

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

SECTION 106 COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: October 5, 2005 9:00AM – 1:00PM

Location Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington

Attendees: Joseph Woo, Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W)
Sheila Abar, AFRH-W
Hector Abreu Cintron, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)
Lisa Burcham, D.C. State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)
Nancy Witherell, National Capitol Planning Commission (NCPC)
Tom Mayes, National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)
Sophie Lynn, NTHP
David Moshier, US Army
Nancy Czapek, General Services Administration (GSA)
Pamela Wessling, RSM McGladrey (RSM)
John Thompson, RSM
Giles Moore, Koetter Kim & Associates (KKA)
Carrie Albee, EHT Tracerics, Inc. (Tracerics)

The meeting began shortly after 9:00AM in Room 206 at the Sherman Building at AFRH-W. Nancy Czapek provided opening remarks regarding the project, the process, and project status. The committee was informed that AFRH will be sending out a request for qualifications (RFQ) on October 12th for development zones 3 and 4 (east side of the campus). The AFRH website has provide a venue for developers who are interested in the project to register with contact information.

Tim Cox sent the committee his regrets for being unable to attend: Mr. Cox was testifying before a congressional committee and continuing the arduous task of trying to raise capital to make repairs to the AFRH-Gulfport facility in Gulfport, Mississippi following the extensive devastation from hurricane Katrina.

Nancy Czapek described the financial need for development to provide revenue to the Trust, which is the only source of funds for AFRH, for its capital and operating expenses.

GSA, which is advising AFRH, is recruiting a project manager for the AFRH-W project; Nancy will be serving in that capacity until the position is filled. Nancy Czapek introduced the consulting team, led by RSM and including KKA and TRACERIES.

Tom May requested that Sophia Lynn be added as a contact person for the PA committee.

Q: Will the Programmatic Agreement Committee (PA) receive copies of the RFQ prior to being sent out?

A: No. The RFQ is a document distributed to interested parties that will enable the AFRH to gain a better understanding of the market demand, and how best to move forward with the Request for Proposal process.

Pam Wessling outlined the work that RSM McGladrey team has undertaken on behalf of AFRH. She introduced Carrie Albee (Traceries) and Giles Moore (KKA).

Of the twenty PA committee members listed on the directory, five are present. ACHP - Were all members on the directory invited? Yes.

PRESENTATION

AFRH-GULFPORT - Nancy reviewed recent activities at the Washington campus of AFRH, including the arrival of 336 Gulfport residents. A portion of the Gulfport population chose to relocate to live with family members, rather than travel to Washington. A small portion of Gulfport residents are still arriving at the Washington campus.

The Gulfport high rise residence tower sustained significant damage; many of the single story structures are no longer present on the site.

AFRH-WASHINGTON - A brief history of AFRH was reviewed, including size of the campus, current population (+/- 1,400), and the nature of the built and natural environment. Current funding sources and the need to increase the size of the AFRH trust fund were reviewed.

MASTER PLAN

OVERVIEW

Pam Wessling reviewed the objectives of the Master Plan.

HISTORIC

Carrie Albee of Traceries presented a brief history of the site and reviewed a portion of the historic inventory.

The Master Plan addresses anticipated activities on the entire site for a twenty year period. Zones 1 and 2 contain the historic core and AFRH operations; the Master Plan addresses AFRH consolidation of their operations to the north campus (Zones 1 and 2) and allows for development for future needs. The Master Plan addresses the need to provide residential quarters for retired military personnel married couples, currently an unmet need.

SHPO said that the Master Plan is for new private development and for AFRH development activities so both need to be addressed pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Also, the SHPO expressed interest in address the landscape in the Historic Inventory.

NTHP - the Master Plan should address the view sheds from AFRH historic properties.

NTHP engaged map makers who plotted coordinates on the site, will provide their information to GSA.

SHPO-what is the area of potential effect (APE) on the site?

GSA-the APE was delineated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and reviewed by SHPO staff. It includes adjacent neighborhoods, cemetery, some development to the east, but not the hospital area to the south.

SHPO -In order for the SHPO to review the Master Plan, it is extremely important that the National Historic Landmarks are clearly delineated on the plan.

ACHP stressed that the Master Plan must clearly spell out to developers the precise boundaries of the historic character areas.

GSA – Regarding the golf course, AFRH wants to make adjustments to two of the holes to better integrate the golf course with resident activities. Currently, the golf course is

separated from the core AFRH areas; relocating the two southernmost holes to the north side of the course would allow the residents to more easily participate in the course and enjoy the activities on the course.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

Giles Moore of KKA reviewed the purpose of design guidelines included in the Master Plan. NTHP – some guidelines are easy to define, others more difficult, including streetscape, entries and heights. RSM – the design guidelines clearly address those features of the site (existing and proposed) that are very important, but leave flexibility for future operations. SHPO – set standards and identify where those apply and where they don't apply in the design framework and the RFP.

NTHP – are final Design Guidelines included in the RFP? GSA – draft guidelines, which were submitted to NCPC in June of 2005, are included. ACHP – when significant changes are made to the design guidelines at some future date, they need to be reviewed by consulting parties to the Programmatic Agreement. SHPO – a twenty year plan needs to contain flexibility.

KKA-Design guidelines illustrate how things might be in the plan. There is a need to strike a balance between prescriptive guidelines and guidelines that allow some flexibility for a development that will occur over such a long time..

The existing and proposed Urban Design Framework were presented by KKA; key features include adjacencies, topographic features and views, and landscape. Buildings shown in black are those that are intended to remain. Buildings shown in white may be demolished for development.

NTHP – some of the buildings on site are not stable. What is the status of the Scott Building? GSA – the Scott Building will remain in service for AFRH now and in the foreseeable future. It is a large asset that continues to provide adequate service and would be costly to replace. The Scott Building will not be demolished. The meeting contained several inquiries regarding demolition of Scott Building. Each time the question was raised, it was reiterated that ARFH has an immediate need (plans for a dementia ward on the upper level) and long term need for the Scott building, and that there are no plans at present or in the future to demolish the Scott building.

DENSITY

SHPO – regarding density, do the guidelines address where to put buildings, etc? NTHP – would like to see clearer delineation of which buildings are to remain, with a breakdown by zones. GSA – the existing and proposed Urban Design Framework clearly shows in black (to remain) and white (can be demolished) what AFRH would like pursue. AFRH would like to replace LaGarde Building with a new facility on the north end of the campus so that nursing home residents are not distant from other AFRH residents and activities. NTHP – is there a chart in the RFP that spells out the proposed density? GSA –The handout contains New Development Potential Uses and Densities, which indicates by zone the proposed FAR and total proposed development area within each zone. AFRH wishes to generate the maximum revenue by inviting development on their site. The eastern edge is proposed for the greatest density, and is where there will be the least impact on other portions of the site. We should further explore these issues at the next Programmatic Agreement (PA) meeting.

NTHP – parking is not shown on the charts. There is a huge range in the EIS. This should be discussed at future meetings. ACHP – has the acreage needed for structured parking been addressed in the charts?

ACCESS

The Urban Design Framework proposes additional entrances to the site. SHPO – does DC Department of Transportation (DDOT) need to approve the proposed changes? GSA – All proposed entrances have existing curb cuts, most are abandoned entries that are being brought back into active service. The bridge on the east side of the campus is being repaired by the District of Columbia. NTHP – will an entry be opened at the north end of the campus? GSA – no.

NTHP – NTHP is interested in the Randolph gate on the west side of the campus and the Ivy Gatehouse. The gatehouse dates from the Lincoln era. Don't know what their interest is at this point, will assess and report back. SHPO – If you bring public in through the Randolph gate, does this allow for interpretive programs of the historic core? NTHP – yes.

Regarding security and opening the Randolph gate to tourist (bus) traffic, a key card entry could facilitate security and still allow tour operators access.

HEIGHTS

KKA reported that there is 140 feet of grade change across the site. RSM – we attempted to mark heights with balloons, however the light weight balloons were insufficient to deal with windy conditions, and the expense of providing sturdier balloons was beyond the budget for the meeting. SHPO – the National Park Service should contribute balloons, they frequently conduct balloon tests.

SHPO – will there be view sheds through development zones 3 and 4? KKA – due to the significant grade change, the buildings on the lower portion of the site will allow views to the south. Yes, the view shed will continue to the south through zone 4.

HISTORIC FEATURES

Traceries presented the eligibility of the site for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under three separate criteria:

- Military,
- Political, and
- Architecture/Landscape Architecture.

Landmark status of the site was reviewed, with distinctions of each of the designated areas:

- DC Historic Landmark
- National Historic Landmark
- National Register of Historic Places
- National Monument (entire site)

The various landmark areas overlap and in some cases bisect buildings.

NTHP – the Master Plan needs to clearly spell out that public visitors to the Lincoln Cottage and visitor center are part of NTHP operations and will be accommodated in any development scheme.

SHPO – will non-contributing buildings be demolished? GSA – we are open to demolition of non-contributing structures. The RFQ for Zones 3 and 4 identifies contributing and non-contributing structures. AFRH is seeking interest in reuse of contributing structures, but much of the east side of the campus (utility buildings) may be demolished to make way for new buildings.

NTHP – What is the extent of the wrought iron fence? TRACERIES - the west and north portions of the perimeter contains the historic fence. ACHP – we would like to see the historic fence remain. GSA – we will tee that up for future study. SHPO – is a new security fence being provided by the developers, and is it sympathetic to the existing?

GSA – yes, details will be contained in the design guidelines. SHPO – the issue of fence maintenance needs to be addressed.

PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE

Tracerics conducted an inventory of the entire site and prepared a Historic Structures Report. Tracerics concluded that the AFRH-W *Period of Significance* is 1851 thru 1944.

ACHP - Might the period of significance be extended to the 1950's, as it would meet the criteria of fifty years old? Tracerics – Construction of the golf course in the mid twentieth century compromised portions of the site where many of the 1950's era buildings are located. ACHP – The period of significance could change in the next ten years. SHPO – this is why it is necessary to have a strong sense of the end of Period of Significance. It is essential to lock that date and be respectful of modernist architecture.

NTHP - When was the (underground) reservoir constructed? GSA - The 1920's.

SHPO - What is the significance of 1944? The Programmatic Agreement committee needs to agree on the Period of Significance.

SHPO - What would be the cost for Tracerics to do additional building reports on the 1950's era buildings?

NCPC - What is the status of archeological survey? Tracerics – Phase I has been completed by Greenhorn and O'Mara. The SHPO reviewed it, and comments from SHPO were incorporated into the document.

SITE

Currently 262 acres, at one time the site contained nearly 500 acres. The parcels south of Irving Street were de-commissioned in the 1950's.

Tracerics reviewed character areas based on historical boundaries that are still present on the site. NCPC - are historic maps included in the Resource Room? GSA - They will be.

Regarding the two lakes on the south west portion of the site, there is concern for residents' sense of safety and well being, should the lakes become a public feature. AFRH would need to gain residents' acceptance if this area were open to the public. GSA will continue to explore whether it can be a shared resource. SHPO – you might explore having developers improve areas surrounding the lakes.

NTHP OPERATIONS ON THE SITE

A cooperative agreement between the NTHP and AFRH provides for operations of NTHP on the site. The agreement includes 2.83 acres. NTHP is principally engaged in restoration of the Lincoln Cottage in preparation of opening the National Landmark to the public.

NTHP separately leases the Administration Building which is intended to be a visitors center when the Lincoln Cottage opens to the public.

NTHP also leases one of the residences to house a NTHP staff member. NTHP is interested in leasing an additional residence for the same purpose.

NTHP requested that GSA consider NTHP's interest in renovating dilapidated buildings for its staff, who will be very involved in the construction activities.

NTHP – when tourist activities begin on campus, NTHP plans on installing a curb cut and creating new parking, or utilizing the parking lot adjacent to the Grant Building. We expect several tour busses on site at the same time. RSM – The renovation of the Grant building anticipates utilizing parking there for tenants, and parking for the north campus uses will need to be resolved.

ACHP – does NTHP plan on allowing visitors access to the larger site? NTHP – would like to see pathways re-oriented to provide greater focus on the cottage. NTHP staff will instruct visitors not to wander the site, nor interrupt residents

PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

NCPC – NCPC would like to be a signator to the PA. David Moshier would like to be a concurring party only. ACHP suggests that the PA be hashed out by the signators, then presented to the concurring parties, as an efficient method of making progress.

The signators do not want a negotiating meeting; signators will commit to providing input and comments via email and phone calls between regularly scheduled meetings to meet the proposed schedule.

Who is the contact person at GSA? Until the open position of AFRH project manager is filled, Nancy Czapek will remain the contact person.

NTHP (TM) – NTHP wants to be in the process at the early stage, not sure that they need a role as signator. GSA – AFRH will need to determine what, if any, additional signators, makes sense. SHPO – can adjust the cooperative agreement to accommodate the NTHP participation at the level they choose.

NTHP (SL) – The NTHP wants to be a signator.

NTHP (TM)-will talk to Dick Moe regarding role that NTHP will want to play, likely as signator.

SHPO – will provide comments to work with your schedule. Is the agreement going to the entire committee? ACHP – only to the signators.

Agreed - Send the PA to NCPC, NTHP, ACHP, SHPO and David. NCPC – CFA would like to review the PA, they have requested a copy for review.

SCHEDULE

A schedule of some activities was provided. RSM – we will add a line for the Master Plan. The draft Master Plan goes to NCPC at its January 2006 meeting and the Final Master Plan to NCPC in July 2006.

SHPO – request that an informational meeting be held with the DC Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) in December 2005, prior to the NCPC meeting.

GSA – would like to sign a PA in January 2006 if possible. Otherwise, summer of 2006. SHPO – suggest that a draft PA is prepared in January and a final ready for signature in June 2006.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

GSA – The Grant Building RFQ/RFP may be issued soon. SHPO – will the Grant RFQ/RFP be issued after the draft PA? GSA – yes, the Grant project will go out as a one stage process. SHPO – if Grant is issued prior to the final PA, we need a final Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). GSA – a current MOA for the Grant Building was entered into a number of years ago.

NEXT STEPS

- RSM will contact all committee members to confirm that the listed parties are interested in participating in the PA committee, and request response from members not present of their intent to attend/participate in subsequent meetings,
- Notice will be distributed, via email, of next meeting once members confirm their availability,
- NTHP (SL) to provide language for RFP regarding public visitors to Lincoln Cottage,
- RSM send NTHP (SL) electronic copy of Historic Structures inventory,
- Master Plan to include current users, tenants on the site, especially NTHP,
- Revise site plan to indicate the National Historic Landmark and Historic District, review of the Master Plan needs to include those area designations,
- NTHP provide map coordinates to GSA,
- Add APE to the presentation,
- Extract Design Guidelines from Master Plan as separate document for distribution at subsequent meeting,
- Prepare site model to demonstrate proposed density,
- Modify Urban Design Framework to exclude Sheridan Building from development zone,
- Revise schedule to include the Master Plan,
- Add HPRB mid December meeting to project schedule,
- GSA to distribute the PA,
- Comments on PA by 10/20/05, and
- Meet with SHPO regarding Period of Significance.