

---

---

## MEETING MINUTES

---

---

**SUBJECT:** Working Session for Section 106 Consulting Parties: AFRH-W Zone and Zone A

**DATE/TIME:** August 22, 2007; 9:00 AM – 2:30 PM

**LOCATION:** AFRH-W, Sherman Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room

---

### ATTENDEES:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)

Katharine Kerr

Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH)

Roy Coogle

Joe Woo

Tim Cox

Committee of 100 (C100)

Barbara Zartman

U.S. Commission of Fine Arts

Frederick Lindstrom

Crescent Resources (CR)

Stacy Outlaw

Bobby Zeiller

Ronnie McGhee

D.C. State Historic Preservation Office (DCSHPO)

Tim Dennee

Ruth Troccoli

D.C. Preservation League (DCPL)

Rebecca Miller

Ehrenkrantz, Eckstut, & Kuhn (EE&K)

Hillary Lord

Matt Bell

EHT Traceries (EHT)

Emily Eig

Carrie Barton

Staubach

Pam Wessling

Koetter, Kim and Associates (KKA)

Mark DeShong

National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)

Jeff Hinkle

Christine Saum

National Park Service (NPS)

Gary Scott

National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)

Tom Mayes

Frank Milligan

Elizabeth Merritt

Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects (NBW)

Kennan Williams

Robinson and Associates (RA)

Daria Gasparini

Trijan

Mike Walker

Venable

Catherine V. Buell

The Section 106 Consulting Parties for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) met on Wednesday, August 22, 2007, from 9:00 AM to 2:30 PM to discuss potential adverse effects for the AFRH-W Zone and Zone A. 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 to provide a summary of the programmatic issues that AFRH is trying to address with changes to its campus and facilities:

- Many residential units need to be renovated and made ADA accessible;
- The Home is conducting a study to determine the location of a new facility for dementia patients. The study should be completed by the end of September; and
- The Home is studying how to accommodate an anticipated increase in spouses at the Home.

Joe Woo (AFRH) and Pam Wessling (Staubach) reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Mark deShong (KKA) presented the updates to the Master Plan for AFRH-W Zone.

- **Square Footage:** Reduction of total square footage of proposed new development to 398,000 sq ft.

- **Chapel Woods:** In response to Tim Dennee's (DCSHPO) comments from the 7/27/2007 Section 106 meeting, the proposed development in Chapel Woods has been changed from single-family homes located throughout the wooded area to a more consolidated development of townhouses to be located in the center of Chapel Woods where there is currently a large area of impervious surface. This revision is intended to create a more sustainable design and lessen the impact on the natural resources of the site.
- **North Quadrangle:** The footprint, massing, and height of a proposed building on the west side of the quadrangle would be based on the footprint, massing, and height of the former Sheridan Building on that site. A visual of the former Sheridan Building and the proposed building in the context of the quadrangle was provided.

The following issues were addressed after Mr. DeShong's presentation:

- **Parking and Circulation:** Gary Scott (NPS) asked Mr. DeShong where parking would be relocated in the AFRH-W Zone, as most of the new development is proposed to be located on sites currently occupied by parking lots. Mr. DeShong explained that parking could be located on the east side of the site behind the Sheridan Building, where the change in topography would lessen the visual impact of an above-ground parking structure. Tom Mayes (NTHP) asked about parking for visitors to the Lincoln Cottage. Pam Wessling (Staubach) commented that the visitation parking was accounted for in the parking count and is included in the EIS. Mr. Mayes would like visitation parking to the National Monument to be explicitly addressed in the Master Plan. Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) commented that circulation is an issue around the Grant Building and that constructing a building on the location of the former Sheridan Building would worsen that condition and discourage use of the Grant Building. Frederick Lindstrom (C100) asked about the parking and circulation in Chapel Woods and requested that this be looked at more closely.
- **Impact on Lincoln Cottage:** Frank Milligan (NTHP) commented that he has always been concerned about development of the former Sheridan Building site because of its proximity to the National Monument. Joe Woo (AFRH) stated that the Grant Building would be examined for re-use first before a new building would be constructed on the Sheridan Building site and that no specific use for a new building has been determined at this time.

Joe Woo (AFRH) presented the Home's current landscape and facilities plan.

- **Facilities Plan:** Three functions from the current service area are still required by the Home and will have to be relocated once Zone A is leased: (1) maintenance office; (2) storage area for residents' baggage; and (3) laundry pickup/delivery area for LaGarde. Currently, the former laundry space (non-contributing) adjacent to the historic Heating Plant is vacant, and AFRH plans to relocate the three functions to that area. No new construction will be involved. Also, the Scott Building could be converted into a health facility and a new residence facility would be constructed to the east of the Sheridan Building. If the Scott Building is found to be unsuitable for use as a health facility, the new building to the east of the Sheridan Building would be used for that purpose.
- **Landscape Plan:** The Eagle Gate guard house (non-contributing) will be demolished and a new guard house will be sited on an island in the middle of the entrance. A promenade will be constructed between Sheridan and Sherman Buildings. The Home also plans to create a more formal landscape behind the Scott Building. Also, additional trees will be planted throughout the AFRH-W Zone.

Tom Mayes (NTHP) stated that he would like to make sure the landscape plan is coordinated with the landscape plan for the National Monument. Mr. Woo should contact Frank Milligan (NTHP). Mr. Woo explained that the Home has reviewed the Trust's plans.

Bobby Zeiller (CR) presented the updates to the plan for Zone A. The presentation focused on the following points:

- **Historic Pasture:** The new design, changed in response to stakeholder comments provided since Crescent submitted its proposal in 2006, preserves more contiguous space of the historic pasture and is less formal.
- **Parcel G:** The northern building of Parcel G was relocated to Parcel T to preserve the historic viewing stand.
- **Irving Street Entrances:** Two new entrances have been added from Irving Street, resulting in two full-movement entrances and one right in/right out entrance.
- **Relocation of Fence:** The security fence has been partially relocated to preserve more trees at the intersection of Pershing Drive and Arnold Drive.
- **North Capitol Street Entrance:** The North Capitol Street entrance has been made less formal.
- **Reconfiguration of Hotel Arrival Court:** The hotel arrival court to the south of the historic Barnes Building was reconfigured to respect the historic alignment of the existing hospital loop.
- **Pershing Drive:** The historic alignment of Pershing Drive and the street trees will be preserved by locating two lanes of traffic on either side of the existing road and street trees, turning the existing road into a central bike/pedestrian path.
- **Open Space:** Pocket parks have been incorporated into the design.
- **Transitional Facility:** The transitional veterans facility will be located in a new building to the north of the LaGarde Building rather in the LaGarde Building.
- **Internal and External Views:** Crescent provided a study of the internal historic views, including simulated winter and summer views of Buildings C and G from Scott Statue. A balloon test had been attempted in August but was not successful because of the wind. The view to the Shrine from the hotel arrival court has been incorporated into the design by shifting the road configuration.
- **Relocation of Density:** Crescent identified parcels that could receive extra density if buildings had to be reduced in size or eliminated.
- **Views Into the Home:** Crescent provided sketches illustrating possible views into the Home from Irving Street and North Capitol Street. Building elevations facing these external streets will be treated as building fronts, and heights and masses will be varied to avoid the feel of an institutional development. Existing mature buffer landscape will be retained, and above-grade parking will be incorporated into the architecture.

Kennan Williams (NBW for Crescent) presented the landscape design for Zone A, focusing on the area around the historic pasture and Pershing Drive.

- **Parking:** Barbara Zartman (C100) expressed concern over the impact of parked cars on the pastoral view that Crescent is trying to retain. Crescent will look at options, including parking on only one side of street. However, there was also discussion that parking on both sides of the street helps to slow traffic and provides parking for visitors to the park.
- **Building G:** Tom Mayes (NTHP) asked if Building G could be eliminated. Bobby Zeiller (CR) responded that Crescent has already started to consider that option because of the impacts on internal views. Density from Building G could be relocated east of the hospital complex. Crescent's plans showed possible locations for redistributing that density.
- **Landscape:** Tom Mayes (NTHP) asked how the new water features would be landscaped. Gary Scott (NPS) asked if the water features would require a high level of maintenance. Mr. Williams explained that because these would be incorporated into the storm management of the site, they would require less maintenance. Frank Milligan (NTHP) asked if historic streams were located further east. Emily Eig (EHT) explained that there were originally several streams on the site, including two through Zone A. Frederick Lindstrom (C100) asked how excavated dirt will be used. Most dirt will have to be removed from the site.

The Consulting Parties went on a tour of the AFRH-W Zone and Zone A at 11:00 AM. During the tour, Crescent Resources used a balloon test and a lift to demonstrate the heights of proposed buildings C, D, and

G in Zone A. This was in response to concerns over the impact of new development on the historic internal and external views from Scott Statue.

The Consulting Parties reconvened at 1:00 to discuss adverse effects in the AFRH-W Zone and Zone A. Pam Wessling (Staubach) led the discussion. Ms. Wessling went through the list of potential adverse effects that have been identified for the AFRH and A Zones. The chart below summarizes the discussion by providing the group's consensus on the impact of the current proposals for the two zones.

ITEM NUMBER	ZONE	RESOURCE TYPE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ITS CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES, THE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK, AND THE NATIONAL MONUMENT	POTENTIAL CAUSE	
1	AFRH-W	A	Ground Disturbance in AFRH-W Zone (formerly the area outside of Development Zones as defined by DEIS and Draft Master Plan, which includes the National Historic Landmark and National Monument)	Ground Disturbance in close proximity to Lincoln Cottage (new construction on Grant Building parking lot) and in Golf Course (installation of new security fence and relocation of two golf holes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED by SOP for ground disturbance in HPP.</li> <li>AFRH will be working with new staff archeologist at DCSHPO.</li> </ul>
2	AFRH-W	A	Ground Disturbance in AFRH-W Zone (former Development Zone 1)	Ground Disturbance on the one small area with moderate archeological sensitivity for pre-historic occupation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED by SOP for ground disturbance in HPP.</li> <li>AFRH will be working with new staff archeologist at DCSHPO.</li> </ul>
3	AFRH-W	A	Ground Disturbance in AFRH-W Zone (former Development Zone 2)	Ground Disturbance on the one small area with moderate archeological sensitivity for pre-historic occupation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED by SOP for ground disturbance in HPP.</li> <li>AFRH will be working with new staff archeologist at DCSHPO.</li> </ul>
4	AFRH-W	B	Physical Alteration/Demolition of Contributing Built Resources within the AFRH-W Zone (former area outside of Development Zones in DEIS and Draft MP, which includes the NHL and National Monument)	Rehabilitation and Adaptive Re-use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED by SOPs for alteration, restoration, repair, and maintenance in HPP.</li> <li>MINIMIZED by design guidelines.</li> <li>Hiring of Cultural Resources Manager is required by HPP and PA.</li> </ul>
5	AFRH-W	B	Physical Alteration/Demolition of Contributing Built Resources within the AFRH-W Zone (former Development Zone 1)	Rehabilitation and Adaptive Re-use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED by SOPs for alteration, restoration, repair, and maintenance in HPP.</li> <li>MINIMIZED by design guidelines.</li> <li>Hiring of Cultural Resources Manager is required by HPP and PA.</li> </ul>
6	AFRH-W	B	Physical Alteration/Demolition of Contributing Built Resources within the AFRH-W Zone (former Development Zone 2)	Rehabilitation and Adaptive Re-use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED by SOPs for alteration, restoration, repair, and maintenance in HPP.</li> <li>MINIMIZED by design guidelines.</li> <li>Hiring of Cultural Resources Manager is required by HPP and PA.</li> </ul>
7	AFRH-W	B	Lack of Maintenance for Contributing Built Resources within AFRH-W Zone (former area outside of Development Zones and former Development Zones 1 and 2)	Insufficient funding to allow for proper maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED by SOP for maintenance in HPP.</li> <li>Additional money from ground lease will provide funds for maintenance of historic resources.</li> </ul>
8	AFRH-W	D	Compromise of the historic scale of the Home in AFRH-W Zone (formerly Development Zone 1)	Development	MINIMIZED by design guidelines.

9	AFRH-W	D	Compromise of the historic scale of the Home in AFRH-W Zone (formerly Development Zone 2)	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED by design guidelines.</li> <li>Height of development in Chapel Woods reduced.</li> </ul>
10	AFRH-W	L	Physical Alteration/ Destruction/ Removal of part or all of the Meadow (RLS: Significant) in Savannah I (former Formal Meadow) in AFRH-W Zone (former area outside of Development Zones in DEIS and Draft MP)	Relocation of two golf holes from Zone A (former Zone 4) to Savannah I (former Formal Meadow)	AVOIDED. No longer proposed.
11	AFRH-W	L	Physical Alteration/ Demolition/ Removal of Pershing Drive South Street Trees (RLS: Significant) and Open Stand (RLS: Supporting) in the Lakes Character Area of AFRH-W Zone (former area outside of Development Zones in DEIS and Draft MP)	Relocation of two golf holes from Zone A (former Zone 4) to Open Stand/Pershing Drive Street Trees West in Lakes Character Area	AFRH -W Landscape Plan will address tree maintenance, treatment, and replenishment throughout AFRH-W Zone in accordance with HPP HP SOP #3 - Maintenance
12	AFRH-W	L	Physical Alteration/ Demolition/ Removal of all or part of Chapel Woods East (RLS: Significant) and Chapel Woods West (RLS: Significant) in AFRH- W Zone (former Development Zone 2)	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED: Change in design to consolidate development on impervious surface in center of Chapel Woods.</li> <li>Further design of parking will be presented at next meeting.</li> <li>Replanting of trees will be added to the Final Master Plan.</li> </ul>
13	AFRH-W	SO	Loss of Central Grounds Character Area Open Space (RLS: Significant) in AFRH-W Zone (former Development Zone 1a) with visual intrusion into National Monument and NHL site	Proposed new building on non-contributing Grant Parking Lot (former Sheridan Building site)	Effects of construction on views from Lincoln Cottage will be viewed at next meeting.
17	AFRH-W	V	Obstruction of current visibility of Home from northeast perimeter (former Development Zone 1)	Development	AVOIDED (See Current Visibility Map)
18	AFRH-W	V	Obstruction of current visibility of Home from northwest perimeter (possible Lincoln-era view) (former area outside of Development Zones)	Development on AFRH-W Zone	AVOIDED (See Current Visibility Map)
19	AFRH-W and A	V	Obstruction of historic view corridor from Scott Statue southerly to the U.S. Capitol Building (RLS: Significant)	Development on Zone A (former Development Zone 4)	MINIMIZED: Height of Building C has been reduced from six stories to four stories.

20	AFRH-W and A	V	Obstruction of base of historic view shed [internal view] from Scott Statue southward to downtown (RLS: Significant)	Development on Zone A (former Development Zones 3 and 4) and Zone B (former Development Zone 5)	POSSIBLE MINIMIZATION: relocate density from Parcel G to Parcels K and L. Crescent will present effects of density relocation at next meeting.
21	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	B	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>• MITIGATED. HALS as possible mitigation tool.</li> <li>• The HPP and AFRH Landscape Plan are mitigation for overall effects.</li> </ul>
22	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	D	Compromise of the integrity of the National Register-eligible Historic District	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MITIGATED and MINIMIZED: Design guidelines are minimization/mitigation. Design guidelines will incorporate comments from Consulting Parties.</li> <li>• HALS as possible mitigation tool.</li> <li>• Tim Dennee wants "no-build" option for Zone C brought up as minimization or mitigation tool.</li> </ul>
23	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	D	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>• MINIMIZED. Location of security fence is being determined.</li> <li>• Crescent is proposing to relocate security fence for Zone A to preserve trees.</li> <li>• Design will conform to design guidelines.</li> </ul>
24	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	D	Compromise of the integrity of the National Register-eligible Historic District	Utility lines necessary for new development	AVOIDED: (utility lines to be underground.

25	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	D	Compromise of the historic architectural character of the Home	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MINIMIZED. Design guidelines are a mitigation tool. Design guidelines will incorporate comments from Consulting Parties.</li> <li>• Review timing / coordination related to tax credits will be discussed between AFRH and ACHP.</li> </ul>
26	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	D	Compromise of the historic architectural character of the Home	Development (Streets)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MITIGATED. Design guidelines are a mitigation tool. Design guidelines will incorporate comments from Consulting Parties.</li> </ul>
27	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	L	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MINIMIZED. Topography is addressed in the Master Plan.</li> <li>• Crescent is using existing topography in design.</li> </ul>
28	AFRH-W and A, B, and C	SO	Loss of open space throughout site	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MITIGATED and MINIMIZED. HALS survey could be a mitigation tool.</li> <li>• Addition of public open space that is not currently open space is mitigation.</li> <li>• Addition of pocket parks in Crescent's design.</li> <li>• Removal of formal oval and redundant street retains more contiguous open space in Crescent's design.</li> </ul>
29	AFRH-W and B and C	V	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)	Issue for Zones B and C (discussed at previous meeting).

33	Zone A	A	Ground Disturbance in Zone A (former Development Zone 3)	Ground Disturbance on one or more of the four areas with potential for archeological sensitivity: 1) Site of a post 1873 cross-gable wood frame building; 2) Site of Corlise Cottage; 3) Site of former Barnes Building (c. 1876); 4) Site of possible late 19th century building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MINIMIZED by SOP for ground disturbance in HPP.</li> <li>• AFRH will be working with new staff archeologist at DCSHPO</li> </ul>
34	Zone A	A	Ground Disturbance On Zone A (former Development Zone 4)	Ground Disturbance on the one small area with moderate archeological sensitivity for pre-historic occupation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MINIMIZED by SOP for ground disturbance in HPP.</li> <li>• AFRH will be working with new staff archeologist at DCSHPO</li> </ul>
35	Zone A	B	Physical Alteration/Demolition to Contributing Built Resources in Zone A (former Development Zones 3 and 4)	Rehabilitation and Adaptive Reuse; Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MITIGATED and MINIMIZED: Hiring of CR Manager at Home required by HPP and PA.</li> <li>• MINIMIZED: HPP requires use of Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.</li> <li>• MITIGATION: Rehabilitation of Forwood Building and Barnes Building to be first in phasing program by Crescent (prior to any new construction).</li> <li>• Restoration of existing operating room in Forwood Building as interpretive site could be mitigation tool.</li> </ul>
36	Zone A	B	Lack of Maintenance for Contributing Built Resources within Zone A (former Development Zones 3 and 4)	Transfer of maintenance responsibility to developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MINIMIZED by SOP for maintenance in HPP.</li> <li>• MITIGATED. Additional money from ground lease will provide funds for maintenance of historic resources.</li> </ul>
37	Zone A	D	Compromise of the historic scale of the Home in Zone A (formerly Development Zones 3 and 4)	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crescent will present effects of density relocation at next meeting.</li> <li>• MINIMIZED by design guidelines.</li> </ul>
38	Zone A	L	Physical Alteration/Destruction/Removal of Contributing Natural Landscape resources in Zone A (former Development Zone 3)	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MINIMIZED. Grading and landscaping plan is being developed by Crescent.</li> <li>• MITIGATED. HALS survey as possible mitigation tool.</li> <li>• Enhancement of view from Scott Statue with pruning as possible mitigation tool.</li> </ul>
39	Zone A	L	Alteration/Destruction/Removal of Pershing Drive East Street Trees (RLS: Significant) in Zone A (former Development Zone 4)	Widening of Pershing Drive East	MINIMIZED: Crescent's new plan preserves street and street trees as linear park with pedestrian/bike land, flanked by vehicular traffic.

40	Zone A	L	Physical Alteration/Destruction/Removal of all or part of Pasture (RLS: Significant) in Savannah II in Zone A (former Development Zone 3)	Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MINIMIZED: Crescent's new plan retains more contiguous space in pasture by removing formal oval and redundant road.</li> <li>• Too many new trees on pasture would crate false landscape. Historic maps of pasture will be used in landscape plan to ensure character of pasture is respected.</li> </ul>
41	Zone A	SO	Loss of Open Space (RLS: Significant, as part of Spatial Organization) in Zone A (former Development Zones 3 and 4)	Development on Pasture and adjacent Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MINIMIZED: Crescent's new plan retains more contiguous space in pasture by removing formal oval and redundant road.</li> </ul>
42	Zone A	SO	Loss of Open Space in Zone A (former Development Zone 4) (RLS: Significant, as part of Spatial Organization)	Development south of Pershing Drive East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MITIGATED and MINIMIZED. HALS survey could be a mitigation tool.</li> <li>• Addition of public open space that is not currently open space is mitigation.</li> <li>• Addition of pocket parks in Crescent's design.</li> <li>• Removal of formal oval and redundant street retains more contiguous open space in Crescent's design.</li> <li>• Relocation of Building G would preserve more open space.</li> <li>• Use of bike paths will be added to the Final Master Plan.</li> </ul>
43	Zone A	V	Obstruction of current, non-historic view from Hospital Complex easterly to the Basilica and Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.	Development on Zone A (former Development Zone 3)	MINIMIZED: alignment of streets and design of buildings to retain view form hotel arrival court to Basilica.
44	Zone A	V	Obstruction of the current internal view shed from the Hospital Complex to the Pasture (RLS: Significant) in Savannah II	Development on Zone A (former Development Zone 3)	MINIMIZED: Retention of a majority of the historic pasture; development only proposed for perimeter of the pasture in Zone A.
45	Zone A	V	Obstruction of current view corridor from First Street into the Home	Development on Zone A (former Development Zone 4)	MINIMIZED: First Street to be continued into Home.

46	Zone A	V	Obstruction of current view, non-historic view from North Capitol Street to Forwood Building	Development on Zone A (former Development Zones 3 and 4)	MINIMIZED: Forwood Building is a featured element in the selected developer's plan for Zone A.
47	Zone A	V	Obstruction of current, non-historic visibility of Home from eastern perimeter	Development on Zone A (former Development Zones 3 and 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED. Design of buildings to be 4-sided architecture, with varying heights and masses to avoid "wall effect."</li> <li>Retention of mature vegetation along buffer.</li> </ul>
58	Zone A	V	Obstruction of current visibility of Home from southern perimeter	Development on Zone A (former Development Zone 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design of buildings to be 4-sided architecture, with varying heights and masses to avoid "wall effect."</li> <li>Retention of mature vegetation along buffer.</li> </ul>
59	AFRH-W, A, B, and C	D	Change of Home boundaries / Reduction in size of Home	Lease or sale of development zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED. 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.</li> <li>Current Home residents will be able to access amenities of new development.</li> <li>Consolidation of Home's services needed for more efficient operation.</li> </ul>
60	AFRH-W	B	Change in setting and feeling of Rose Chapel (RLS: Significant)	Development on Chapel Woods (former Development Zone 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MINIMIZED. Development is being condensed and the height has been decreased.</li> <li>More detail about parking/circulation to be presented at next meeting.</li> </ul>
64	AFRH-W, A, B, and C	D	AFRH's loss of day-to-day control over sections of the Home, including the historic resources within those sections	Ground lease or transfer of land to third party.	MINIMIZED: Transaction documents provide strong oversight of Home's resources. 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. Maintenance SOP in HPP applies to AFRH and tenants.
65	Zone A	L	Compromise of potential historic hydrologic features.	Development and ground disturbance on Zone A.	MINIMIZED. Crescent is incorporating hydrologic features of Home into design.

Ms. Wessling (Staubach) summarized the key issues that need to be addressed at the next Section 106 meeting:

- Views from Lincoln Cottage
- Parking in AFRH-W Zone
- Redistribution of density and relocation of Building G
- Minimizing the impact of Building C on internal views (landscape screening and architectural design)
- Enhancement of views from Scott Statue

- Addition/design of trees around historic pasture

In addition, in response to a request from Katherine Kerr (ACHP), AFRH will consult with ACHP about the relationship between the Home's review and tax credit review of the rehabilitation of the historic buildings in Zone A so that those reviews can be coordinated.

AFRH will also discuss with DCOP and the DC SHPO the role of the Historic Preservation Review Board in review and interpretation of the MOU's zoning stipulations.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.

The next Section 106 consulting parties meeting is scheduled for 11 September, from 9am-3pm at AFRH-W.