

AFRH-W – MEETING RE: PRESERVATION PLAN

March 22, 2006

MINUTES

Attendees: Hector Abreu, ACHP
Carrie Albee, EHT Tracerics
Tim Dennée, DC SHPO
Emily Eig, EHT Tracerics
Gene Keller, NCPC
Doug Pulak, GSA
John Thompson, RSM McGladrey
Nancy Witherell, NCPC

Began 2:05 PM. Hector Abreu, Carrie Albee, Gene Keller, Doug Pulak, John Thompson, and Nancy Witherell present.

Nancy Witherell began the formal discussion by stating that NCPC wanted to review the final Master Plan and the final Preservation Plan together.

Project Update

Doug Pulak stated that GSA has identified a Project Manager for the AFRH-W development. This person is scheduled to begin mid-April and will report to the Director of Disposal. Nancy Czapek, former Director of Disposal, has been promoted within GSA but will remain involved in the project. A new Director has been selected from within GSA and has begun to transition into the position.

Doug Pulak stated that the review panel will be making a recommendation of qualified responders to Tim Cox by the end of the month. John Thompson explained that the Selection Panel was comprised of 2 people from GSA, Joe Woo (AFRH architect), 1 person from the Administrative Office of the Courts, and 1 person from the NIH.

Tim Dennée joined at 2:13 PM.

Doug Pulak confirmed that the RFQ was for Zones 3 & 4 only, and stated that at this point the qualifications were of primary interest, although the concepts submitted in response were also considered. Doug Pulak stated that the RFP was scheduled to be sent out in early summer. It is anticipated that the next version of the draft AFRH-W Master Plan will be submitted to NCPC after a developer is selected.

Doug Pulak stated that at this point it appeared that the AFRH is open to taking Zone 6 off the table for any development at this time.

Nancy Witherell stated that it was her understanding that the deadline for the submittal for the Master Plan was November or December 2006. She indicated that the developer should be on board for that, and that NCPC wanted the Preservation Plan to be part of

that submission so that the Board could review the documents at the same time. Therefore, the draft documents need to come out before that, and working back from that date that is a short timeframe.

Doug Pulak responded by stating that the exact dates will be firmed up when the Project Manager is in place. NCPC, ACHP, and DC SHPO requested an updated sequence of project milestones/major tasks.

Nancy Witherell inquired as to the participation of CFA. She stated that CFA had not seen the Master Plan, and that they should since reviewing master plans is in their purview.

Doug Pulak stated that the meetings with Consulting Parties would begin again at the beginning of the summer.

Preservation Plan

Tim Dennée stated that he would like to see a more specific assessment of impacts, mitigation, and minimization. He indicated that this was the most important part of the Preservation Plan. Likely (adverse) effects need to be clearly stated so that they can be fully analyzed, minimized and mitigated.

Nancy Witherell and Hector Abreu concur that the Preservation Plan needs to be given to the developers and that it needs to inform their responses to the RFP. This is particularly important for Zones 3 and 4. This is the only way for the Preservation Plan to be an effective mitigation.

Hector Abreu referenced the RFP process for redevelopment of the GSA-owned former aircraft manufacturing plant at Middle River, MD as a successful example of information sharing and negotiation with potential developers during a RFP process.

In response to Carrie Albee's inquiry as to the level of detail in the Preservation Plan, Tim Dennée stated that he wanted to see defined and specific statements of what is appropriate and what is not, but that they could be general (i.e. not necessarily what materials that can be used in new construction, but general principles about how new construction should proceed).

Tim Dennée called for additional and more specific proscriptions for developers. He encouraged the AFRH to be more limiting and specific about what developers could and could not do when the RFP went out. He also wanted statements of how contributing buildings will be maintained and how they can be reused. The RFP should specifically state that preference will be given for preservation of contributing elements and reuse of significant buildings. Carrie Albee stated that a matrix of levels of significance for historic resources is being developed by Traceries.

Hector Abreu asked about how archaeology was going to be handled and who would be responsible. This needs to be resolved in the PA. He cited the example of the Southeast Federal Center where it was ultimately decided that GSA would be responsible, and not the developer, because it was too complicated to do it otherwise.

Nancy Witherell stated that the PA must be completed before NCPC will render a final decision on the Master Plan. Tim Dennée stated that he does not want to sign off on the PA until he knows what the Master Plan is going to be and what is going to happen on the site.

Tim Dennée is still waiting on more specific financials justifying and defining the need of the AFRH. Doug Pulak and John Thompson confirmed that this was being prepared. Tim Dennée still wants to see what the alternatives are, instead of just the maximum build-out approach. He asked to what extent the proposed development will meet the AFRH's financial needs.

Hector Abreu restated that the developer needs to have the PA, as well. When the RFP goes out it should have the PA and the Master Plan and the Preservation Plan, etc., attached. That is the whole point of these documents – to inform the response of the developers. Tim Dennée echoed this and stated that developers want to be told what their parameters are, but he keeps hearing from the AFRH that they can't finalize these documents until the developers respond. Hector indicated that he wants the Preservation Plan to be attached to the PA.

Tim Dennée is particularly concerned about the direction that is to be given to the developer regarding Zones 3 and 4. He feels that the RFP should specifically limit the physical area in which development can occur, and that the developer should be bound to rehabilitate the entire hospital complex.

Nancy Witherell stated that she sees the Preservation Plan as having three aspects: the buildings and their immediate surroundings, the landscape, and the viewsheds.

Tim Dennée particularly mentions his concern about the view to the Capital and the city. He wants development specifically pulled back from that viewshed.

Emily Eig joined at 3:05 PM.

Landscape Study

Nancy Witherell stated that she had recently received an excellent Cultural Landscape report that she felt successfully integrated architecture and the landscape (Patent Office). She specifically mentioned the power of the graphics to communicate the landscape features effectively.

The subject of the Landscape Report prepared by the National Trust for the Lincoln Cottage was raised. A copy needs to be obtained for use by the consultant selected to prepare the Landscape Study.

The subject of security and how that will be handled at the AFRH was raised. NCPC, ACHP, and DC SHPO expressed their concern about how this might be carried out and stated that they expected more information about this. They requested that the Landscape Study include security treatment options and recommendations for landscaping within and around all new development.

Process

NCPC, ACHP, and DC SHPO indicated that they wanted to see the draft RFP in advance, and that they would like to see the RFQ responses as well.

Tim Dennée stated that he felt that the biggest problem in the process has been the sequence. AFRH wants the market to generate the plan, and this is the reason that none of the documents discussed are more detailed and therefore effective. But he feels that the documents should be detailed and proscriptive, and that they should dictate what the developer is to do. He also stated that he did not see that the minimization of impacts was a genuine concern in the process at all, as indicated by the above approach.

Formal meeting concluded, 3:25 PM.