on the devices for all of
9 the Navy missiles, ballistic missiles, and anti-air missiles
10 were developed at the laboratory.

11 And I guess what we're really proud of, and it's
12 kind of a transition to Food and Drug, we had a great
13 technology transfer. The Brown Magnetometer, you've all
14 felt it but you didn't realize it. You went through it at
15 the airport, for the airport detection. Also, you come up
16 to a red light, Brown Magnetometer is what changed the light
17 when you're making a left turn and things like that.

18 The HNS explosive was developed at the laboratory
19 and was used on the moon by NASA. The parachutes to recover
20 the shuttle's rocket motors were developed by the
21 laboratory. And last but not least, there was a metal
22 developed called NITINOL. I'm sure all of you have heard of
23 somebody who has had to have a stent for open heart artery.
24 NITINOL metal is what makes those stents.

25 So we're very proud of what we achieved, and we

1 support the adding of Building 1 to the historical Master
2 Plan. Thank you.

3 MS. MILES: Thank you. That was all extremely
4 interesting testimony. Thank you, and thank you for your
5 service. Does anyone have any questions for any of the
6 members of the panel?

7 MS. WHITNEY: I have a couple of questions,
8 please, if you don't mind. And I don't know who to direct
9 my question to. So the three of you, first, can you tell me
10 on site, where was the ordnance testing? There was actually
11 testing of live ammunition, live explosives on the site?
12 And if so, where was that?

13 MR. TINO: Okay. Actually, any tests we did of an
14 actual warhead was done off-site.

15 MS. WHITNEY: Okay.

16 MR. TINO: Like Solomon's Island, out in the
17 Pacific, things like that. But we could test up to 5 pounds
18 of explosive, experimental explosive. And that was done in
19 what we call the back area, the 300 area near the Prince
20 George's boundary. And I lived right back there, and I
21 could always tell when they were doing explosive testing,
22 because pictures were a little crooked.

23 But towards the end, we built a bomb proof
24 structure, so we could test up to 50 pounds of explosive
25 without disturbing anyone.

1 MS. WHITNEY: That's a very good segue into my
2 next question, the neighborhood. Do you have any
3 recollection of when and which area of the neighborhood was
4 developed first in the area?

5 MR. TINO: Right across the street, where that
6 barn was, there was some sort of a co-op formed by employees
7 at the laboratory, and those houses, which of course are
8 still there, were developed first. And I'm not sure,
9 probably down past -- I don't know how familiar you are with
10 the area, south of the laboratory, across the street from
11 New Hampshire, there's a series of homes that probably came
12 in maybe the sixties or seventies. But the homes I'm
13 talking about probably were in the early fifties. They were
14 there when I started in '57.

15 MS. WHITNEY: And you're talking, when you say
16 across the street, you're talking New Hampshire Boulevard?

17 MR. TINO: Yes, across from New Hampshire.

18 MS. WHITNEY: Okay. Thank you very much.

19 MS. MILES: If there are no other questions, thank
20 you, gentlemen. I've really enjoyed your testimony. And
21 let's have some deliberations. I'll look to my right then.
22 I looked left earlier. Commissioner Treseder?

23 MR. TRESEDER: Am I correct that under the
24 criteria for designation, basically, you're listing under
25 appendix A, you're not just referring to those. You're

1 actually saying that this project qualifies under all these
2 criteria. Is that correct?

3 MS. YOULA: Yes, I mentioned the criteria that I
4 thought that it qualified under, the four.

5 MR. TRESEDER: But, in your presentation, but it
6 was A, B, C and D under, A, B, C, D and E, all nine?

7 MS. YOULA: No, on page --

8 MR. TRESEDER: I'm sorry.

9 MS. YOULA: You don't have the staff report in
10 front of you. Do you have the staff report? Page 16, 1A,
11 1C, 2A, 2E.

12 MR. TRESEDER: Good. That's what I was looking
13 for. I'm sorry.

14 MS. YOULA: Yes. The appendix just lists all the
15 criteria in the Ordinance.

16 MR. TRESEDER: Great. Thanks for answering my
17 question.

18 MS. YOULA: Yes. Very confusing.

19 MS. MILES: Do you want to have a moment,
20 Commissioner Treseder, or should we move on? Okay. Well,
21 would you care to comment upon your view of the proposed
22 nomination?

23 MR. TRESEDER: Well, I agree, it's a very
24 significant building. I'm really glad that everyone is
25 taking care to maintain that the critical component of the

1 complex. I understand that the rest of the buildings were
2 not practical to salvage, but I'm very glad they chose to
3 salvage this component, which is the most distinctive
4 element, and it has all these criteria.

5 MR. SWIFT: I also appreciate the presentation and
6 the work that's been done. I do think that it meets the
7 criteria that have been pointed out in the staff report, and
8 I'll specifically emphasize 2E as an established and
9 familiar visual feature of the neighborhood or of the campus
10 in this case. And criteria 1A as far as value for the
11 development of the nation.

12 MR. WHIPPLE: Just for clarification, are you
13 excluding the other two?

14 MR. SWIFT: No, I'm agreeing with all of them, and
15 emphasizing the ones that stood out to me. My apologies.

16 MR. WHIPPLE: Thank you.

17 MR. KIRWAN: I agree with the previous
18 Commissioners' comments. I grew up in Silver Spring, so I
19 always, for many years, drove by that complex and wondered
20 what went on behind there. And it's really wonderful to get
21 this opportunity through this process to sort of publically
22 explain the story of the Naval Ordnance Lab.

23 And I think I really thank all of you for what
24 you've done to contribute to that story being told and
25 getting out there, and particularly to the adeptly handled

1 re-purposing of the complex by Kling Stubbins and RTKL and
2 of course the histories that you all have brought to the
3 table, too. So I fully support the staff recommendations.

4 MS. WHITNEY: I can only, I can only echo
5 everything that my fellow Commissioners have previously
6 stated. That facility stands as a sentinel not just to the
7 neighborhood but to the entire region, very impressive
8 architecture as well as architects that were behind it, and
9 the history behind it and the secrets behind it that only
10 those walls could tell.

11 Thank goodness we live in this century that we
12 have the ability to think ahead and preserve these
13 structures. So thank you for being involved in that, as
14 well as being involved in the secrets behind those
15 buildings. It meets all the criteria that is required, and
16 I fully support this designation.

17 MS. MILES: I agree that the proposed designation
18 meets all of the criteria, and I would emphasize 1A and 1B
19 in my opinion. And I think that the reuse and then the new
20 construction are very, I think deft is exactly the right
21 word, just beautifully done. And I'm so pleased that we
22 have an opportunity to recognize the original structure,
23 which I think is a magnificent example. So can I have a
24 motion?

25 MR. KIRWAN: Madam Chair, I will make a motion

1 that the Historic Preservation Commission accepts the
2 recommendations of Historic Preservation staff that the
3 Naval Ordnance Laboratory Administration Building be added
4 to the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites of
5 Montgomery County, Maryland, as an interim measure to
6 protect the resource prior to designation; and designate it
7 on the Master Plan of Historic Preservation in accordance
8 with the eligibility criteria noted in the staff report and
9 including the proposed environment setting.

10 MS. WHITNEY: I second the motion.

11 MS. MILES: Thank you. All in favor please raise
12 your right hand. It's unanimous. Thank you all very much.
13 Thank you, Sandra. It was a pleasure to get to see this
14 resource. Do we have any minutes for January 15th?

15 MR. SILVER: You have minutes for January 25th.

16 MS. MILES: January 25th. I mean, I can see the
17 two from a one. My apologies, January 25th.

18 MR. SWIFT: I move that the Commission approve the
19 January 25th minutes, as edited.

20 MS. MILES: Is there a second?

21 MS. WHITNEY: I second.

22 MS. MILES: All in favor? Unanimously approved.
23 Do we have minutes from February, that's an 8.

24 MR. WHIPPLE: Those haven't gone out yet.

25 MS. MILES: Very good, thank you.

1 MR. WHIPPLE: Or haven't come back, anyway.

2 MS. MILES: All right. Thank you. And do we have
3 a volunteer for this evening? Thank you, Bill, Commissioner
4 Kirwan. Do we have any Commission items? Do we have any
5 staff items? Very good. We are adjourned. Thank you.

6 (Whereupon, at 8:32 p.m., the hearing was
7 adjourned.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the foregoing pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission.



Teresa S. Hinds

2/26/12