

---

---

## MEETING MINUTES

---

---

**SUBJECT:** Working Session for Section 106 Consulting Parties for AFRH: Zones B and C  
**DATE/TIME:** August 8, 2007; 9:00 AM – 3:45 PM  
**LOCATION:** AFRH-W, Sherman Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room

---

---

### ATTENDEES:

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 4A (ANC) Timothy Jones	Susie Kim Geoff Lawson
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) Katharine Kerr	National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) Jeff Hinkle
Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Roy Coogle Joe Woo	Gene Keller Christine Saum
Committee of 100 (C100) Barbara Zartman	National Park Service (NPS) Gary Scott
EHT Traceries (EHT) Emily Eig Carrie Barton	National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) Tom Mayes Frank Milligan Betsy Merritt
Staubach Pam Wessling	Trijan Mike Walker
General Services Administration (GSA) Tim Sheckler	Venable Catherine V. Buell
Koetter, Kim and Associates (KKA)	

The Section 106 Consulting Parties for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) met on Wednesday, August 8, 2007, from 9:00 AM to 3:45 PM to discuss adverse effects for Zones B and C. The meeting was held at the Home.

Introductions were made. Tim Cox, Chief Operating Officer of AFRH, joined the meeting briefly to thank the Consulting Parties for attending and for all of their contributions to the master planning effort. Joe Woo reviewed the agenda and Tim Sheckler presented the list of “unresolved” adverse effects that had been updated per comments from the July 27, 2007, meeting of the Section 106 Consulting Parties for AFRH. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) and Carrie Barton (EHT) clarified that the potential adverse effects included on the “unresolved” list were only those that had been brought up consistently as priorities (“hot topics”) by the Consulting Parties during past meetings. They further clarified that identified potential adverse effects that were not included on the “unresolved list” were not necessarily fully resolved and that they would be discussed. Gary Scott commented that the issue of visibility from Park Place Road and Rock Creek Church Road toward the Home had been properly captured by the language of Potential Adverse Effect #57 (current visibility of Home from western perimeter). Tom Mayes (NTHP) stated that he wanted to make sure that the entirety of the historic wooded character around Randolph Street Gatehouse is included as part of “setting” and “feeling” for Potential Adverse Effect #61.

Susie Kim (KKA) introduced various development schemes for Zone C. She began by reviewing options previously seen by the Consulting Parties, all of which continued the urban characteristics of the adjacent neighborhood into the new development. This progression of options showed a

decrease in density and overall square footage, as well a movement of development away from the north side of Zone C (in the vicinity of the Randolph Street Gatehouse). Ms. Kim then presented a new option for the zone that, as suggested in the previous Section 106 meeting on July 27, 2007, was not based on a “new urbanism” approach. The new option did not rely on the extension of the street patterns found in the neighborhoods adjacent to the Home’s western boundary, but was more consistent with the curvilinear street patterns associated with the Home’s aesthetic. The new option was also more responsive to the topography of the site. The group discussed the pros and cons of the new option, expressing the following general comments:

- New option is more successful in respecting Lincoln’s Route (NTHP).
- Density should be shifted further to the south (NTHP).
- More contiguous open space at the northern portion of Zone C would be desirable (ANC 4C and NTHP).

In general, the group felt that the new option was a step in the right direction if development is going to occur on Zone C.

The group then discussed the Master Plan and the Programmatic Agreement with respect to Zones B and C. Barbara Zartman (C100) asked about the timeframe for development of Zones B and C. Tim Sheckler (GSA) responded that the likely timeframe was ten to twenty years away but that there was not a set timetable. Gary Scott (NPS) asked why the Consulting Parties need to consider Zones B and C, and why Zone A could not be approved first. Gene Keller (NCPC) responded that NCPC has to consider the whole property in terms of concepts and ideas for development in the future. Mr. Scott reminded the group that the National Monument (NM) and the National Historic Landmark (NHL) have to be taken into consideration and their protection from adverse effects is a priority. Mr. Keller agreed and commented that considering the NM and NHL was part of the purpose of getting input from the Consulting Parties. Christine Saum (NCPC) commented that when the Master Plan goes before NCPC for approval, NCPC staff wants a plan it can support; therefore, NCPC staff would consider a different approach to the Master Plan process (Zone A before Zones B and C), but it is not the place of NCPC staff to suggest another approach. Ms. Zartman commented that the approval of details for Zones B and C seems irrelevant when the development will not occur for such a long time. Tom Mayes (NTHP) commented that going through the process of identifying adverse effects is helpful regardless of the timeframe for Zones B and C. Betsy Merritt (NTHP) agreed with Mr. Mayes, and added that the advantage of considering the plans for Zones B and C now is to make sure that safeguards are in place when the development does occur. Ms. Zartman stated that she was uncomfortable making decisions about the designs for B and C since she could not anticipate the impact of development in twenty years. Tim Sheckler (GSA) commented that he understands that there are different levels of design development for the different zones, but that the point of the consultation was to draw up a general framework that everybody can agree on and then to develop basic parameters without specific detail of architectural design. Ms. Saum commented that she could see how the process seems constraining because market forces and the needs of the Home can change so much over the next ten to twenty years. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) clarified that if there could be major changes in the market and/or in the needs of the Home that required the Master Plan to be revised and that, in the event of a need for revision, NCPC would have to approve any amendments to the Master Plan, once again triggering the Section 106 process. Joe Woo (AFRH) commented that having parameters of design is beneficial for the Home so that they can have some idea of the income potential for Zones B and C and it is crucial for future financial planning even if the development never happens.

Gary Scott (NPS) stated that his role as representative for NPS was to identify the NPS National Capital Region's position for a no-build option on Zone C for the purpose of protecting the integrity of the NHL and NM and preserving the character of Lincoln's approach to the Home. Mr. Scott added that he was to reiterate the idea of an NPS purchase of Zone C from AFRH for use as park land. Mr. Scott did not want planning for development on Zone C to preclude discussion of this possibility. Pam Wessling (Staubach) commented that the two paths of discussion could be taken simultaneously and that it is possible to plan for what development could look like on Zone C while also leaving open the option about the purchase / lease of Zone C for public green space if funds become available for that purpose.

At 10:30 a.m., the group decided to visit Zones B and C in the field. While on site, the group discussed which parts of the site were most sensitive and how the new option for development presented by Ms. Kim could be changed to respect those historic/sensitive elements.

The group broke for lunch at 12:30 p.m.

After lunch, the group reviewed the on-site discussion. The following items were brought up as potential issues:

- How would the new development be accessed? Would openings be made in the historic (1899) fence? Would the openings be for vehicular or pedestrian access?
- Would the Randolph Street Gate or Park Road Gate be reactivated?
- How would the iron and masonry bridge at the northern point of the Lakes be incorporated into the traffic patterns of the new development? Could the bridge be retrofitted without compromising its integrity?
- Can the rehabilitation of the Lakes be part of the mitigation package? Can the public access the Lakes and would that be considered a public amenity?
- Can continuity of visual corridors from neighboring streets be maintained without mirroring the streets in the new development? The development in Zone C should not give the idea of a gated community, with dead end streets terminating at the gate.
- Rooftop pools and penthouses are not appropriate for the development on Zone C.
- The historic fences need to be rehabilitated. The need for the rehabilitation of the fence at Zone C is immediate and should not be contingent on the development of Zones B and/or C.
- Programmatic Agreements are often not adhered to after they are signed, so there is no guarantee that preservation measure required by that document will be taken. What kind of safeguards can be put into the Programmatic Agreement to help ensure that it is followed?
- What reviews would future development undergo?

The group then discussed mitigation and identified a number of possible tools that might provide for mitigation:

- Rehabilitation of the historic fence (possible).
- Preservation of the historic trees (AFRH is currently creating a landscape plan for the Home).
- Implementation of "Eye-Witness to History Program" for tree preservation (possible).
- Hiring of a Cultural Resources Manager for Home to assure the Programmatic Agreement is followed (already required by the Historic Preservation Plan).

- Completion of an Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) (possible).

The group then decided to discuss the list of adverse effects with respect to the new scheme presented by Susie Kim (KK) and the list of possible mitigation options.

ITEM NUMBER	ZONE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ITS CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES, THE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK, AND THE NATIONAL MONUMENT	POTENTIAL CAUSE	
21	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	Physical Alteration/ Destruction/ Removal of Contributing Natural Landscape Resources within the AFRH-W Zone (former area outside of Development Zones in DEIS and Draft MP, which includes the NHL and National Monument, and the former Development Zones 1 and 2) and Development Zones A (former Development Zones 3 and 4), B (former Development Zone 5), and C (former Development Zone 6)	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HALS survey could be possible mitigation</li> <li>• The HPP and AFRH Maintenance Plan are mitigation for overall effects</li> </ul>
22	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	Compromise of the integrity of the National Register-eligible Historic District	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design Guidelines are a mitigation tool. Design Guidelines will incorporate comments from Consulting Parties.</li> <li>• HALS could be used as a mitigation tool.</li> </ul>
23	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	Installation of new security fence to divide AFRH-W Zone from Development Zones	Need to secure AFRH-W campus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where will the division between new development and the Home be EXACTLY? Pershing Drive will belong to AFRH and fence will be west of Pershing Drive within the new development.</li> <li>• Fence will be for pedestrian security only.</li> <li>• Fence should not cut through/divide character areas.</li> <li>• Susie Kim (KKA) will return with schemes for security fence.</li> </ul>
24	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	Compromise of the integrity of the National Register-eligible Historic District	Utility lines necessary for new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utility lines will be below ground, so adverse effects are AVOIDED.</li> <li>• What about above-grade utility boxes? How do you control Pepco?</li> </ul>

ITEM NUMBER	ZONE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ITS CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES, THE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK, AND THE NATIONAL MONUMENT	POTENTIAL CAUSE	
25	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	Compromise of the historic architectural character of the Home	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design Guidelines are a mitigation tool. Design Guidelines will incorporate comments from Consulting Parties.</li> <li>• NCPD will approve the Master Plan and zoning will be, in a sense, an "overlay" based on the heights/density/massing decided on in the final Master Plan.</li> </ul>
26	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	Compromise of the historic architectural character of the Home	Development (Streets)	Design Guidelines are a mitigation tool. Design Guidelines will incorporate comments from Consulting Parties.
27	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	Change in contributing topographical features within AFRH-W Zone (former area outside of Development Zones in DEIS and Draft MP, which includes the NHL and National Monument, and the former Development Zones 1 and 2) and Development Zones A (former Development Zones 3 and 4), B (former Development Zone 5), and C (former Development Zone 6)	Clearing/grading/new construction	Topography is addressed in the Master Plan.
28	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	Loss of open space throughout site	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HALS survey could be a mitigation tool.</li> <li>• Addition of public open space that was not open to the public before is also mitigation (already being done).</li> <li>• Interpretive signage component could be mitigation tool (already being done in Zone A).</li> </ul>
29	AFRH-W and B and C	Obstruction of current internal visibility around Lakes and towards AFRH-Zone (former area around Development Zones)	Development on Zones B and C (former Development Zones 5 and 6)	The new option presented by KKA should minimize this effect. New development will honor lakes.
30	AFRH-W and C	Obstruction of current view corridor from approach to Scott Statue westerly to Mount Saint Alban	Development on Zone C (former Development Zone 6)	Development is being pushed South and East in Zone C. AVOIDED.
31	AFRH-W and C	Obstruction of current view shed from approach to Scott Statue westward to Mount Saint Alban	Development on Zone C (former Development Zone 6)	Development is being located South and East in Zone C. AVOIDED.

ITEM NUMBER	ZONE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ITS CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES, THE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK, AND THE NATIONAL MONUMENT	POTENTIAL CAUSE	
32	AFRH-W and C	Obstruction of current view corridor from Grant Circle along Illinois Avenue to Central Grounds Character Area. (Lincoln-era view)	Development on Zone C (former Development Zone 6)	Development is being located South and East in Zone C. AVOIDED.
48	Zone B	Ground Disturbance on Zone B (former Development Zone 5)	Ground Disturbance on one or both of the two small areas with moderate archeological sensitivity for pre-historic occupation	MINIMIZED by SOP for ground disturbance in the HPP.
49	Zone B	Compromise of the historic scale of the Home in Zone B (formerly Development Zone 5)	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The height of the proposed development in Zone B would be significantly less than that of the Washington Hospital Center.</li> <li>• Could Zone B take some of the density from Zone C as a minimization for Zone C?</li> <li>• A balloon test will be done to determine what is visible from Scott Circle.</li> </ul>
50	Zone B	Physical Alteration/Destruction/Removal of all or part of Enclosed Pasture (RLS: Supporting) in Zone B (former Development Zone 5)	Development	HALS survey could be possible mitigation tool.
51	Zone B	Loss of Open Space in Zone B (former Development Zone 5) (RLS: Significant, as part of Spatial Organization)	Development on Enclosed Pasture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HALS could be possible mitigation tool.</li> <li>• Addition of public open space that was not open to the public before is also mitigation (already being done).</li> </ul>
52	Zone B	Obstruction of current secondary view corridors from adjacent neighborhoods to southwestern perimeter of Home	Development on Zone B (former Development Zone 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balloon studies would be helpful.</li> <li>• Addition of "meandering" sidewalk / bike trail as mitigation.</li> <li>• Landscaped buffer along Irving and Park Place as mitigation.</li> <li>• Remove Master Plan option for taller buildings along Park Place</li> <li>• Lively mixed use development for neighborhood as mitigation.</li> <li>• KKA present refinements to options for Zone B.</li> </ul>
53	Zone C	Ground Disturbance on Zone C (former Development Zone 6)	Ground Disturbance on any part of the zone as the entire area holds moderate sensitivity for pre-historic occupation	MINIMIZED by SOP for ground disturbance in the HPP.

ITEM NUMBER	ZONE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ITS CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES, THE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK, AND THE NATIONAL MONUMENT	POTENTIAL CAUSE	
54	Zone C	Compromise of the historic scale of the Home in Zone C (formerly Development Zone 6)	Development	Height has been MINIMIZED. The Final Master Plan will reflect these changes.
55	Zone C	Physical Alteration/Destruction/Removal of all or part of Alfalfa Field/Community Garden (RLS: Supporting) in Zone C (former Development Zone 6) (possible Lincoln-era view)	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MITIGATED by addition of public open space.</li> <li>• HALS survey could be possible mitigation tool.</li> <li>• Relocation of the gardens is possible mitigation.</li> </ul>
56	Zone C	Loss of Open Space in Zone C (former Development Zone 6) (RLS: Significant, as part of Spatial Organization)	Development on Alfalfa Field/Community Garden and non-contributing Driving Range	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HALS could be possible mitigation tool.</li> <li>• Addition of public open space that was not open to the public before is also mitigation (already being done).</li> <li>• No longer tying in street grid.</li> <li>• Density is being decreased.</li> <li>• This alternative will also be addressed an alternative in the Master Plan.</li> </ul>
57	Zone C	Obstruction of current visibility of Home from western perimeter	Development on Zone C (former Development Zone 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was improved with latest alternative from KKA</li> <li>• KKA will come back with more options.</li> <li>• Language in Master Plan will be revised to reflect 106 discussions.</li> </ul>

ITEM NUMBER	ZONE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ITS CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES, THE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK, AND THE NATIONAL MONUMENT	POTENTIAL CAUSE	
58	Zones A and B	Obstruction of current visibility of Home from southern perimeter	Development on Zone A (former Development Zone 4) and Zone B (former Development Zone 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to be broken up into two adverse effects by Zone.</li> <li>Balloon studies would be helpful.</li> <li>Addition of "meandering" sidewalk / bike path as mitigation.</li> <li>Landscaped buffer along Irving and Park Place as mitigation.</li> <li>Lively mixed use development for neighborhood as mitigation.</li> <li>Susie Kim (KKA) to come back in September with different options for Zone B.</li> </ul>
59	AFRH-W, A, B, and C	Change of Home boundaries / Reduction in size of Home	Lease or sale of development zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technically, the Home is not shrinking in size, as the land will be leased, not sold. Home will retain strong oversight of the leased property through transaction documents / leases.</li> <li>Current home residents will be able to access amenities of new development.</li> </ul>
61	AFRH-W and C	Change in setting and feeling of Randolph Street Gatehouse (RLS: Significant)	Development on Zone C (former Development Zone 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is being improved by new option from Susie Kim (KKA).</li> <li>Master Plan will reflect 106 discussions. Language needs to reflect importance of protecting southern portion of Quarters' Woods.</li> <li>Susie Kim to come back in September with different options for Zone C.</li> </ul>
62	Zone C	Change in setting and feeling of Alfalfa Field/Community Garden (RLS: Supporting), possible Lincoln-era view	Development on Zone C (former Development Zone 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is being improved by new option from KKA.</li> <li>Master</li> <li>Relocation of gardens is possible mitigation.</li> <li>KKA will refine options for Zone C.</li> </ul>
63	Zones B and C	Physical Alteration/Demolition of historic Iron Fence (RLS: Significant)	Changing of western boundary of Home or breaking of fence for new development in Zones B and C (former Development Zones 5 and 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New access openings should be for pedestrian use only (MINIMIZED).</li> <li>Rehabilitation of fence could be possible mitigation tool</li> </ul>

ITEM NUMBER	ZONE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ITS CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES, THE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK, AND THE NATIONAL MONUMENT	POTENTIAL CAUSE	
64	AFRH-W, A, B, and C	AFRH's loss of day-to-day control over sections of the Home, including the historic resources within those sections	Changing of western boundary of Home or breaking of fence for new development in Zones B and C (former Development Zones 5 and 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transaction documents with selected developers provide strong oversight of Home's resources (MINIMIZED).</li> <li>• The increase of money from the new development will help the Home have more control of its historic resources and better means of maintaining them (MITIGATED).</li> <li>• Maintenance SOP's, required of AFHR and tenants, will assist in helping to control the historic resources on the site.</li> </ul>

Also from the discussion, it was decided that three new adverse effects need to be added to the table:

1. Change in setting and feeling of Park Road Gatehouse (AFRH-W Zone).
2. Physical alteration/demolition of historic West Drain/Irrigation Channel (Zone B).
3. Obstruction of internal view south from Randolph Street Gate to the Alfalfa Field/Community Garden and Alfalfa Field/Driving Range.

Also, the view addressed by item 3. above needs to be added to views study in HPP.

Susie Kim (KKA) stated that she will bring revised options for Zones B and C based on the group's discussion to the September 11, 2007, Section 106 meeting of the Consulting Parties.

Joe Woo (AFRH) and Tim Sheckler (GSA) thanked everyone for their participation and attendance.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.

The next Section 106 consulting parties meeting is scheduled for 22 August, from 9am-3pm at AFRH..