

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Draft Preservation Plan –
Review of Comments

11 December 2006

Protecting a Promise



Renewing the Trust

Agenda: Draft Preservation Plan

Introduction

Relationship of PP
to Section 106/PA and to Master Plan

Comments

Responses

Update/Next Steps

Protecting a Promise
Renewing the Trust



Introductions

Protecting a Promise
Renewing the Trust



Purpose of the Preservation Plan

Purpose of the Preservation Plan

Relationship To the Master Plan

Relationship To the Section 106/
Programmatic Agreement

How to Address

Protecting a Promise
Renewing the Trust



Comments

- Excellent comments
- Types of comments
 - Identification of typos/minor edits/missing citations
 - Requests for amplification/research
 - Requests to address 106 and Draft Master Plan
 - Requests to insert reader's point of view
 - Conflicting interpretations/misreadings of text
 - Directives to include additional ideas and materials



Comments

Main Issues - 1

- Nominate entire AFRH-W site to National Register
- Provide schedule for NR nomination
- Address Section 106 and the Master Plan in relation to the Preservation Plan
- Address the Home in the context of the District of Columbia
 - Amplify history of public access/tourism to the Home
 - Amplify the importance of the Home in the context of the Senate Park commission and Plan of 1902 (McMillan Plan)
 - Broaden the discussion of the history of the home's governance
- Clarify the history of North Capitol/Irving street extensions
- Reconsider the significance of the garden plot
- Address the evaluation of open space
- Expand the definition of the historic view sheds: widen the view sheds, add other outward views and internal views corridors, and include inward views
- Expand the discussion of the Home's archaeological potential



Comments

Main Issues – 2

- Provide primary material for fact checking (e.g. AFRH Board of Commissioners minutes)
- Address protocol of naming buildings
- Clarify ranking criteria and evaluation methodology
- Expand contents of Appendix (what belongs in Volume III?)
- Add information regarding consistency with federal and district elements of the comprehensive plan
- Commitment to Cultural Resource Manager
- Develop the Recommendations
 - Clarify the review process for large and small actions
 - Include facility needs assessments in PP
 - Revisit recommendations standards and review process



Response

Approach

- Respond Directly to Comments
- Revise Draft



Response

Revise Draft

- Research topics in need of further development:
 - Senate Park Commission and Plan of 1902
 - Federal and District Elements of Comprehensive Plan
 - Civil War: Lincoln's Route, Soldiers' Encampment, Cemetery
 - Role of Home within the Context of Homes for the Disabled (St. Elizabeths, Gallaudet, State Homes)
 - Extension of North Capitol/Irving Streets
- Re-visit and revise as appropriate:
 - Evaluation of Open Space (add new resource – open space)
 - Significance of the Garden Plot, Driving Range, Golf Course
 - Expansion of outward view sheds and Inclusion of views inward and within
 - Integration of Archaeology report into main text
- Revise text to include:
 - Context for Preservation Plan within Section 106 process
 - Supplemented historic context for Home based on research



Response

- Clarify qualitative evaluation criteria for relative significance and methodology employed
- Confirm or revise evaluations as necessary following analysis of new findings
- Work with DC SHPO/ACHP to further develop Recommendations Section
- Supplement images (photos, maps, illustrations, etc) for greater understanding
- Supplement Appendix as appropriate and reasonable
- Reformat with additional images



Next Steps

- Written response to comments will be distributed prior to next meeting
 - Proposed next meeting – January 16, 2007
- Final draft will be prepared and distributed end of January 2007.



Process Update

Protecting a Promise
Renewing the Trust



Protecting a Promise



THANK YOU

Renewing the Trust