
MEETING MINUTES

SUBJECT: Meeting of Section 106 Consulting Parties for AFRH

DATE/TIME: June 20, 2007; 1:30PM – 4:00PM

LOCATION: GSA, 301 7th Street, S.W., Room 2700

ATTENDEES:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)	Koetter, Kim and Associates
Katharine Kerr	Susie Kim
Reid Nelson	Military Officers Association of America (MOAA)
Alec Bennett	Mike Hayden
Advisory Neighborhood Council 4C (ANC)	National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)
Timothy Jones	Nancy Witherell
Commission of Fine Arts (CFA)	Gene Keller
Frederick J. Lindstrom	Jeff Hinkle
Committee of 100 (C100)	National Park Service (NPS)
Barbara Zartman	Gary Scott
Richard Houghton	National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)
Crescent Resources	Tom Mayes
Bobby Zeiller	Elizabeth Merritt
Stacy Outlaw	R McGhee and Associates Architects (RMAA)
DC State Historic Preservation Office (DC SHPO)	Ronnie McGhee
Tim Dennee	Rhodeside & Harwell (R&H)
EHT Traceries (EHT)	Aaron Feldman-Grosse
Emily Eig	Robinson and Associates (R&A)
Laura Trieschmann	Daria Gasparini
Carrie Barton	Judy Robinson
Ehrenkrantz, Eckstut, & Kuhn (EE&K)	Staubach
Hillary Lord	Pam Wessling
General Services Administration (GSA)	Representing Mr. Jim Graham
Tim Sheckler	Cliff Valenti
Victoria Hartke	

The Section 106 Consulting Parties for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) met on Wednesday, June 20, 2007, from 1:30 PM to 4:30 PM to discuss updates to the Programmatic Agreement (PA), Historic Preservation Plan (HPP), and Draft Master Plan (Draft MP). The meeting was facilitated by John Chenery from Veteran Solutions, Inc.

Introductions were made by Tim Sheckler (GSA). John Chenery reviewed the agenda and outlined the goals/objectives for the meeting:

1. Reinforce Section 106 process elements
2. Introduction to the revised PA and Chapter 6 of the HPP
3. Address view shed issues
4. Gain feedback on alternate Zone C open space and fence configuration

Barbara Zartman (C100) commented that GSA's provision of meeting materials to the consulting parties did not leave sufficient time to review the information prior to the meeting. Tim Sheckler clarified that it was

not his intention for the Consulting Parties to comment at this meeting on the materials at this meeting on the materials sent out the day before, but rather to provide written comments after the meeting.

Section 106

Katharine Kerr (ACHP) gave a presentation on the Section 106 process. The materials presented by Ms. Kerr will be provided on the AFRH Development website as they were too large to email (http://www.afrhdevelopment.com/project_info/sec106.php). She stated that additional information about the Section 106 process is available on the ACHP website. Tim Dennee added a brief description of the SHPO's role in Section 106 review. Pam Wessling explained that the Section 106 and NEPA processes had been combined. Impacts on historic resources are described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), and mitigation will be determined through the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision. After the presentation, there were several questions/comments:

Comment/Question

1. Cliff Valenti (UNC) asked whether a master list of adverse effects had been created and was available. It was discussed that the draft EIS contained a list of adverse effects, but that a more detailed list was still in development., and had not been completed at this time. Mr. Valenti also inquired as to which of the consulting parties would be signing the PA. It was not apparent that this question was answered in the meeting. (For the record, PA signatories are AFRH, DC SHPO, ACHP, NPS, and possibly Crescent) Katherine Kerr (ACHP) answered that the adverse effects needed to be discussed during the PA process. Emily Eig (EHT) stated that a list of Consulting Parties was available, and Tim Sheckler said the list would be posted on the website in the near future for review.
2. Tom Mayes (NTHP) asked whether the ACHP had made the decision to participate in the Section 106 process for AFRH. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) answered that she was new to the project and was checking to see if an official notification had been submitted by ACHP.
3. Timothy Jones (ANC) asked whether the "no-build option" had been taken into consideration. Pam Wessling (Staubach) answered that the "no-build option" has been considered. Cliff Valenti (UNC) asked where you can review the specifics of the analysis of the "no-build option." Tim Sheckler (GSA) said that the option was presented in the Draft EIS. Mr. Valenti said that the Draft EIS did not include specifics about the analysis of the "no-build option." Pam Wessling answered that the final determination has not been made and that the analysis will be presented in the Final EIS. Tim Dennee (DCHPO) clarified that the Draft EIS presents the potential impacts of different options. The "no-build option" would not present many impacts beyond the financial impacts for AFRH. Tim Dennee added that in the context of Section 106, the

Action

List of adverse effects will be created and reviewed at next Section 106 meeting (GSA, Crescent, EHT).

List of consulting/concurring parties will be made available on the project website (GSA).

ACHP will determine if this needs to be submitted

Analysis of "no-build" / no action option will be provided in final EIS (AFRH, GSA).

“no-build option” is also still being discussed as part of the available mitigation options.

Tim Sheckler (GSA) gave a presentation on the PA. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) added that there are two levels of agreement documents in the Section 106 process: (1) the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which is used when all effects of the undertaking are known; and (2) the Programmatic Agreement, which is used when the effects of the undertaking are not known. Since the effects of development on the Home cannot be fully known given that the project will occur over a long period of time, AFRH chose the PA as its agreement document. The HPP will be the guiding document for the PA by outlining historic preservation procedures to be used by AFRH as it proceeds with plans. After Tim Sheckler’s presentation, there were several questions/comments about the PA:

Comment/Question

Action

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Frederick Lindstrom (CFA) asked what the extent of the national security exemption would be and noted that the broad language used in the presentation/PA was a major concern for him. Emily Eig (EHT) noted that a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) could be added to Chapter 6 of the HPP with clear language about how to address the possibility of the use of the Home for national security reasons. | SOP for national security use of AFRH-W will be added to Chapter 6 of the HPP and shared with the Section 106 Consulting Parties (EHT). |
| 2. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) noted that the language of the PA needed to be changed to reflect the use of the HPP as the procedural document. | PA will be reviewed for procedural language and changed as necessary (GSA). |
| 3. Reid Nelson (ACHP) asked for clarification on the relationship between the AFRH Federal Preservation Officer (FPO) and the AFRH Cultural Resources Manager (CRM). Emily Eig (EHT) answered that the CRM would work under the direction of the FPO. | A flowchart of the agency positions has been provided in Chapter 6 of the HPP (EHT). |

Tim Sheckler (GSA) updated the consulting parties on the status of the National Register nomination for the Home, stating that the nomination had been completed and was being reviewed by GSA. AFRH will submit a draft of the nomination to Tim Dennee (DCHPO) soon. Following receipt, the DCHPO has 30 days to comment. Frederick Lindstrom (CFA) asked for clarification on the process of nominating the Home to the National Register. In response, Emily Eig (EHT) outlined the review process for the nomination on the national and local levels. Tim Dennee added that the DC SHPO will send the nomination and his comments to the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) for its concurrence. After the 30-day comment period, AFRH will make any final edits it determines necessary, sign, and submit the nomination directly to the Keeper of the Register, who has a 45-day period for review. If the Keeper signs the nomination, the Home will be listed as National Register Historic District. Once the Keeper lists the Home as an historic district in the National Register, the HPRB will enter the AFRH-W Historic District into the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites.

Comment/Question

Action

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Nancy Witherell (NCPC) requested that the draft historic district nomination be posted on the AFRH project website | Tim Sheckler (GSA) will post it on the website. |
|---|---|

Aaron Feldman-Grosse (RH) presented updated information about the views study at the Home, which is included in the HPP. After the presentation, there were several comments/questions per the National Register nomination process.

Comment/Question

Action

1. Tim Dennee (DCHPO) was concerned about the criteria used to define and evaluate historic views, and felt like the definition of a historic view as used in the HPP was not meaningful to the significance of the Home. He emphasized that view to the Forwood Building from the North Capitol Street traffic clover leaf is a significant view, regardless of whether the traffic clover leaf is historic. He stated that the experience of the Home and its historic resources is important, not the experience of the vantage point.
 2. Frederick Lindstrom (CFA) agreed with Tim Dennee's (DCSHPO) comment and emphasized the importance of perimeter views along North Capitol Street. Mr. Lindstrom also added that if there is a view from Scott Statue to the U.S. Capitol Building, there should be a reciprocal view to the Home. Aaron Feldman-Grosse (RH) clarified that because vantage points for views are from the ground level, that reciprocity of views is not necessarily possible. Although one can see the top of the Capitol from Scott Statue, one cannot see the grounds of the Capitol. Therefore, one cannot see the Home from the grounds of the Capitol.
 3. Frederick Lindstrom (CFA) commented that it was incorrect to say that the view of the Capitol from Lincoln Cottage has been "demolished" by the construction of the Scott Building (Building 80). Mr. Lindstrom stated that views can only be obstructed, and the view from Lincoln Cottage to the U.S. Capitol would exist if the Scott Building was no longer there. Lost views can be restored and should be acknowledged in the HPP. Aaron Feldman-Grosse (RH) concurred.
 4. Gary Scott (NPS) emphasized the importance of views into the Home along the historic Rock Creek Church Road because of their association with President Lincoln's route from the city to the Home. Mr. Scott did not feel that enough significance had been placed on this subject.
- The methodology and criteria for evaluating historic views will not change, but documentation of significant current views of the Home from all vantage points surrounding the Home will be added to the HPP and discussed at future Section 106 meetings. (EHT and RH).
- Language explaining reciprocity of views will be added to Chapter 5 of the HPP (EHT and RH).
- HPP will be checked for correct language for obstructed views (EHT and RH).
- Association of views with Lincoln will be reviewed and language will be added to Chapter 5 of the HPP as necessary. A map of Lincoln-era resources at the Home may be added if appropriate (EHT and RH).

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>5. Tim Dennee (DCHPO) asked if one can see the trees/green space of the Home from downtown. Emily Eig (EHT) responded that one cannot see the green space and that non-historic views are a master planning issue. Mr. Dennee again said that the HPP view study is too narrow.</p> | <p>View of green space of Home from downtown will be reviewed (EHT and RH).</p> |
| <p>6. Barbara Zartman (C100) emphasized the importance of internal views and stated that there are more than the two internal views shown on the map. Frederick Lindstrom (CFA) agreed and brought up the issue of how to define infinite views.</p> | <p>Current internal views at Home will be reviewed (EHT and RH).</p> |

Susie Kim (KKA) presented updates to the Master Plan for the Home. After the presentation, there were several comments and questions:

Comment/Question

1. Gary Scott (NPS) said that there was substantial progress on Zone A and a developing consensus that it is a good design. Mr. Scott added that more attention needs to be given to Zone C given its connection with Lincoln's route to the Home.
2. Tim Dennee (DCHPO) referenced Cliff Valenti's (UNC) comment from earlier in the meeting about the list of adverse effects. Mr. Dennee did not feel that the updates to the Draft MP addressed adverse effects that had been discussed during previous meetings. Mr. Dennee also felt that relying on the HPP was not sufficient because the HPP presents process elements for the future when the most substantial undertaking for AFRH is occurring now with the development of Zone A. Reid Nelson (ACHP) agreed with Mr. Dennee. Mr. Nelson also thinks that a discussion should occur about what qualities make the property significant and how the Draft MP affects those qualities. Frederick Lindstrom (CFA) felt that both adverse effects and positive effects need to be addressed, including the positive effects of rehabilitating existing buildings as mitigation. Tim Dennee wants future discussion to focus on a holistic analysis rather than one that focuses on specific elements and their effects. Richard Houghton (C100) stated that the cumulative effects of development are relevant to AFRH and need to be discussed. Mr. Houghton agreed with Tim Dennee that the discussion cannot focus just on specific areas.
3. Nancy Witherell (NCPC) commented on the portion of the

Action

- Documentation supporting the National Historic Landmark (NHL) and the National Monument will be reviewed for consideration of the the role of Lincoln's route to the significance of those areas (EHT).
- List of adverse and positive effects will be created and reviewed at the next Section 106 meeting (GSA, Crescent, EHT).
- The Section 106 Consulting

presentation relating to Zone C streets and whether or not there should be breaks in the historic fence to connect the new streets to Park View. She emphasized the difference between visual continuation of the streets and physical continuation of the streets from the adjacent neighborhood to the Home. Frederick Lindstrom (CFA) added that providing only a visual continuation is a substantial planning challenge and is often perceived negatively by adjacent neighborhoods. Susie Kim (KKA) brought up examples of successful fenced green spaces that are not perceived negatively by the community.

Parties will discuss this further in future meetings, addressing historic concerns regarding the options of openings in the fence.

4. Tom Mayes (NTHP) stated his belief that the locations of proposed Buildings C and D in Zone A are clearly visible from the area around Scott Statue. Mr. Mayes thinks these buildings should be eliminated from the Draft MP because the green space created by the trees in that area is an essential part of the view from Scott Statue. He stated that whether one can see over the buildings to points outside the Home is not the issue. Aaron Feldman-Grosse (RH) agreed to go on site with Mr. Mayes to identify what land within the Home's boundaries can be seen from Scott Statue.

View from Scott Statue will be reviewed (EHT, RH, GSA, and NTHP).

5. Reid Nelson (ACHP) suggested that a landscape analysis be used as a model to assess significant elements and adverse effects. He also suggested that the Consulting Parties review the original nomination of the NHL and the National Monument at the Home and to clarify the significance of the Home as interpreted by the NHL and National Monument. Tom Mayes (NTHP) agreed with Mr. Nelson's comment. Mr. Mayes also stated that there is now more knowledge about the site than when the nomination was filed.

NHL nomination will be reviewed and a list of significant features from the nomination will be created and reviewed at next Section 106 meeting (EHT).

6. Nancy Witherell (NCPC) and Frederick Lindstrom (CFA) agreed with Tom Mayes (NTHP) and emphasized the challenge of the debate over whether to respect the character of the neighborhood or the character of the Home when planning development in Zone C.

The Section 106 Consulting Parties will review the planning issues in Zone C.

Tim Sheckler (GSA) presented the next steps for the Section 106 review process for AFRH.

Comment/Question

Action

1. Richard Houghton (C100) commented that the Consulting Parties needed more than a month before the next meeting (which is proposed to be July 19 or July 20). Other Consulting Parties said that meeting in July would not be a problem.
2. Tim Dennee (DCHPO) stated that he had an issue with discussing the PA before creating a list of adverse effects.

GSA will review possible meeting times for July (GSA).

List of adverse effects will be created and reviewed at the next

Mr. Dennee thinks that the Master Plan needs to be decided upon first and foremost so that adverse effects can be identified. Barbara Zartman (C100) agreed with Mr. Dennee and requested a list of adverse effects be made available before any additional comments about the PA are submitted. Mr. Dennee then said that the PA and the list of adverse effects could be done in tandem.

Section 106 meeting (GSA, Crescent, EHT).

Tim Dennee (DCHPO) commented that AFRH, as the federal agency, needs to take more ownership of the Section 106 responsibilities rather than relying on the Consulting Parties to “police” the Master Plan.

Tim Sheckler reinforce to AFRH the importance of having strong and visible representation in the process.

3. Reid Nelson (ACHP) suggested making information, such as the list of Consulting Parties, more easily accessible. Mr. Nelson also asked about a public involvement plan. Tim Sheckler (GSA) responded that AFRH has had constant contact with the community over the last few years. Mr. Nelson thinks that a plan for public involvement should be revisited.

GSA will meet with ACHP to review the process to date and the plan for future meetings.

List of Consulting Parties will be made available on the project website (GSA).

4. Reid Nelson (ACHP) suggested that the Consulting Parties needed to use future meetings to identify and address adverse effects.

List of adverse effects will be created and reviewed at next Section 106 meeting (GSA, Crescent, EHT).

5. Barbara Zartman (C100) remembered that there is a scale model and suggested that it be used to help assess impacts at future meetings

Model will be updated (GSA, Crescent, KKA).

Tim Sheckler (GSA) requested that Consulting Parties provide written comments on Chapter 6 of the HPP and the PA.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.