
MEETING MINUTES

SUBJECT: Meeting of Section 106 Consulting Parties for AFRH
DATE/TIME: July 27, 2007; 9:00 AM – 12:00 AM
LOCATION: AFRH-W, Sherman Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room

ATTENDEES:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) Katharine Kerr	General Services Administration (GSA) Tim Sheckler
Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Roy Coogle Bill Jentarra “Kit” W. R. Kitsen Joe Woo	Victoria Hartke Doug Pulak Koetter, Kim and Associates Susie Kim Mark deShong
Committee of 100 (C100) Barbara Zartman Richard Houghton	National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) Nancy Witherell Jeff Hinkle
Crescent Resources Bobby Zeiller	National Park Service (NPS) Gary Scott David Murphy
DC State Historic Preservation Office (DC SHPO) Tim Dennee	National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) Tom Mayes Frank Milligan
EHT Traceries (EHT) Laura Trieschmann Carrie Barton	R McGhee and Associates Architects (RMAA) Ronnie McGhee
Ehrenkrantz, Eckstut, & Kuhn (EE&K) Hillary Lord Matt Bell	Robinson and Associates (R&A) Judy Robinson
Staubach Pam Wessling	Staubach Pam Wessling Trijan Janet Walker

The Section 106 Consulting Parties for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) met on Friday, July 27, 2007, from 9:00 AM to 11:30 AM to discuss potential adverse effects at the Home due to new development. The meeting was held at the Home.

Introductions were made. Joe Woo (AFRH) reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Mr. Woo announced that the Historic District nomination for the Home was submitted to DCSHPO for review on July 13, 2007.

Carrie Barton (EHT) gave a brief presentation on the list of potential adverse effects created by EHT Traceries for use in Section 106 consultation. Ms. Barton stressed that the document was a first draft and was open for comment and discussion.

Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) made a comment that the number one adverse effect is the shrinking of the size of the Home. AFRH's loss of day-to-day control over portions of the Home is not mentioned in the table and needs to be added.

Tim Sheckler (GSA) reviewed the purpose of the meeting to be (1) Identify any potential adverse effects missing from the list made by EHT Traceries and (2) Review and finalize the list of unresolved potential

adverse effects. Mr. Sheckler then announced that the group would break into two separate discussion groups to discuss the potential adverse effects table.

Barbara Zartman (C100) commented that she thought the purpose of the meeting was to use the model. Tim Sheckler (GSA) clarified that the model would be used in the discussion of the adverse effects. Ms. Zartman also commented that she would like to address effects on Rose Chapel. Mr. Sheckler explained that discussion of specific adverse effects would be the agenda of the two discussion groups.

David Murphy (NPS) expressed concern over discussing the different development zones simultaneously. Mr. Murphy asked how the group would resolve the different levels of review that would be required for the “theoretical development” on Zones B and C versus the specific development proposal for Zone A. He was uncomfortable with the different levels of intensity of review. Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) responded that the consulting parties have to address all areas of the campus now despite the different levels of specificity of the plans. This would help head off problems in the early stages of the planning process. Gary Scott (NPS) agreed with Mr. Murphy that a Programmatic Agreement for the whole site would be difficult to agree on because of the different stages of planning throughout the Home. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) explained that all areas of the Home had to be addressed at the same time because NCPC will not accept portions of a Master Plan document. Therefore, the consulting parties must address plans for future development at the same time as the current proposal for development. Mr. Dennee added that there will be continuous review of development proposals and plans as they come up. Ms. Kerr agreed and added that the Historic Preservation Plan, Programmatic Agreement, and transaction documents would all ensure that Section 106 review of future development proposals is executed. Mr. Scott added that his primary concern is the western portion of the Home, and he does not want unforeseen adverse effects on those areas to fall through the cracks because the consulting parties have already agreed on Programmatic Agreement language that does not address those effects. Tom Mayes (NTHP) asked if it was possible to defer planning for Zone C or to provide less detail in the Programmatic Agreement language for Zone C. Ms. Kerr responded a Programmatic Agreement has to address the unknown and will require the review of any amendments to the Master Plan as planning progresses in Zones B and C. The Programmatic Agreement will be explicit in stating that if Zones B and C are not developed for 10-15 years, that the requirements laid out by the Master Plan will be revisited.

Groups A and B split up into different rooms and began discussion on the potential adverse effects table.

After one hour, the two groups reconvened and reviewed the separate discussions. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) summarized the discussion for Group A and Carrie Barton (EHT) summarized the discussion for Group B.

Group A: (Katharine Kerr, Bill Jentarra, Barbara Zartman, “Kit” W.R. Kitsen, Richard Houghton, Laura Trieschmann, Hillary Lord, Matt Bell, Victoria Hartke, Tim Sheckler, Susie Kim, Matt Hinkle, Gary Scott, Tom Mayes, Janet Walker, Ronnie McGhee)

- Potential Adverse Effects Table needs to be reformatted to be easier to read. The text is too small.
- The boundaries of the APE need to be revisited to address the exclusion of the VA and Washington Hospital Complexes.
- Compromising the integrity of the historic setting and feeling of Rose Chapel due to development on Chapel Woods should be added to the list of potential adverse effects.
- Compromising the integrity of the Park Place fence (historic Iron Fence) as an historic built resource due to breaking or relocating the fence should be added to the list of potential adverse effects.
- The table should address the design of a new security fence and its effect on visibility into the Home from the western perimeter.
- Compromising the integrity of the historic setting and feeling of Randolph Street Gatehouse due to development on Zone C should be added to the list of potential adverse effects.
- Although the view from the 1st Street corridor into the Home is outside the current PA boundaries, it needs to be added to the list of unresolved issues.

- Compromising the integrity of the historic setting and feeling of the alfalfa field/community garden should be added as a potential adverse effect, as this green space would have been the focal point of a possible Lincoln-era view. Some consulting parties commented the integrity of this historic resource would be compromised if a “new urbanism” design (townhouses, high density, extension of city street grid, etc.) was used for development on Zone C and that the character of development there should be more in keeping with the late nineteenth-century character of much of the Home. Continuing the character of the Officers’ Quarters to the north, south to the development on Zone C would be more appropriate.
- The visibility into the Home along the eastern boundary (along North Capitol Street) needs to be addressed more thoroughly.
- The potential adverse effect that addresses the obstruction of internal views from Scott Statue to the southern portion of the Home due to Buildings C and D (Crescent) should be expanded to include loss of historic spatial organization (loss of open space) due to Buildings C and D.
- Ground disturbance in the AFRH-W zone due to relocation of two golf holes and installation of a new security fence needs to be added to the list of potential adverse effects.
- The area of effect along the southern boundary (along Irving Street) needs to be addressed.
- Cumulative adverse effects to the National Register-eligible Historic District need to be considered.
- The potential adverse effects on Pershing Drive need to address more than just the orientation of the historic road. The alignment of the roads needs to be preserved/protected, along with their historic feeling and setting.

Group B: (Tim Dennee, Nancy Witherell, Doug Pulak, Judy Robinson, Pam Wessling, Roy Coogle, Joe Woo, Carrie Barton, David Murphy, Frank Milligan, Bobby Zeiller, Mark deShong)

- Protecting the Pershing Drive street trees is a priority for NCPC and NPS. Maintaining the alignment of the historic road is not sufficient.
- There was a clarification of the “unresolved” list of adverse effects. This list does not preclude addressing the other adverse effects. Rather, it is meant to point out those issues that continue to be hot topics during Section 106 meetings and that were addressed as high priority in Tim Dennee’s staff report and by comments submitted by other Consulting Parties.
- Development of Home and the loss of control over portions of the Home and its historic resources is a top priority and is the #1 adverse effect. Joe Woo (AFRH) explained that the Home is downsizing, so a 1-1 replacement of square footage lost to new development is not AFRH’s plan.
- Language addressing development in Chapel Woods should be clarified. The use of “preserve,” “protect,” etc. should be looked at more closely.
- The management of landscape resources, particularly trees, should be a high priority of AFRH and third-party developers. The scope of a tree management plan should cover 200 years, not 25 years. The Home is developing a landscape plan that should be completed in the coming months. The National Trust notes that the Home understands, recognizes, and supports the importance of preserving the historic landscape around Lincoln Cottage.
- A balloon test needs to be followed through on to examine the effects of Buildings C and D (Zone A) on internal views southward from Scott Statue. Crescent has a new section to provide more information about effects of Buildings C and D.
- New development in Chapel Woods should not be scattered. Rather, it should be clustered to take advantage of present open paved space in Chapel Woods and to ensure protection of the tree canopy.
- A 1-1 replacement of trees is not sufficient. The character of the tree canopy must be maintained, which is not necessarily the result of a 1-1 replacement.
- Tree protection and planting should be used as a mitigation measure.
- The view into the Home along North Capitol Street should be examined carefully. The language addressing the design of new development and landscaping along this corridor needs to be fleshed out.
- New development on the site of the former Sheridan Building (current Grant Building parking lot) needs to be added to the list of “unresolved” issues. The Home is adding this building to complete the historic quadrangle. The height and massing of this building will be critical.

- Nancy Witherell (NCPC) suggests a one- or two-day meeting with sufficient advanced planning rather than short weekly meetings to resolve potential adverse effects.

The discussion shifted to the structure and timing of future meetings to resolve the potential adverse effects. Tim Sheckler (GSA) proposed meeting on August 8th and 22nd for all-day working sessions. Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) noted that he had not planned on being available during the month of August. The Consulting Parties agreed that it would be most productive to discuss Zones A and AFRH-W on the 8th and Zones B and C on the 22nd. The meetings will last from 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM. (Note: Due to scheduling conflicts, the order of the meetings was reversed, e.g. Zones B/C will be discussed on 8 Aug, and Zone A / AFRH Zone will the discussed on 22 Aug.)

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM.