
MEETING MINUTES

SUBJECT: Meeting with AFRH Section 106 Consulting Parties: Master Plan and PA
DATE/TIME: December 5, 2007; 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM
LOCATION: AFRH-W, Sherman Building, 1st Floor Conference Room

ATTENDEES:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) Katharine Kerr	Nancy Witherell National Park Service (NPS)
Advisory Neighborhood Council 4 (ANC) Timothy Jones	Gary Scott David Murphy
Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Joe Woo	National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) Tom Mayes
Committee of 100 (C100) Don Hawkins	Robinson and Associates (RA) Judith Robinson
Crescent Resources (CR) Stacy Outlaw Bobby Zeiller	Staubach Pam Wessling
D.C. State Historic Preservation Office (DCSHPO) Tim Dennee	Trijan Development (TD) Mike Walker
D.C. Office of Planning (DCOP) Geraldine Gardner	United Neighborhood Coalition (UNC) Reyn Anderson
Ehrenkrantz, Eckstut, & Kuhn (EE&K) Matt Bell	Venable Catherine Buell
EHT Traceries (EHT) Emily Eig Carrie Barton	
General Services Administration (GSA) Tim Sheckler	
Koetter, Kim and Associates (KKA) Mark deShong	
National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)	

The Section 106 Consulting Parties for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) met on Wednesday, December 5, 2007, from 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM to review comments to the Master Plan and discuss the Programmatic Agreement. The meeting was held at the Home.

Tim Sheckler (GSA) reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

MASTER PLAN

Mr. Sheckler summarized the comments received from the Consulting Parties on the Final Master Plan. He then opened the discussion to the Consulting Parties. The primary points of discussion were:

- **Transparency of financial needs of AFRH:** Reyn Anderson (UNC) feels like there is a lack of transparency of the financial needs of AFRH. Other Consulting Parties agreed that it would be helpful to know how and to what degree the proposed development will address the agency's long-term financial needs. They would like there to be more thorough and transparent financial

projections prior to development, as well as a commitment to reevaluate the agency's financial needs after each phase of development.

- **“No Development” as an option in the Master Plan and Programmatic Agreement:** Because the financial needs of AFRH could change and because a party could offer to purchase the land or put an easement on the land for park use, Gary Scott would like the option for no development to be explicitly stated in the Master Plan and Programmatic Agreement. Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) and Nancy Witherell (NCPC) agreed. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) agreed that conditions of development could be specified in the MP and PA.
- **Trees and Landscape Features:** David Murphy (NPS) would like there to be a focus on the long-range protection of the function of landscape resources rather than just the protection of the individual elements of the landscape resources (i.e. the Master Plan should include as a goal protection of the screening function of a tree cluster rather than just the trees themselves). This would include specifications for necessary height, root spread, location, and density of new trees rather than just a requirement for a one-to-one replacement of trees. Mr. Murphy would also like the Master Plan to address how the ground disturbance and the addition of hardscape, infrastructure, and roads will affect the existing and proposed landscape resources. He noted that there are no good examples of standards for such elements but that some cities, such as Alexandria, are beginning to address them. Tim Sheckler (GSA) noted that the Home has committed to undertake a landscape plan that will address these issues. Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) added that he would like to know what is being done with the tree survey once it is completed. Mr. Dennee also summarized Mr. Murphy's comments by saying that the Master Plan needed to include performance standards for landscape features. Tom Mayes (NTHP) agreed and reinforced Mr. Dennee's comment about the protection of the character of the historic and existing trees.
- **Coordination of Documents:** David Murphy (NPS) discussed concerns with the coordination of all of the relevant planning and compliance documents (Master Plan, Historic Preservation Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, and Programmatic Agreement).
- **New Building on Grant Quadrangle:** Consulting Parties discussed issues with the architectural character of the new building on the former Sheridan Building site. Mark deShong (KKA) explained that he tried to create a framework for the design of the new building but did not intend to design the building in the Master Plan. Mr. Mayes would also like for language to be included in the MP about screening the new construction from the National Historic Landmark with new landscape features.
- **Overall Vision of the Master Plan:** Several of the Consulting Parties discussed the need for overall vision statements or statements of commitments to be explicitly stated in the Master Plan in order to avoid unintended consequences in the future.
- **Importance of Rock Creek Church Road:** Gary Scott and David Murphy (NPS) emphasized the need to state the importance of Rock Creek Church Road as one of the last remaining remnants of late nineteenth century rural Washington.
- **Temporary Surface Parking Lots:** Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) would like language added to the Master Plan about landscape screening of temporary parking lots.
- **Sustainability:** Several Consulting Parties agreed that the option of green roofs should be added to the Master Plan. Tim Sheckler (GSA) stated that the green roof alternative would be added to the Master Plan along with the mention of Zone A as a LEED pilot program.

- **Bike Paths:** Reyn Anderson (UNC) would like to see how the proposed bike paths will connect to paths outside the Home and thinks there should be a statement about how the Home and the developers will work with the city to develop a holistic bike path system. Pam Wessling (Staubach) explained that the plan includes bike paths and that their location was determined with input of this group.
- **Lincoln Cottage:** Tom Mayes (NTHP) would like the restoration and use of the Lincoln Cottage and Administration Building as an interpretive site and visitors' center to be added as a long-term use for that area of the campus in the Master Plan.
- **Traffic Management Plan:** Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) would like the Master Plan to address traffic management and the issues related to 21st-century development. Mr. Dennee would like the Master Plan to address how traffic needs are being managed, not just how the plan addresses traffic/zoning requirements and constraints. Bobby Zeiller (Crescent) stated that Traffic Management Plan for Zone A has already been submitted to NCPC and is summarized in the Master Plan. Geraldine Gardner (DCOP) would like a copy of the draft Traffic Management Plan to be sent to the Office of Planning. Mr. Zeiller agreed to send a copy.

PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

Emily Eig (EHT) presented the proposed design review process for federal and private development on federally-owned land at the Home.

Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) stated that he would like the Consulting Parties to decide whether they were willing to delegate Section 106 review authority to DCSHPO, CFA, and NCPC. There was no objection to this concept from the Consulting Parties. The Consulting Parties made the following comments related to the review process and the Programmatic Agreement:

- Judy Robinson (RA) would like there to be wording in the text of the PA that makes it clear that the Master Plan is the base line for review.
- Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) would like to discuss the proposed review process with HPRB to make sure they are on board.
- Katharine Kerr (ACHP) would like ACHP to be put back into the review process flowchart.
- Tom Mayes (NTHP) would like to remove the current model covenant from the PA and make a general statement that a covenant is necessary when land is sold.
- Geraldine Gardner (DCOP) stated that the design review process assumed that there would be no input from the Board of Zoning Appeals. Emily Eig (EHT) explained that if there is a sale of the property, the proposed design review process would no longer be relevant.
- Katharine Kerr (ACHP) clarified to the other Consulting Parties that the Cultural Resources Manager for AFRH-W would be involved in the review throughout the process.
- Judy Robinson (RA) and Bobby Zeiller (Crescent) asked for clarification on whether the DCSHPO would have final approval. Emily Eig (EHT) explained that the DCSHPO would have final approval in the issuance of the DCRA building permit but that double jeopardy would be avoided by not having to take the project back to HPRB during the permitting phase.

- Katharine Kerr (ACHP) asked what would happen if a building was sold and land was not. Bobby Zeiller (Crescent) explained that all improvements revert back to the Home at the end of the ground lease.
- Tom Mayes (NTHP) would like a whereas clause added to the Programmatic Agreement that states that the Home will be locally designated.
- Katherine Kerr (ACHP) discussed the duration of the Programmatic Agreement and would like the duration to be stipulated as 20 years from the date of the execution of the Programmatic Agreement.
- Timothy Jones (ANC) would like to investigate the possibility of using the Witness to History Tree Preservation Program.
- David Murphy (NPS) suggested that language be added to Programmatic Agreement that says that the landscape plan should be consistent with the vision set forth in the Historic Preservation Plan and Master Plan. Tim Dennee (DCOP) thinks this language is more appropriate for just the Master Plan.
- Tom Mayes (NTHP) would like the protection of viewsheds to be addressed in the Programmatic Agreement as mitigation.

Tim Sheckler (GSA) announced that the Final Master Plan will be updated to reflect written comments and comments made during the meeting. The Signatories will finalize the Programmatic Agreement.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM.