

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

SECTION 106 COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: October 5, 2005 9:00AM – 1:00PM

Location Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington

Attendees: Joseph Woo, Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W)
Sheila Abar, AFRH-W
Hector Abreu Cintron, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)
Lisa Burcham, D.C. State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)
Nancy Witherell, National Capitol Planning Commission (NCPC)
Tom Mayes, National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)
Sophie Lynn, NTHP
David Moshier, US Army
Nancy Czapek, General Services Administration (GSA)
Pamela Wessling, RSM McGladrey (RSM)
John Thompson, RSM
Giles Moore, Koetter Kim & Associates (KKA)
Carrie Albee, EHT Tracerics, Inc. (Tracerics)

The meeting began shortly after 9:00AM in Room 206 at the Sherman Building at AFRH-W. Nancy Czapek provided opening remarks regarding the project, the process, and project status. The committee was informed that AFRH will be sending out a request for qualifications (RFQ) on October 12th for development zones 3 and 4 (east side of the campus). The AFRH website has provide a venue for developers who are interested in the project to register with contact information.

Tim Cox sent the committee his regrets for being unable to attend: Mr. Cox was testifying before a congressional committee and continuing the arduous task of trying to raise capital to make repairs to the AFRH-Gulfport facility in Gulfport, Mississippi following the extensive devastation from hurricane Katrina.

Nancy Czapek described the financial need for development to provide revenue to the Trust, which is the only source of funds for AFRH, for its capital and operating expenses.

GSA, which is advising AFRH, is recruiting a project manager for the AFRH-W project; Nancy will be serving in that capacity until the position is filled. Nancy Czapek introduced the consulting team, led by RSM and including KKA and TRACERIES.

Tom May requested that Sophia Lynn be added as a contact person for the PA committee.

Q: Will the Programmatic Agreement Committee (PA) receive copies of the RFQ prior to being sent out?

A: No. The RFQ is a document distributed to interested parties that will enable the AFRH to gain a better understanding of the market demand, and how best to move forward with the Request for Proposal process.

Pam Wessling outlined the work that RSM McGladrey team has undertaken on behalf of AFRH. She introduced Carrie Albee (Traceries) and Giles Moore (KKA).

Of the twenty PA committee members listed on the directory, five are present. ACHP - Were all members on the directory invited? Yes.

PRESENTATION

AFRH-GULFPORT - Nancy reviewed recent activities at the Washington campus of AFRH, including the arrival of 336 Gulfport residents. A portion of the Gulfport population chose to relocate to live with family members, rather than travel to Washington. A small portion of Gulfport residents are still arriving at the Washington campus.

The Gulfport high rise residence tower sustained significant damage; many of the single story structures are no longer present on the site.

AFRH-WASHINGTON - A brief history of AFRH was reviewed, including size of the campus, current population (+/- 1,400), and the nature of the built and natural environment. Current funding sources and the need to increase the size of the AFRH trust fund were reviewed.

MASTER PLAN

OVERVIEW

Pam Wessling reviewed the objectives of the Master Plan.

HISTORIC

Carrie Albee of Traceries presented a brief history of the site and reviewed a portion of the historic inventory.

The Master Plan addresses anticipated activities on the entire site for a twenty year period. Zones 1 and 2 contain the historic core and AFRH operations; the Master Plan addresses AFRH consolidation of their operations to the north campus (Zones 1 and 2) and allows for development for future needs. The Master Plan addresses the need to provide residential quarters for retired military personnel married couples, currently an unmet need.

SHPO said that the Master Plan is for new private development and for AFRH development activities so both need to be addressed pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Also, the SHPO expressed interest in address the landscape in the Historic Inventory.

NTHP - the Master Plan should address the view sheds from AFRH historic properties.

NTHP engaged map makers who plotted coordinates on the site, will provide their information to GSA.

SHPO-what is the area of potential effect (APE) on the site?

GSA-the APE was delineated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and reviewed by SHPO staff. It includes adjacent neighborhoods, cemetery, some development to the east, but not the hospital area to the south.

SHPO -In order for the SHPO to review the Master Plan, it is extremely important that the National Historic Landmarks are clearly delineated on the plan.

ACHP stressed that the Master Plan must clearly spell out to developers the precise boundaries of the historic character areas.

GSA – Regarding the golf course, AFRH wants to make adjustments to two of the holes to better integrate the golf course with resident activities. Currently, the golf course is

separated from the core AFRH areas; relocating the two southernmost holes to the north side of the course would allow the residents to more easily participate in the course and enjoy the activities on the course.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

Giles Moore of KKA reviewed the purpose of design guidelines included in the Master Plan. NTHP – some guidelines are easy to define, others more difficult, including streetscape, entries and heights. RSM – the design guidelines clearly address those features of the site (existing and proposed) that are very important, but leave flexibility for future operations. SHPO – set standards and identify where those apply and where they don't apply in the design framework and the RFP.

NTHP – are final Design Guidelines included in the RFP? GSA – draft guidelines, which were submitted to NCPC in June of 2005, are included. ACHP – when significant changes are made to the design guidelines at some future date, they need to be reviewed by consulting parties to the Programmatic Agreement. SHPO – a twenty year plan needs to contain flexibility.

KKA-Design guidelines illustrate how things might be in the plan. There is a need to strike a balance between prescriptive guidelines and guidelines that allow some flexibility for a development that will occur over such a long time..

The existing and proposed Urban Design Framework were presented by KKA; key features include adjacencies, topographic features and views, and landscape. Buildings shown in black are those that are intended to remain. Buildings shown in white may be demolished for development.

NTHP – some of the buildings on site are not stable. What is the status of the Scott Building? GSA – the Scott Building will remain in service for AFRH now and in the foreseeable future. It is a large asset that continues to provide adequate service and would be costly to replace. The Scott Building will not be demolished. The meeting contained several inquiries regarding demolition of Scott Building. Each time the question was raised, it was reiterated that ARFH has an immediate need (plans for a dementia ward on the upper level) and long term need for the Scott building, and that there are no plans at present or in the future to demolish the Scott building.

DENSITY

SHPO – regarding density, do the guidelines address where to put buildings, etc? NTHP – would like to see clearer delineation of which buildings are to remain, with a breakdown by zones. GSA – the existing and proposed Urban Design Framework clearly shows in black (to remain) and white (can be demolished) what AFRH would like pursue. AFRH would like to replace LaGarde Building with a new facility on the north end of the campus so that nursing home residents are not distant from other AFRH residents and activities. NTHP – is there a chart in the RFP that spells out the proposed density? GSA –The handout contains New Development Potential Uses and Densities, which indicates by zone the proposed FAR and total proposed development area within each zone. AFRH wishes to generate the maximum revenue by inviting development on their site. The eastern edge is proposed for the greatest density, and is where there will be the least impact on other portions of the site. We should further explore these issues at the next Programmatic Agreement (PA) meeting.

NTHP – parking is not shown on the charts. There is a huge range in the EIS. This should be discussed at future meetings. ACHP – has the acreage needed for structured parking been addressed in the charts?

ACCESS

The Urban Design Framework proposes additional entrances to the site. SHPO – does DC Department of Transportation (DDOT) need to approve the proposed changes? GSA – All proposed entrances have existing curb cuts, most are abandoned entries that are being brought back into active service. The bridge on the east side of the campus is being repaired by the District of Columbia. NTHP – will an entry be opened at the north end of the campus? GSA – no.

NTHP – NTHP is interested in the Randolph gate on the west side of the campus and the Ivy Gatehouse. The gatehouse dates from the Lincoln era. Don't know what their interest is at this point, will assess and report back. SHPO – If you bring public in through the Randolph gate, does this allow for interpretive programs of the historic core? NTHP – yes.

Regarding security and opening the Randolph gate to tourist (bus) traffic, a key card entry could facilitate security and still allow tour operators access.

HEIGHTS

KKA reported that there is 140 feet of grade change across the site. RSM – we attempted to mark heights with balloons, however the light weight balloons were insufficient to deal with windy conditions, and the expense of providing sturdier balloons was beyond the budget for the meeting. SHPO – the National Park Service should contribute balloons, they frequently conduct balloon tests.

SHPO – will there be view sheds through development zones 3 and 4? KKA – due to the significant grade change, the buildings on the lower portion of the site will allow views to the south. Yes, the view shed will continue to the south through zone 4.

HISTORIC FEATURES

Traceries presented the eligibility of the site for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under three separate criteria:

- Military,
- Political, and
- Architecture/Landscape Architecture.

Landmark status of the site was reviewed, with distinctions of each of the designated areas:

- DC Historic Landmark
- National Historic Landmark
- National Register of Historic Places
- National Monument (entire site)

The various landmark areas overlap and in some cases bisect buildings.

NTHP – the Master Plan needs to clearly spell out that public visitors to the Lincoln Cottage and visitor center are part of NTHP operations and will be accommodated in any development scheme.

SHPO – will non-contributing buildings be demolished? GSA – we are open to demolition of non-contributing structures. The RFQ for Zones 3 and 4 identifies contributing and non-contributing structures. AFRH is seeking interest in reuse of contributing structures, but much of the east side of the campus (utility buildings) may be demolished to make way for new buildings.

NTHP – What is the extent of the wrought iron fence? TRACERIES - the west and north portions of the perimeter contains the historic fence. ACHP – we would like to see the historic fence remain. GSA – we will tee that up for future study. SHPO – is a new security fence being provided by the developers, and is it sympathetic to the existing?

GSA – yes, details will be contained in the design guidelines. SHPO – the issue of fence maintenance needs to be addressed.

PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE

Tracerics conducted an inventory of the entire site and prepared a Historic Structures Report. Tracerics concluded that the AFRH-W *Period of Significance* is 1851 thru 1944.

ACHP - Might the period of significance be extended to the 1950's, as it would meet the criteria of fifty years old? Tracerics – Construction of the golf course in the mid twentieth century compromised portions of the site where many of the 1950's era buildings are located. ACHP – The period of significance could change in the next ten years. SHPO – this is why it is necessary to have a strong sense of the end of Period of Significance. It is essential to lock that date and be respectful of modernist architecture.

NTHP - When was the (underground) reservoir constructed? GSA - The 1920's.

SHPO - What is the significance of 1944? The Programmatic Agreement committee needs to agree on the Period of Significance.

SHPO - What would be the cost for Tracerics to do additional building reports on the 1950's era buildings?

NCPC - What is the status of archeological survey? Tracerics – Phase I has been completed by Greenhorn and O'Mara. The SHPO reviewed it, and comments from SHPO were incorporated into the document.

SITE

Currently 262 acres, at one time the site contained nearly 500 acres. The parcels south of Irving Street were de-commissioned in the 1950's.

Tracerics reviewed character areas based on historical boundaries that are still present on the site. NCPC - are historic maps included in the Resource Room? GSA - They will be.

Regarding the two lakes on the south west portion of the site, there is concern for residents' sense of safety and well being, should the lakes become a public feature. AFRH would need to gain residents' acceptance if this area were open to the public. GSA will continue to explore whether it can be a shared resource. SHPO – you might explore having developers improve areas surrounding the lakes.

NTHP OPERATIONS ON THE SITE

A cooperative agreement between the NTHP and AFRH provides for operations of NTHP on the site. The agreement includes 2.83 acres. NTHP is principally engaged in restoration of the Lincoln Cottage in preparation of opening the National Landmark to the public.

NTHP separately leases the Administration Building which is intended to be a visitors center when the Lincoln Cottage opens to the public.

NTHP also leases one of the residences to house a NTHP staff member. NTHP is interested in leasing an additional residence for the same purpose.

NTHP requested that GSA consider NTHP's interest in renovating dilapidated buildings for its staff, who will be very involved in the construction activities.

NTHP – when tourist activities begin on campus, NTHP plans on installing a curb cut and creating new parking, or utilizing the parking lot adjacent to the Grant Building. We expect several tour busses on site at the same time. RSM – The renovation of the Grant building anticipates utilizing parking there for tenants, and parking for the north campus uses will need to be resolved.

ACHP – does NTHP plan on allowing visitors access to the larger site? NTHP – would like to see pathways re-oriented to provide greater focus on the cottage. NTHP staff will instruct visitors not to wander the site, nor interrupt residents

PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

NCPC – NCPC would like to be a signator to the PA. David Moshier would like to be a concurring party only. ACHP suggests that the PA be hashed out by the signators, then presented to the concurring parties, as an efficient method of making progress.

The signators do not want a negotiating meeting; signators will commit to providing input and comments via email and phone calls between regularly scheduled meetings to meet the proposed schedule.

Who is the contact person at GSA? Until the open position of AFRH project manager is filled, Nancy Czapek will remain the contact person.

NTHP (TM) – NTHP wants to be in the process at the early stage, not sure that they need a role as signator. GSA – AFRH will need to determine what, if any, additional signators, makes sense. SHPO – can adjust the cooperative agreement to accommodate the NTHP participation at the level they choose.

NTHP (SL) – The NTHP wants to be a signator.

NTHP (TM)-will talk to Dick Moe regarding role that NTHP will want to play, likely as signator.

SHPO – will provide comments to work with your schedule. Is the agreement going to the entire committee? ACHP – only to the signators.

Agreed - Send the PA to NCPC, NTHP, ACHP, SHPO and David. NCPC – CFA would like to review the PA, they have requested a copy for review.

SCHEDULE

A schedule of some activities was provided. RSM – we will add a line for the Master Plan. The draft Master Plan goes to NCPC at its January 2006 meeting and the Final Master Plan to NCPC in July 2006.

SHPO – request that an informational meeting be held with the DC Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) in December 2005, prior to the NCPC meeting.

GSA – would like to sign a PA in January 2006 if possible. Otherwise, summer of 2006. SHPO – suggest that a draft PA is prepared in January and a final ready for signature in June 2006.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

GSA – The Grant Building RFQ/RFP may be issued soon. SHPO – will the Grant RFQ/RFP be issued after the draft PA? GSA – yes, the Grant project will go out as a one stage process. SHPO – if Grant is issued prior to the final PA, we need a final Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). GSA – a current MOA for the Grant Building was entered into a number of years ago.

NEXT STEPS

- RSM will contact all committee members to confirm that the listed parties are interested in participating in the PA committee, and request response from members not present of their intent to attend/participate in subsequent meetings,
- Notice will be distributed, via email, of next meeting once members confirm their availability,
- NTHP (SL) to provide language for RFP regarding public visitors to Lincoln Cottage,
- RSM send NTHP (SL) electronic copy of Historic Structures inventory,
- Master Plan to include current users, tenants on the site, especially NTHP,
- Revise site plan to indicate the National Historic Landmark and Historic District, review of the Master Plan needs to include those area designations,
- NTHP provide map coordinates to GSA,
- Add APE to the presentation,
- Extract Design Guidelines from Master Plan as separate document for distribution at subsequent meeting,
- Prepare site model to demonstrate proposed density,
- Modify Urban Design Framework to exclude Sheridan Building from development zone,
- Revise schedule to include the Master Plan,
- Add HPRB mid December meeting to project schedule,
- GSA to distribute the PA,
- Comments on PA by 10/20/05, and
- Meet with SHPO regarding Period of Significance.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

SECTION 106 COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: October 19, 2005 9:00AM – 1:00PM

Location Offices of the National Capitol Planning Commission

Attendees: Joseph Woo (JW), Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W)

Hector Abreu Cintron (HA),
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)

Lisa Burcham (LB), D.C. State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)

Tim Dennee (TD), SHPO

Nancy Witherell (NW), National Capitol Planning Commission (NCPC)

Jonathan McIntyre (JM), - (NCPC)

Sophia Lynn (SL), National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)

Gary Scott (GS), National Park Service (NPS)

David Murphy (DM), NPS

Barbara Zartman (BZ), Committee of 100 on the Federal City (C100)

Sandra Hoffmann (SH),
Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned (PCHCC)

Rebecca Miller (RM), D.C. Preservation League (DCPL)

Timothy Jones (TJ), ANC-4C

Paul Brooks (PB), Catholic University of America (CUA)

Nancy Czapek (NC), General Services Administration (GSA)

Steve Schwartz (SS), GSA

Pamela Wessling (PW), RSM McGladrey (RSM)

John Thompson (JT), RSM

Giles Moore (GM), Koetter Kim & Associates (KKA)

Mona Khechen (MK), KKA

Emily Eig (EE), EHT Tracerics, Inc. (EHT)

Carrie Albee (CA), EHT

The meeting began shortly after 9:00AM in the Moynihan Conference Room at the offices of NCPC. These meeting minutes do not attempt to provide a linear record of the meeting, but rather groups the comments of participants into topical areas.

OPENING REMARKS

NC provided opening remarks regarding the project, the process, and project status. The purpose of the meeting was to review draft guidelines for the Home pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The committee was informed that AFRH sent out a request for qualifications (RFQ) on October 12th for development of zones 3 and 4 (east side of the campus) and historic buildings located within those zones.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

NC stated that GSA is interested in the committee's comments on the guidelines for the entire site which were presented at the meeting, with particular focus on zones 3 & 4. The RFQ for zones 3 and 4 went out to the development community. During this working session, she explained, the group will review historic and urban design analyses that informed the proposed guidelines. With the site model that was prepared by KKA, participants can gain an understanding of the scale of the project and what is being proposed. The model includes several different options. With the committee's input, GSA will refine the guidelines and develop them in greater specificity to review with the committee at the next committee meeting in two weeks.

GM gave a Power point presentation of the following:

- Master Plan objectives,
- Design Framework,
- Existing Conditions, and
- Proposed Urban Design Framework.

He followed that with a presentation of the model and various options to use as a tool to explain the guidelines and what they might look like. The options are for illustrative purposes only. The guidelines are not intended to be prescriptive and define block by block what will be built. They are instead intended to capture key elements that should be observed when development occurs and they are generally more performance based than prescriptive.

EE presented information on the historic features, the eight historic Character Areas and historic views from the site.

The discussion that ensued encompassed the following key topics:

- The pastoral character of the site and the introduction of more urban elements,
- Historic elements and buildings,
- Open space,
- Views, view sheds and vistas,
- Density,
- Streets and bike paths,
- Plans for existing buildings,
- AFRH plans for a new facility, and
- NTHP plans.

HISTORIC FEATURES

Guidelines for addressing the historic character of the site were shown, including contributing buildings, views, open space and wooded areas, historic streets and allees of streets. Thus, historic character came up in discussion of most of the topic areas included within the minutes as well as the topics described in this section – the period of significance, the historic eligibility of the site as a whole, what Lincoln saw when he came to the site and incentives to developers to rehabilitate historic buildings.

LB – The period of significance was discussed at the last meeting. The end date reported in the AFRH Historic Structures report (1944) precedes the cold war and a number of large buildings on the campus. I would like to have a better understanding of how AFRH arrived at the end date for period of significance.

EE – In preparing our Historic Structures report for the property, we did not research the 1950's era buildings, so we don't have additional information to provide. The end date for the period of significance (1944) was the year in which the AFRH took a comprehensive survey of the existing physical plant in preparation for the 1947 and 1953 Master Plans that followed (and would, as we know, radically depart from the former approach to development at the Home). This year signals the beginning of the post-war Master Planning process and the end of the century of traditional development patterns at the Home.

GS – Harewood Road and Rock Creek Church Road are 19th c. intact historic roadways and are immensely significant.

EE – In 1988 the entire site was listed as eligible.

LB – Will AFRH provide incentives for rehab of existing buildings?

NC – AFRH and GSA are investigating options for the rehabilitation of existing buildings on the site. We are looking into historic tax credits and wish to explore other options that might be available. In that regard, if the SHPO knows of programs that

might be of benefit, we request that you forward information to us, so that we might point developers towards programs that will achieve the rehabilitation that we are seeking.

SL – There is a pronounced difference between new and historic buildings on the site. NPS would like AFRH to demolish the Scott Building so that the view shed from Lincoln’s cottage can be restored.

NC – The Scott Building is one of the main residential buildings for the Home and it is fully occupied.

GS – Is there a method that can be employed to achieve compatibility of new construction with the historic buildings?

LB – The AFRH team should identify features of the adjacent neighborhood, including scale massing and materials. The Design Guidelines should encourage responsiveness to context. Plus, AFRH should reintroduce historic entrances to the site.

EE – There are no historic elements on Irving Street.

GS – We are concerned that AFRH is taking a “Crystal City” approach to North Capitol Street. A wall of office buildings abutting the historic avenue is not the correct approach. Can the buildings in Zone 3 step back from North Capitol Street?

LB – What are the preservation plans for contributing buildings on the AFRH site over the next twenty years? She requested that this be addressed with specificity in the design guidelines.

NC – AFRH wants there to be adaptive re-use of historic buildings will solicit proposals for adaptive re-use of contributing buildings that are excess to its needs. Contributing buildings are indicated on the plan (in black). We seek to provide adaptive re-use for those contributing buildings that are surplus to the needs of AFRH.

SL - Rock Creek Church Road was the route Lincoln traveled and has historic value.

SH - Correction, Lincoln’s route to Old Soldier’s home was via 7th St.

OPEN SPACE

The presentation and model showed open space that will remain within the areas that will be reserved for AFRH, which include the golf course and central green spaces with zone 1, and portions of zone 2. In zones 3 and 4, a substantial portion of the meadow will remain and guidelines were prepared to address that space. New development in zones, 3, 4, 5 and 6 would also be required to protect some existing open space and/or create new ones. These areas will likely be outside of a new secured perimeter and publicly accessible for the most part, depending on the development proposals.

Discussion about open space generally revolved around the following:

- Neighbors' interests in preserving the open space, especially near their homes, and making it publicly accessible;
- Creation and/or retention of green space as a buffer between new development and adjacent streets;
- Continuity of open space within the development zones; and
- Views of open space from surrounding areas.

SH - Residents (of the surrounding neighborhood) appreciate the open green space. The only concern for open space expressed by AFRH is from within the site. We would like to see a balance of built environment and park space. Ideally, we would like the open space dedicated to neighborhood use. AFRH should at least provide a green buffer along the perimeter of the site.

GM-We will show a buffer on the guidelines.

NC-I would like to remind Sandra that open space on the site is not currently accessible. AFRH is looking for ways to make some areas of the site accessible to the public, while being mindful that AFRH's primary responsibility is for the residents and their security.

SL-Are you suggesting that AFRH will provide open space for the neighbors to walk in?

NC – Yes, we are looking at providing some areas of the site with accessibility to the neighbors.

HA - Will the central open space on the AFRH campus will be accessible to neighbors?

SH - No, the central open space (golf course) will be closed off from the neighborhood, and be visually obscured by development. How does this contribute to the quality of life

in the neighborhood? What's left? Is a narrow green space on the edge of the development for walking dogs and kids?

NC - A portion of the edge will remain undeveloped. 100 acres on the interior of the site will continue to be open space. With development, the secured perimeter will change and there are portions of the site that will become accessible, portions of which are open space.

SH – The proposed open space/buffer would be a more valuable asset to the neighborhood were it connected so that it could be utilized as a bicycle route for commuting.

DM – The NPS would like to see a balance of landscape features included in the preservation plan for the site.

TD – The forested area of Zone 2 is an important buffer.

SH - Federal elements of the comprehensive plan receive an imbalance of the open space. The city and federal governments should work towards alternates that may involve land swaps. The neighborhood association is exploring ways to meet AFRH's financial needs. It is important to maintain an historic sense of retreat; the Lincoln Cottage is a place of retreat. Financial needs of AFRH can be satisfied from various sources. This land is location specific.

JM - On the North Capitol St. route to downtown, the AFRH site provides relief for commuters -- green pause from the dense urban fabric. NCPC would like to see some of the buildings on the North Capitol St. edge present an inviting face to the street. How much green will be sacrificed? NCPC would like to see a balance between the built environment and the existing green buffer.

LB – The open space contained in Zone 3 and 4 is too isolated. You should work to achieve visual and pedestrian continuity with the other open spaces contained in these zones. New open space should be contiguous with pasture and act as a transition to the scale of existing buildings. The quadrangle shown on the model is inviting. I would like to see sample illustrations in the Design Guidelines.

VIEWS

The presentation showed existing and historic views and view sheds, and the height and open space guidelines were prepared to protect certain views. Comments on views generally concerned views into the site and views of open space and wooded areas.

DM - Long distance views were established by the McMillan Commission in 1902. AFRH is a wooded hill top. The NPS would like to see the site maintained as parkland contributing to the treed city image. Views of AFRH viewed from outside the site are important, not just the view from the adjoining neighborhood, but from the steps of the Capitol. Ninety foot high trees represent a 50-year investment. AFRH should be looking at the landscape with the 50-year investment in mind.

LB - External views into the site are important. The AFRH team needs to produce photographs or video to capture the important external view into the site. It would be helpful for the PA Committee to better understand. Development can be a buffer. Views from the Scott Statue, and intimate views from off the site should be maintained.

SL - From the Frederick Douglas house in Anacostia, the AFRH site is visible.

GM-We will be supplementing the Proposed Urban Design Framework by adding external views for other zones. (Zone 6 external views currently shown).

LB – Your model shows the upper range of the proposed density. We would like to see alternatives. The DC Office of Historic Preservation would like to stress that view sheds are important to preserve.

BZ – The proposed height of the buildings doesn't include the mechanical penthouse which will further intrude.

LB – The SHPO will review the Design Guidelines very closely regarding penthouse protrusions into the view sheds.

ROAD LAYOUT AND DENSITY

The presentation included 3 street typologies for major and minor roadways. Except for a connecting route between Irving Street and North Capitol Street, the exact layout of the streets was not specified in the guidelines. This generated discussion which principally related to the pastoral character of the site as compared to a more urban character that might be created, in part, if the street grid is rectilinear as compared to curvilinear. The discussion also addressed the density on the site as a whole and for zones 3 and 4, which

were generally viewed as the zones most capable of supporting density, and the zones for which the most detailed guidelines were presented at this meeting..

LB - Are the street patterns recommended because of existing patterns? Isn't zone 4 currently meadow & woods?

GM – Yes, Zone 4 is currently a meadow. We are not recommending a particular street pattern, but rather stating that the Irving Street entrance and bridge over North Capitol Street are to connect. Our guidelines call for a major road connecting these two entrances.

GS - Will the proposed road from Irving Street to the North Capitol Street bridge provide a short-cut through to the Catholic University (CUA) campus?

JW – The connection is only to the on/off ramps of North Capitol Street; the gate to CUA is open only at certain hours.

LB – Your plan should minimize streets on the site.

TD – What do you want the layout of streets to look like? Do you want an extension of the city grid or are you looking for curvilinear arrangement that responds to the landscape elements? You need to be more definitive about how you want the streets arranged.

GM – We would like to allow for flexibility in street location and arrangement. Other than the requirement that a major street (defined in the guidelines) connects the Irving Street entrance from the south with the North Capitol Street entrance on the east side of Zone 3, we would like to leave it up to the market to determine the best, most efficient arrangement of streets in this zone, using the 3 street typologies shown in the guidelines. We feel that we will achieve the best results with this approach.

DM – This is a romantic landscape. The planning team should think like Olmsted.

TD – The proposed plan is going to be different than a romantic landscape.

PW – The street pattern will depend on the uses in Zone 3 and 4. When we have completed the RFQ / RFP process, we will have a much better idea of whether this will be predominantly commercial or residential, and this will help to define what is needed for the layout of streets.

HA – The width of streets being proposed suggest a certain density in this zone.

GM – There are a variety of street widths proposed, depending on the function that they serve. The model shows a density of construction that is consistent with the design guidelines and the published density figures we provided you last month and in the DEIS. These are for illustrative purposes and not dictating a particular plan. We use the model to help analyze various alternatives.

DM – The plan should preserve Pershing Drive in Zone 4.

TD – I have a concern with the proposed density on the site. Where did the targeted FAR and total square footage numbers included in the previous presentation come from?

HA – How much money will be generated by the development plan?

PW – The proposed development plan is for the next twenty years. At what rate will the proposed density be absorbed? It is difficult to predict. Market projections of demand and financial returns are generally considered somewhat reliable for 5 year period. With a twenty-plus year absorption, it isn't possible to gain accurate projections of revenues. As well, the revenue will depend on the mix of uses that are eventually developed.

GS – Can a suburban office park density be a model for development on the ARFH site? How did you arrive at the proposed building heights?

GM - The proposed hierarchy of street widths helped to formulate the datum height (height at which buildings step back). It is the proportion of the street height to width that we are seeking to achieve on the primary streets.

JM - Will security requirements for setbacks to protect against blasts limit potential users?

GM – These properties do not anticipate federal tenants as primary occupants. We are not planning DoD mandated setbacks. This might have the affect of limiting some federal tenants from consideration.

TD – AFRH should prepare a rough street plan, set up rough parcel size and locations and calculate the value of the proposed development. Differing uses should be clustered within Zones 3/4.

GM – Request that committee review the proposed density shown at Zone 3.

LB – Regarding Zone 6, we prefer an extension of the adjacent street grid as an organizing element for the proposed residential development. Are the proposed entrances in the correct location?

DM – Has AFRH confirmed that the bridge over North Capitol Street (that is currently being renovated) adequate for the increased quantity of traffic?

JM - Was there a transportation management plan prepared for the site?

NC – Yes, it is covered in the DEIS and developers will be required to have a plan as part of the project mitigation.

AFRH FACILITIES

New facilities for AFRH are proposed in the plan for zones 1 and 2, and existing buildings in zones 1 and 2 retained. Most buildings in zone 3 and 4 are not used by AFRH, except LaGarde Building and Pipes Building (temporarily). The guidelines encourage developers to adaptively re-use buildings which are considered as contributing to the historic character of the site.

GS - What is being proposed for the existing maintenance facilities in zone 3?

JW - Maintenance buildings on the east side of the site are primarily vacant buildings and are slated for demolition, except for the one contributing building.

SL-The Smithsonian greenhouses are still in use.

TJ - The Smithsonian greenhouses could be utilized to produce hydroponic vegetables for AFRH.

JW-We are looking for alternate locations to relocate the Smithsonian greenhouses on the site in Zone 1.

LB-What facilities in zone 3 and 4 are currently being used by AFRH?

NC-Pipes Building was brought back into service temporarily to house Gulfport residents, and the LaGuarde Building is occupied. AFRH would like to relocate the nursing home and dementia functions housed in the LaGarde Building to the northern part of the campus to better integrate those residents with AFRH operations, but this idea will require more study. Some of the smaller buildings are being used by AFRH as residences for staff.

JW-AFRH wants to relocate all residents to the northern end of the campus for greater efficiency in operations.

HA – What are the new buildings shown on the model, how are they funded?

GM – Some of the new buildings in zone 1 are for illustrative purposes. For example, small buildings could flank green space in front of the Grant Building and create a quadrangle.

NC – Other buildings would be for AFRH purposes, such as a replacement for LaGarde Building, and for parking. AFRH does not currently have funding for, nor has it fully studied that option.

NW - Will the golf course remain unchanged?

NC - A couple of the holes on the southern edge of the site (zone 4) might be relocated closer to the Scott Building.

SL - Is the golf course the 100 acres you referred to?

NC - The 100 acres includes the golf course and core of AFRH campus.

INTENT OF THE GUIDELINES

JM – Will new buildings be compatible with existing? Do you intend a stylistic contrast with buildings on campus? NCPC is concerned that the scale of the development blocks will influence the setting. The development plans should reflect the arrangement on campus. What is shown on the model does not appear to be residential; it feels more commercial or institutional. How do you plan on achieving your goal? Your approach does not utilize zoning; you are not proposing a street layout, nor specifying size of floor plates or overall massing?

GM – The Design Guidelines allow for multiple scenarios; they are guidelines and don't prescribe a single outcome. We plan on reviewing developers proposals for conformance to the broad directions contained in the guidelines. Different zones have differing goals. In some areas, we require a percentage of open space. Major roads are a certain width and have specific building heights which face the major roads. While allowing flexibility in how the market pursues street patterns and block arrangements, the guidelines control where the tallest buildings will be placed, in relation to the required open space, and other specific components of the development.

INFRASTRUCTURE

TD – Someone has to incur the cost of constructing the streets and associated utility work.

BZ – Has AFRH done an infrastructure survey?

NC – As part of the EIS process, AFRH has surveyed the existing infrastructure that is available to service the site and reported on the findings.

NTHP OPERATIONS ON THE SITE

SL – AFRH needs to re-assess the Eagle Gate. Is it sufficient for the 20,000 visitors who are expected to visit the site annually?

NC/PW - The DEIS addresses traffic. DC Department of Transportation discouraged AFRH from opening any additional northern gates. NTHP is required to prepare environmental analyses for its activities on the site that will supplement the work being conducted by AFRH.

SL – Your model shows a proposed building in the parking lot for the National Monument. NTHP would like to have the parking lot adjacent to the Grant Building for its operations on the site.

NC – The Grant Building parking lot is essential to the building's commercial viability and is not available for National Trust operations.

LB – The parking requirements for the National Monument must be addressed.

NC – We are discouraging parking buses on the site. AFRH has communicated to the NTHP its responsibilities in regards to operating on this site. They are required to prepare an amendment to the Environmental Impact Statement which addresses estimates of numbers of visitors, transportation and parking. To date, we have not received the requested material.

REGULATORY

There was discussion of the regulatory process. GSA and NCPC maintain that development on Federally-owned property does not require zoning but is reviewed through the NCPC master planning process.

TD – With a long term lease arrangement on federal property, does this preclude adherence to DC zoning requirements?

NC – The project is not required to be permitted through DCRA.

TD – A developer can not build on federal land without DC Zoning approval.

BZ – This issue came up with the NPS and trailer being utilized for Charter School classrooms.

TD – GSA should get its legal department to draft a memorandum.

NC – GSA attorneys are currently engaged in that effort.

PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

NC reiterated the need for the signators to provide comments on the Programmatic Agreement that was circulated to them last year. The next draft will then be shared with all committee members. LB agreed to provide initial comments on the Programmatic Agreement but expressed that it was premature for Master Plan comments. HA-This is the first round of comments. Comments in future drafts should be shared with all review parties and GSA agreed to that.

ARCHEOLOGICAL STUDIES

LB asked if an analysis of archeological resources included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) PW responded that the findings on archeological resources are in the DEIS. A draft report on these resources was submitted to the SHPO and revisions made based on the SHPO's comments prior to inclusion of the information in the DEIS.

GULFPORT HOME

A question was asked about the status of the Gulfport site and whether or not it would be abandoned. JW explained that some of the wooden structures on site were damaged beyond repair and will be demolished. However, there are no current plans to demolish the residential tower at Gulfport. AFRH has requested funds from Congress to renovate the residential tower at Gulfport .

FINANCIAL ALTERNATIVES TO DEVELOPMENT AT AFRH-W

A question was asked about other options being pursued by AFRH to increase its revenues, with the comment from SL that this current funding arrangement is over 150 years old and should be reviewed and updated. The NTHP would like to see a comprehensive review of all available options to obtain funding. NTHP will assist AFRH in gaining public support for other options.

NC – The AFRH is proceeding with very specific direction from Congress. AFRH was authorized Congress to leverage its real estate asset to increase revenues in the Trust Fund in order to provide a funding stream for the Home's operations and capital improvements. AFRH is limited in how it can invest its funds but is interested in legislation that could change that. AFRH has also revamped its operations to reduce operating costs.

BZ – The federal government could pursue land swaps elsewhere and attribute the revenues to AFRH.

NC – There is no available Federal land in the District of Columbia, other than land owned by NPS. GSA has no excess land in DC.

LB – How much revenue does AFRH need to generate with the project?

NC – Funding requirements change from year to year. It isn't possible to put an exact figure forward, because AFRH can not anticipate natural disasters and other unforeseen events. Real estate projections beyond five years are notoriously inaccurate. The Master Plan covers a twenty year period. We seek flexibility in the plan.

NEXT STEPS

GM – We plan on providing more specificity on the priorities and on the historic elements in each of the six development zones on the site.

LD – The views into the site are important, but we don't have the visual tools to evaluate their priority and level of importance. A video or additional photographs of external views into the site are important.

NC – We will include additional images with our next presentation. If possible, we will prepare a video, if not; more still images will be taken. We are working towards a submission to NCPC.

NC – We would like to circulate a draft Design Guidelines and solicit comments from the participants prior to submitting to NCPC.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

SECTION 106 COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: November 02, 2005 9:00AM – 1:00PM

Location DC Office of Planning

Attendees: Joseph Woo (JW),
Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W)
Hector Abreu Cintron (HA),
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)
Lisa Burcham (LB), DC State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO),
Tim Dennee (TD), SHPO
Rosalynn Taylor (RT), DC Office of Planning (DCOP)
Anita Hairston, DCOP
Nancy Witherell (NW), National Capitol Planning Commission (NCPC)
Tom Mayes (TM), National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)
Frank Milligan (FM), NTHP
Gary Scott (GS), National Park Service (NPS)
David Murphy (DM), NPS
Sandra Hoffmann (SH),
Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned (PCHCC)
Rebecca Miller (RM), D.C. Preservation League (DCPL)
Reyn Anderson (RA), United Neighborhood Coalition (UNC)
Timothy Jones (TJ), ANC-4C
Paul Brooks (PB), Catholic University of America (CUA)
Nancy Czapek (NC), General Services Administration (GSA)
Steve Schwartz (SS), GSA
John Thompson (JT), RSM McGladrey (RSM)
Giles Moore (GM), Koetter Kim & Associates (KKA)
Mona Khechen (MK), KKA
Emily Eig (EE), EHT Traceries, Inc. (EHT)
Carrie Albee (CA), EHT

This list represents all persons that signed the Section 106 Meeting sign-in sheet. There may be others who attended, however they are not included on this list.

OPENING REMARKS

The meeting began shortly after 9:00AM in the offices of The District of Columbia, Office of Planning. These meeting minutes do not attempt to provide a linear record of the meeting, but rather groups the comments of participants into topical areas related to the six proposed development zones.

NC provided opening remarks regarding the project, the process, and project status. The purpose of the meeting was to review draft guidelines for the Home pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The committee was informed that AFRH planned to modify the schedule for the project. A number of participants had expressed their concern that the project was moving too quickly and requested that AFRH allow more time for review of the Master Plan. In response to those requests, AFRH will submit the Master Plan to NCPC for its February meeting, rather than the January meeting as was previously scheduled. The next meeting of the Section 106 Committee, scheduled for November 16, 2005, has been canceled to allow the AFRH team time to prepare the Draft Master Plan and committee members to review the draft documents prior to the next scheduled meeting. The Draft Master Plan will be distributed by the end of November, hopefully by November 23, 2005.

SH indicated that she had prepared a brief (five minute) presentation that tied into potential development on the site and requested an opportunity to present.

NC asked that she hold her presentation until KKA had an opportunity to complete its prepared presentation.

SITE WIDE ISSUES

GM reviewed those historic features included in the design guidelines that are site-wide, including views, both internal and external, wooded areas and open land, tree lines, roads and paths and buildings.

RT – There is an ongoing study being conducted by the District of Columbia Government on open space in the District of Columbia. This study might inform the activities of the AFRH and be relevant to the concerns expressed by residents of adjacent neighborhoods.

TD – The Master Plan process is normally a comprehensive review of the entire site. AFRH is not clear on what its needs are in Zones 1 and 2, and are unclear on when the Home might proceed with Zones 5 and 6. HPRB suggests that the Master Plan be prepared with a focus on Zones 3 and 4, given the immediate need to produce revenue.

SH – We feel that this is a sensible approach. The review of the Master Plan should consider the open space needs of the capitol as a whole, not just the financial needs of the AFRH. The 106 process is supposed to look at adverse affects and potential mitigation. The PCHCC questions the need that has been promulgated by AFRH. We don't have figures to match up to those needs.

LB – It is a higher priority to minimize/avoid adverse affects in Zone 6 than affecting the scale and density of development proposed in Zones 3 and 4.

A summary of items to be considered in preparing the Master Plan was recorded on flip charts at this meeting. From the site-wide discussion, the item that was recorded was:

- D.C. STUDY OF OPEN SPACE NEEDS

ZONAL GUIDELINES

The design guidelines for the site are broken into each of the proposed development zones. A description of each zone, including area, goals and specifics of the zone introduce each of the zones.

ZONE 1

GM presented the ten-acre zone which contains the AFRH core residential facilities, both existing and proposed. The Zone 1 presentation included views into the site, and contributing buildings located in Zone 1, and it further described Zone 1 as containing three distinct sub-zones. Zone 1a, on the northern most portion of the site, contains two potential building sites. Zone 1b, on the eastern portion of the zone, is the area with the greatest potential development within Zone 1, and Zone 1c, which contains the Sheridan Building, is proposed to receive no development.

DM suggested that the comprehensive plan contained sections which are relevant to the proposed project. During Lincoln's presidency, the signal corps utilized high points in the District for communications, including portions of the AFRH. These high points are considered historic resources and should be respected.

TM –These signal locations should be included in the historic resources on the site.

SH-The signal corps should be seen in the context of the McMillan Plan, which is the center of my presentation.

LB-Is there a timetable for AFRH plan in regard to Zone 1?

NC-The revenue stream must be improved prior to undertaking a capital project like the buildings shown on the draft Master Plan. The revenue generated by AFRH activities in Zones 3 and 4 will drive the schedule for activities in Zone 1.

TM-I'm concerned with your proposal to construct a building between Lincoln Cottage and the Grant Building. It will block views from the Lincoln Cottage.

EE-Foundations on the site suggest that a building was previously located at the same site as the proposed building.

LB – Regarding the areas indicated for proposed building in Zone 1a, we would like to see a superimposed drawing which shows historic landscape elements and proposed building sites. HPRB wants to see an affirmative statement that includes a preservation plan section in the Draft Master Plan.

TM-The design guidelines should strengthen the public visitation component of activities in Zone 1.

SH – The traffic and transportation impact of the National Trust activities should be thoroughly documented as part of the Zone 1 Master Plan.

TD – What specifically is being planned for Zone 1a?

NC – The building proposed for Zone 1a has not been specifically identified at the present time.

A summary of items to be considered in preparing the Master Plan was recorded on flip charts at this meeting. From the Zone 1 discussion, the items that were recorded were:

- HISTORIC ELEMENTS: SIGNAL CORPS, MCMILLAN COMMISSION, and HISTORIC SIGHTLINES WITHIN CITY
- NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION
- LANDSCAPE FEATURES: PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS
- MASTER PLAN ISSUES
 - PRIORITIZE AFRH ACTIONS AND ESTIMATE IN 5 YEAR BLOCKS
 - OVERLAY PROPOSED BUILDING FOOTPRINTS AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS
 - INCLUDE AFFIRMATIVE STATEMENT THAT “DEFINED HISTORIC LANDSCAPE MAINTAINED”
- BUFFER EDGE
 - ALONG EASTERN EDGE OF ZONE 1, WHERE NEW DEVELOPMENT IS PLANNED
- PUBLIC VISITATION
 - INCLUDE AFFIRMATIVE STATEMENT IN MASTER PLAN

ZONE 2

GM presented the proposed design guidelines for Zone 2 development. He gave an overview of the location, the landscape features, the size of the zone (18 acres), and the existing open area (paved parking) in the center of the Chapel Woods. It is the intent of AFRH to utilize the central open area as an organizing element for locating most of the proposed housing in Zone 2. The remainder of housing would be located on the eastern edge of the zone. GM pointed out that there had been considerable loss of tree canopy during severe storm activities in 2004 and 2005. The design guidelines seek to preserve the pattern of roads and pathways within the zone and to maintain a majority of the existing trees located in Zone 2.

LB – What is the need for small scale housing shown in Zone 2?

JT – One of the intended purposes for the small scale housing is to provide residential facilities for married veterans who desire cohabitation.

LB – Is this seen as a continuation of the pattern of housing within the campus? Are you planning on protecting and preserving the existing detached housing on the site?

DM – It appears that the proposed location of houses will require destruction of trees within Zone 2. Does the suburban tract development model need to prevail, or can mature trees be left between houses?

GM – We have not conducted an inventory of existing trees in Zone 2. With careful siting of houses, a majority of the existing trees should be undisturbed. If we shift the western most row of houses to be more in line with the chapel, the existing trees on the western edge of Zone 2 should not be disturbed.

TD – Zone 2 is an important buffer on the site, between AFRH at the north end of the campus and the dense development proposed for Zones 3 & 4. Mitigation might involve planting not only replacement trees, where removed for housing, but also to replace trees that have been lost to storm events during the previous 18 months. The Master Plan should identify foreseeable needs of AFRH and propose solutions to those specific needs. The approach to Zone 2 should be no harm or removal of trees.

LB – AFRH should review the intensity of development in Zone 2. Is a suburban subdivision the proper model for development in this zone?

TM – AFRH should seek to maintain the wooded character of Chapel Woods.

A summary of items to be considered in preparing the Master Plan was recorded on flip charts at this meeting. From the Zone 1 discussion, the items that were recorded were:

- DENSITY: PREFER LESS DENSITY, SCATTER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS
- FOREST:
 - NO TREES HARMED OR DESTROYED
 - MITIGATE - REPLACE DISEASED/DEAD TREES
 - MITIGATE - PLANT ADDITIONAL TREES
 - QUANTIFY – HOW MANY TREES WILL BE REMOVED?
- DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIVE TO SITE FEATURE, HISTORIC TOPOGRAPHY
- DO NOT DIMINISH STYLE OF EXISTING HOUSING ON THE SITE
- GUIDELINES ILLUSTRATE BUILDING HEIGHTS

ZONES 3 & 4

GM reviewed the overall goals and approach to Zone 3 (55 acres) and Zone 4 (22 acres), views within the site, views through Zones 3 & 4, and external views into Zones 3 & 4. He illustrated the proposed green buffer along the North Capitol and Irving Street boundaries of the development zones. GM also review proposed building heights within Zones 3 & 4, and presented a site section which illustrates the significant change in elevation from the northern portion of the AFRH site (Zone 1) to Irving Street on the south edge of the site. The guidelines also illustrated the view corridor and the impact of the change in elevation on sightlines to the far reaches of the city.

GS requested clarification on the adequacy of existing streets, specifically Irving Street and the bridge over North Capitol Street, to handle the traffic generated by the proposed development within Zones 3 and 4.

JT – The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) includes traffic studies for both of the streets that you mentioned. The Final EIS will address the impacts and mitigation necessary as a result of a final alternative.

LB – The allee of trees along Pershing Drive might be lost with the intensity of development that is proposed for this portion of the site. Might there be a method of preserving the existing roadway? Possibly converting Pershing Drive to a bicycle path, or AFRH might look for another alternative. Mitigation in this zone would certainly need to address the loss of this allee of trees along Pershing Drive.

TM – Is it possible to clarify the language in the design guidelines regarding the 130' building height?

JT – Please review the material that was distributed at the October 19, 2005 meeting. This topic was covered in some degree of specificity at that meeting. KKA described the

relationship of the taller structures to open space within the zone. The design guidelines will include language from that presentation.

RT – The DCOP doesn't generally see buildings of 130' height outside of the central core. We feel that there should be further discussion of this height prior to proceeding. I personally like the varying height, but might want to see lower buildings.

TD – The NTHP does not want to see the additional height on the AFRH campus. Where there is no view shed, there isn't an issue. You also need to control the footprint of the higher buildings.

GM – The site section demonstrates that the taller buildings have a limited affect on views.

SH – The McMillan Commission Report, published in 1902, calls for concentration of density in areas already built up. The Old Soldier's Home was specifically noted as a contributing open space within the District of Columbia. Consistent with the community meetings that have been held, we want no development on any parcels at AFRH. We are ready and willing to take action to halt the plans that are underway.

There was discussion concerning the Irving Street entrance. The site model indicates a building on the east side of the entrance. TM felt that the building was too close to the entry and blocked views to the pasture and open space. TM voiced his opinion that there should be no building adjacent to the Irving Street entrance to allow a better entry sequence.

A summary of items to be considered in preparing the Master Plan was recorded on flip charts at this meeting. From the Zones 3 and 4 discussion, the items that were recorded were:

- CONFIRM ADEQUATE CAPACITY OF TRAFFIC INTERSECTIONS
NORTH CAPITOL STREET ENTRANCE
IRVING STREET ENTRANCE REQUIRES ADDITIONAL STUDY
- ENHANCE VIEW SHEDS, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL
- LOCATION OF TALLER BUILDINGS
FOOTPRINT
RELATION TO OPEN SPACE
OUTSIDE OF VIEW SHED
- BUFFER ZONE
WIDTH RESPONDS TO MICRO CONDITIONS
BICYCLE TRAIL
- PERSHING DRIVE
PROTECT ALLEE OF TREES OR
MITIGATE

THE MCMILLAN COMMISSION REPORT

SH requested that she be given an opportunity to speak to the Section 106 Committee regarding the McMillan Commission Report and its' pertinence to the work that was underway at AFRH. The Commission Report was prepared in 1902 and presented to the Senate in the same year. It called for a balance in the open space in the District of Columbia, with parkland provided for the residential areas of the city.

SH made the point that the area west of 16th Street, NW has large tracts of open park space available to the residents of those neighborhoods, and conversely, the neighborhoods east of 16th Street have far fewer resources available. SH stated that she would work to maintain the open space, especially on the western edge of the site.

LB – Does the NCPC incorporate the McMillan Commission Report in its operations?

NW – This is one of three plans that govern the operations of the NCPC. The AFRH plans for Zones 3 and 4 are consistent with the goals of the McMillan Report, in that it concentrates building in areas already developed.

ZONE 5

GM reviewed design guidelines for Zone 5 (8 acres), including external views, landscape elements, and proposed entrances to gain access to Zone 5.

DM used one of the external photographs to illustrate salient elements of a park border road (roadway that borders a park or open space). DM indicated that a park border road has trees on both sides of the street as a transition to the park beyond. A park border road is the road that runs along the edge of a park. DM explained that development in Zone 5 would have the result of shifting the park border (prior to development, Park Place is a park border road) further into the site. When development of Zone 5 occurs, Park Place will have development on both sides (existing houses on the west, new development on the east) and will no longer be a park border road as it passes beside Zone 5. The existing roadway that forms the eastern/northern edge of Zone 5 will become a park border road (development in Zone 5 on one side of the road, lakes and golf course on the opposite side of the road). DM suggested that AFRH should incorporate park border road elements (trees on both sides of the street). Further, the lakes are a neighborhood asset. The development plan should provide some 'breathing room' around the lakes, and not construct right up to the edge of the lakes. The goals of the McMillan Commission Report, as reported by SH, regarding continuity of open space from the McMillan Reservoir to Zone 5 should be pursued.

LB – If the lakes are not provided as a public amenity, then AFRH should decrease the proposed density of Zone 5 or forgo development in this zone altogether.

SH – The historic meadow and cultivated field are the greatest concern for neighborhood residents. Preservation of open space in Zone 6 is a higher priority than maintaining an undeveloped Zone 5.

LB – So, the neighborhood sees a trade-off between Zones 5 and 6.

SH – The neighborhood residents don't know the financial needs of AFRH and whether those needs will be satisfied by the proposed development in Zones 3 and 4. Maintaining open space on the western side of the campus will improve the development that is undertaken on the eastern side of the campus. AFRH should reduce its maintenance costs by reducing the mowing and other maintenance done on the open areas. They should explore a land transfer.

NC – If the NPS has properties of equal size and value that it would like to propose for a land transfer, NPS should prepare a proposal for GSA to consider. We made this request at previous meetings but have not received any proposals for land swaps.

DM – The NPS receives land for park purposes. Our mission is to provide active recreation space for citizens. What is being suggested is a major change in use of Federal land.

LB – How much revenue does AFRH anticipate from the development of their site?

A summary of items to be considered in preparing the Master Plan was recorded on flip charts at this meeting. From the Zone 5 discussion, the items that were recorded were:

- VIEW SHED FROM MCMILLEN RESERVOIR - PRESERVE
- CONTINUITY OF OPEN SPACE FROM MCMILLAN RESERVOIR - PRESERVE
- RETAIN HISTORIC TREE LINE (ROADWAY)
- 80' HEIGHT ADJACENT TO RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD IS PROBLEMATIC
- OPEN SPACE NEEDS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
- INCORPORATE PARK BORDER ROAD ELEMENTS
TREES, BUFFERING, SETBACKS
IF PARK BORDER ROAD FEATURES SHOULD BE INTRODUCED

ZONE 6

SH – Do not develop on this parcel.

TM – Lincoln’s route to the cottage passed the northern portion of Zone 6. The NTHP feels strongly that there should be no construction on this parcel, as it has potential adverse affect to the historic route.

SH – If you must develop in this area, PCHCC suggests that you build on the driving range and allow the cultivated gardens to remain undeveloped. We would like to see Zone 6 as recreation and open space.

LB – Is the NPS suggesting that we should entertain demolition of the houses on the north side of Park Road? Those houses were not present when Lincoln visited the site in 1850’s. We should attempt to entertain a compromise, as we surely are not going to demolish existing structures. Lincoln’s route is already compromised.

TM – The NTHP is adverse to development in Zone 6.

NW – Regarding the street pattern proposed for Zone 6, NCPC would like to see a pattern of streets that responds to the natural features of the landscape rather than a continuation of existing street grid.

SH – Can you relocate the golf course to the western edge of the site and move your proposed development to the central portion of the site?

TM – The NTHP wants AFRH to prepare a view shed analysis before it moves forward with development.

EE – What you are requesting is reasonable, however, commissioning such a study is not within the allowable funds at present. As an alternate approach, I would suggest that a development requirement for buildings taller than 85’ be that the developer prepare a rendering which describes the conditions. This will provide you with what you are requesting, but the cost will be shouldered by the development community rather than by AFRH.

LB – With enough greenery, an adequate screen could be provided for Zones 5 and 6. I would proceed with preparation of the Master Plan to include Zones 5 and 6 with the caveat that further study will be conducted when the AFRH economic conditions are better understood.

- PRESIDENT LINCOLN’S APPROACH ROUTE
PRESERVATION OF VIEWS
- PORTAL VIEW OF IVY GATE

- STREET LAYOUT,
RATHER THAN EXTEND EXISTING GRID, RESPOND TO SYLVAN
CHARACTER
- DENSITY
REDUCE DENSITY
- LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT
ZONE 6B DEVELOPMENT PREFERRED BY NEIGHBORHOOD
SOUTHERN PORTION OF ZONES 6A AND 6B
MAINTAIN VIEW SHED FROM PARK ROAD
- MITIGATION
ENTIRE ZONE 6A AND 6B AS MITIGATION FOR ALL OTHER
PORTIONS OF THE SITE
- LAKE ZONE
HOLD DEVELOPMENT AWAY FROM EDGE OF LAKE TO
PROVIDE “BREATHING ROOM”

The meeting concluded at 12:45.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT

HOME SECTION 106 COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: December 07, 2005 9:00AM - 11:00AM

Location AFRH-W, Sherman Building 2nd floor conference room

Attendees: Joseph Woo (JW), Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH-W)
Lisa Burcham (LB), DC State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO),
Tim Dennee (TD), SHPO
Tom Mayes (TM), National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)
Sophia Lynn (SL), NTHP
Frank Milligan (FM), NTHP
Gary Scott (GS), National Park Service (NPS)
David Murphy (DM), NPS
Rebecca Miller (RM), D.C. Preservation League (DCPL)
Barbara Zartman (BZ), Committee of 100 on the Federal City (C100)
Richard Houghton (RH), C100
Timothy Jones (TJ), ANC-4C
James Berry (JB), ANC-5C
Paul Brooks (PB), Catholic University of America (CUA)
David Moshier (DM), U.S. Army
Nancy Czapek (NC), General Services Administration (GSA)
Steve Schwartz (SS), GSA
Pamela Wessling (PW), RSM McGladrey (RSM)
John Thompson (JT), RSM
Giles Moore (GM), Koetter Kim & Associates (KKA)
Mona Khechen (MK), KKA
Emily Eig (EE), EHT Tracerics, Inc. (EHT)

This list represents all persons that signed the Section 106 Meeting sign-in sheet. There may be others who attended, however they are not included on this list.

OPENING REMARKS

The meeting began shortly after 9:00 AM in the second floor conference room of the Sherman Building at AFRH-W.

Copies of the Draft Master Plan and project schedule were distributed to all attendees.

NC provided opening remarks regarding the status of the project and the process. The purpose of the meeting was to review Draft Master Plan for AFRH-W, especially those portions of the document that have been revised to reflect input from the

committee. NC mentioned that, prior to the meeting, LB expressed thoughts on how the project should move forward.

LB - Following the KKA presentation, I will review thoughts on the larger Master Plan issues with the committee.

The committee was informed that AFRH will submit the Draft Master Plan to NCPC for review at its February 2, 2006 meeting. The Draft Master Plan was posted to the project web site on December 1, 2005. NC mentioned two events associated with public participation in the master plan process: a tour of the site was conducted on Saturday, December 3rd with approximately 75 participants, and an Open House will be held at the Sherman Building on December 13th to review the Draft Master Plan with the public.

LB - I was contacted by HNTB (architectural firm) regarding a tour of the property for potential developers. It is my understanding that HNTB's request was made after the extension, and that they were denied access to the site. She was asked to send information on the contact and GSA will check to see if any requests were made post the deadline for signing up for tours.

DESIGN FRAMEWORK AND GUIDELINES

GM reviewed Section 11 (Design Framework and Guidelines) of the Draft Master Plan.

NC - Regarding the historic fence along the eastern portion of the site, in Zones 5 and 6, neighbors who attended the tour on Saturday requested that portions of the historic fence be modified. Zones 5 and 6 do not require the same level of security as those portions of the site occupied by AFRH residents. The razor wire can be removed from the southern portions of the historic fence. The neighborhood residents asked that consideration be given to making the fence permeable and allowing pedestrian passage through the fence rather than going through the gates where automobile traffic is directed. It was felt that a more permeable fence would better integrate the new residential development into the fabric of the neighborhood.

LB - It is premature to address the openings in the historic fence. When a developer is selected and a specific proposal is presented, the SHPO will review that proposal.

The Design Framework and Guidelines presentation continued (GM) with initial focus on issues which affect site as a whole, including:

- Views, external and internal,
- Historic features; including landscape elements and buildings (contributing and non-contributing),
- Streets and streetscapes, and
- Built form.

SL - What is the Home's approach to preservation of contributing buildings?

LB - This issue should be held for the larger discussion following the KKA presentation.

GM – Following the sections of the guidelines that address the site as a whole, the Design Framework and Guidelines focus on individual zones.

ZONE 1

- Zone 1, activity primarily for AFRH’s own needs
 - Historic landscape and buildings
 - Proposed open space, and
 - Views, external into site and internal to Lincoln Cottage.
- Sub-zones of Zone 1
 - Sub-zone 1a with minimal development (flanking open space), and
 - Sub-zone 1b, the primary location for Zone 1 construction activity, and
 - Sub-zone 1c, little or no construction activity anticipated.
- Location of open space as organizing element in proposed new building locations,
- Replacement structure to address displaced parking (eliminated if a new nursing home is constructed in Sub-zone 1b) at the northern section of Sub-zone 1b, and
- Proposed building heights will relate to existing adjacent building scale, 80’ on the east side of the site and 55’ on the north side of the site.

LB – The National Historic Landmark (NHL) has higher status on the site. Views of the NHL are being scrutinized. The SHPO is reviewing external views; It is important to examine what portions of the NHL can be seen by the public viewing from outside of the fence.

ZONE 2

- Chapel Woods (Zone 2), proposed for residential use by AFRH for its own needs:
 - Historic landscape, pathways, roadways, and
 - Historic buildings.
- Sub-zones of Zone 2:
 - Sub-zone 2a: insert houses within existing trees, and
 - Sub-zone 2b: surface parking area converted to an organizing open space with new housing units located facing the open space, and
 - Sub-zone 2c: new housing inserted along the eastern edge of the zone.

LB – We have concern regarding potential damage to existing trees during construction, and concern with the introduction of additional paved surface to Zone 2. The graphics included in the Draft Master Plan are misleading regarding the detrimental affect that proposed construction activity will have on existing trees. The Design Framework and Guidelines need greater specificity regarding preservation of existing trees.

TD – The Design Framework and Guidelines should demonstrate sensitivity to maintaining existing trees in Zone 2. Without specificity in the guidelines, you will end up with scattered trees adjacent to residential development in Zone 2. The preferred outcome is preservation of dense tree coverage in Zone 2. Specific areas where you propose insertion of residential construction need better documentation to determine exact tree locations to determine feasibility of your proposal.

LB - The SHPO feels that AFRH should take additional time to better develop standards for Zone 2. The guidelines should specify that the roads will be maintained in the same location and the same dimension. Guidelines need to protect maximum tree coverage and require new tree plantings. The scale of new construction needs to respond to the site.

TD - The 106 consultation process seeks to minimize adverse affects of the Master Plan. We see Zone 2 as an opportunity for mitigation of activities that are proposed elsewhere on the site. How do we identify the adverse affects?

DM - What happens if AFRH grows beyond the projections that are contained within this 20 year planning document?

LB - There is a large tract of open space on the site (golf course) that could be developed at some future date, and can accommodate future AFRH expansion.

NC - The proposed development in Sub-zone 1c along North Capitol Street will accommodate growth for AFRH.

LB - The SHPO suggests that Zone 2 be placed in the Draft Master Plan as a "Study Area" for the twenty year period. Zone 2 should be part of the next twenty year Master Plan, rather than the current plan.

ZONES 3 and 4

- Historic Features, including the meadow and Pershing Road
- Views
- Sub-zones of Zone 3 and 4
 - Sub-zone 3a: primarily open space, only 10% coverage allowed, and
 - Sub-zone 3b: primarily open space (maintain 4 acres), and
 - Sub-zone 3c and Zone 4 are the location of the densest development proposed for the site; they contain a series of interconnected open spaces within the development area.
- The Design Framework and Guidelines contain specific controls on location of taller buildings in the development zones and specify that taller buildings be located adjacent to open space.

GS -NPS properties contain significant maintenance facilities. The Master Plan anticipates demolition of AFRH maintenance yard. How do you propose to support the entire facility without a maintenance yard?

NC - Except for the central heating plant, the buildings located in the maintenance yard are vacant. A couple of buildings are used to store busses, none for maintenance. Those functions have been out-sourced.

TM - At the last meeting there was discussion regarding the Irving Street gate and location of buildings in relation to the gate. The diagram on page 60 of the Draft Master

Plan shows a building directly adjacent to the Irving Street entrance. I understood from the last meeting that no building would be located in close proximity to the gate. We need to preserve green space and the view into the site.

GM - If you refer to the Illustrative Development Scenario on page 63 of the Draft Master Plan, you will see that a pair of buildings frames the Irving Street entrance. The buildings have been shifted north from Irving Street, providing open space at the entrance.

LB - You set the tone at the entrance of the site. You should seek to protect the pastoral character at the entrance. The SHPO would like to see the setback issue addressed at the Irving Street gate, and in general, in a more quantitative approach in the Master Plan.

TD - Why are you proposing to frame the view at the Irving Street gate? What is the point?

LB - Protection of view sheds need more specificity in the Design Guidelines. New construction should be prohibited in specific areas, these should be delineated in the Master Plan.

TD - Regarding the open space in Zones 3 and 4, the relationship between void and landscape should be better addressed. The pasture is maintained as open space, yet constructing eight and ten story buildings along the edge of the pasture changes one's perception of the open space, changes one's understanding. What is the prescription? The pasture is transformed. It might not be the logical feature on the site to be targeted for preservation. If Zone 4 is developed as residential use, might the open space be better located along Irving Street?

LB - What do the constructed buildings need for space around them? The pasture is compromised. Preservation of the pasture isn't necessary with the quantity of development that is being proposed. Pershing Drive is the landscape feature that should receive greater priority in planning this portion of the site. Pershing Drive should be maintained along with the alee of trees. I recognize that the existing width of Pershing Drive is inadequate to accommodate traffic generated on the site. We would like to work with you on achieving a satisfactory outcome that preserves some or all of Pershing Drive within Zone 4. The experience of passing through the tree canopy should somehow be incorporated into the final plans for the site.

EE - I would push for a pedestrian path or bicycle path, not as an element in a park.

LB - You need to keep pushing to maintain Pershing Drive in Zone 4. Keep the connection as pedestrian or bicycle path.

NC - We might need to better articulate the problem, not articulate a solution.

TD - You are doing what is appropriate - consulting with developers on achieving an acceptable solution.

JT - While it is not an ideal solution, one possible approach would be to remove trees from one side of Pershing Drive, widen the street, then plant trees along the roadway.

SL - This would create an imbalance and is the wrong approach.

TD - The layout of this zone is unknown.

LB - I would like to see a roadwork system in place. Circulation character is important. Regarding the buffer zone, you should identify a minimum dimension and maintain flexibility within your guidelines.

GM - The Plan specifies 18' as a minimum buffer zone.

GS - A 50' to 60' is a more appropriate width for a buffer zone.

GM - The 18' is within the property line. Actual width is generally greater, and 18' is a minimum dimension. We are allowing for variations to respond to site features.

TD - The guidelines for building height allow for maximum flexibility. Why would a developer build less than the 85' maximum allowed? What would induce less than the 65' street frontage? It seems that the guidelines recognize the bulk of development that is being proposed with the set back requirements. Isn't there a better way to address the bulk of proposed buildings? There is too much similar building proposed.

GM - The guidelines establish a horizontal control line, and step back on the top two floors. The tallest structures on the site are set at 130', but the vast majority of the proposed construction builds to 65', then steps back before reaching the 85' maximum.

RM - Who gets to build to the 130' height?

NC - NCPC is the governing authority that has the final say regarding building on the site.

LB - Can you capture language that spells out the relationship of tall buildings to open space?

GM - Page 59 of the Draft Master Plan contains language that describes conditions that must be met for a building to exceed the 85' height limit in Zones 3 and 4.

PW - AFRH needs the conference room at 11:00 this morning. Rather than continuing the discussion about the remaining zones in the same level of specificity, we should attempt to conclude our discussion about the overall proposal contained in the Draft Master Plan.

LB - Zones 5 and 6 and Zones 1 and 2 are important development areas. We recognize that AFRH has an immediate need for revenue generation from their real estate. The

Design Guidelines are in greater specificity for Zones 3 and 4, and this is the area that AFRH is ready to move forward. I suggest that you proceed with Zones 3 and 4, but continue your planning efforts on the remaining portions of the site. AFRH can pursue parallel tracks; a MOA for Zones 3 and 4 to meet immediate financial needs of AFRH and, continue with greater specificity on planning the remaining areas on the site.

NC - The Master Plan document needs to consider the whole site and how each of the areas relates to the whole. While we don't need finalization of Zones 1 and 2 and Zones 5 and 6, we need a balance and an understanding of how the individual zones relate to the whole.

LB - AFRH should move forward with a separate MOA on the Grant Building. It will be easier to deal with Zones 3 and 4 and the non-contributing buildings in those zones. We can work together to achieve solutions to these zones while AFRH is still drafting a plan for the remainder of the site. I will not take the Draft Master Plan to the Historic Preservation Review Board at present; there are too many questions outstanding.

What does NCPC expect? The SHPO is willing to provide Zones 3 and 4 specific inputs.

Questions still remain regarding AFRH development and reuse of buildings on the site. We have not seen a preservation plan; there is no long-term maintenance plan for contributing buildings on the site. This plan is for redevelopment, not preservation. The preservation component is not clearly expressed.

NC - How do we get further clarification from the Office of Planning?

TM - Your plan treats Zones 3 and 4 differently. You don't address AFRH's own needs or NTHP needs on the site. What about their parking requirements? What about NTHP access and security? AFRH needs to work out details of a visitation plan. We suggest that the critical needs are moved along, and that a separate 106 process be initiated for the remainder of the site. The plan needs to address the protection of the historic character as a whole.

SL - The Grant Building is an "X factor", or unknown. Without a preservation plan, the broader scope of mission is missing. This can have a profound affect on the National Monument.

LB - I suggest that NC and Nancy Witherell (NCPC) have a separate discussion about next steps.

TD - The RFQ response should inform the overall process. When responses are received, you should have a better idea about proposed use, circulation within the site and other unknown issues.

GS - The Draft Master Plan has addressed the need for public open space on the site.

The meeting concluded promptly at 11:00AM.

AFRH-W – MEETING RE: PRESERVATION PLAN

March 22, 2006

MINUTES

Attendees: Hector Abreu, ACHP
Carrie Albee, EHT Tracerics
Tim Dennée, DC SHPO
Emily Eig, EHT Tracerics
Gene Keller, NCPC
Doug Pulak, GSA
John Thompson, RSM McGladrey
Nancy Witherell, NCPC

Began 2:05 PM. Hector Abreu, Carrie Albee, Gene Keller, Doug Pulak, John Thompson, and Nancy Witherell present.

Nancy Witherell began the formal discussion by stating that NCPC wanted to review the final Master Plan and the final Preservation Plan together.

Project Update

Doug Pulak stated that GSA has identified a Project Manager for the AFRH-W development. This person is scheduled to begin mid-April and will report to the Director of Disposal. Nancy Czapek, former Director of Disposal, has been promoted within GSA but will remain involved in the project. A new Director has been selected from within GSA and has begun to transition into the position.

Doug Pulak stated that the review panel will be making a recommendation of qualified responders to Tim Cox by the end of the month. John Thompson explained that the Selection Panel was comprised of 2 people from GSA, Joe Woo (AFRH architect), 1 person from the Administrative Office of the Courts, and 1 person from the NIH.

Tim Dennée joined at 2:13 PM.

Doug Pulak confirmed that the RFQ was for Zones 3 & 4 only, and stated that at this point the qualifications were of primary interest, although the concepts submitted in response were also considered. Doug Pulak stated that the RFP was scheduled to be sent out in early summer. It is anticipated that the next version of the draft AFRH-W Master Plan will be submitted to NCPC after a developer is selected.

Doug Pulak stated that at this point it appeared that the AFRH is open to taking Zone 6 off the table for any development at this time.

Nancy Witherell stated that it was her understanding that the deadline for the submittal for the Master Plan was November or December 2006. She indicated that the developer should be on board for that, and that NCPC wanted the Preservation Plan to be part of

that submission so that the Board could review the documents at the same time. Therefore, the draft documents need to come out before that, and working back from that date that is a short timeframe.

Doug Pulak responded by stating that the exact dates will be firmed up when the Project Manager is in place. NCPC, ACHP, and DC SHPO requested an updated sequence of project milestones/major tasks.

Nancy Witherell inquired as to the participation of CFA. She stated that CFA had not seen the Master Plan, and that they should since reviewing master plans is in their purview.

Doug Pulak stated that the meetings with Consulting Parties would begin again at the beginning of the summer.

Preservation Plan

Tim Dennée stated that he would like to see a more specific assessment of impacts, mitigation, and minimization. He indicated that this was the most important part of the Preservation Plan. Likely (adverse) effects need to be clearly stated so that they can be fully analyzed, minimized and mitigated.

Nancy Witherell and Hector Abreu concur that the Preservation Plan needs to be given to the developers and that it needs to inform their responses to the RFP. This is particularly important for Zones 3 and 4. This is the only way for the Preservation Plan to be an effective mitigation.

Hector Abreu referenced the RFP process for redevelopment of the GSA-owned former aircraft manufacturing plant at Middle River, MD as a successful example of information sharing and negotiation with potential developers during a RFP process.

In response to Carrie Albee's inquiry as to the level of detail in the Preservation Plan, Tim Dennée stated that he wanted to see defined and specific statements of what is appropriate and what is not, but that they could be general (i.e. not necessarily what materials that can be used in new construction, but general principles about how new construction should proceed).

Tim Dennée called for additional and more specific proscriptions for developers. He encouraged the AFRH to be more limiting and specific about what developers could and could not do when the RFP went out. He also wanted statements of how contributing buildings will be maintained and how they can be reused. The RFP should specifically state that preference will be given for preservation of contributing elements and reuse of significant buildings. Carrie Albee stated that a matrix of levels of significance for historic resources is being developed by Tracerics.

Hector Abreu asked about how archaeology was going to be handled and who would be responsible. This needs to be resolved in the PA. He cited the example of the Southeast Federal Center where it was ultimately decided that GSA would be responsible, and not the developer, because it was too complicated to do it otherwise.

Nancy Witherell stated that the PA must be completed before NCPC will render a final decision on the Master Plan. Tim Dennée stated that he does not want to sign off on the PA until he knows what the Master Plan is going to be and what is going to happen on the site.

Tim Dennée is still waiting on more specific financials justifying and defining the need of the AFRH. Doug Pulak and John Thompson confirmed that this was being prepared. Tim Dennée still wants to see what the alternatives are, instead of just the maximum build-out approach. He asked to what extent the proposed development will meet the AFRH's financial needs.

Hector Abreu restated that the developer needs to have the PA, as well. When the RFP goes out it should have the PA and the Master Plan and the Preservation Plan, etc., attached. That is the whole point of these documents – to inform the response of the developers. Tim Dennée echoed this and stated that developers want to be told what their parameters are, but he keeps hearing from the AFRH that they can't finalize these documents until the developers respond. Hector indicated that he wants the Preservation Plan to be attached to the PA.

Tim Dennée is particularly concerned about the direction that is to be given to the developer regarding Zones 3 and 4. He feels that the RFP should specifically limit the physical area in which development can occur, and that the developer should be bound to rehabilitate the entire hospital complex.

Nancy Witherell stated that she sees the Preservation Plan as having three aspects: the buildings and their immediate surroundings, the landscape, and the viewsheds.

Tim Dennée particularly mentions his concern about the view to the Capital and the city. He wants development specifically pulled back from that viewshed.

Emily Eig joined at 3:05 PM.

Landscape Study

Nancy Witherell stated that she had recently received an excellent Cultural Landscape report that she felt successfully integrated architecture and the landscape (Patent Office). She specifically mentioned the power of the graphics to communicate the landscape features effectively.

The subject of the Landscape Report prepared by the National Trust for the Lincoln Cottage was raised. A copy needs to be obtained for use by the consultant selected to prepare the Landscape Study.

The subject of security and how that will be handled at the AFRH was raised. NCPC, ACHP, and DC SHPO expressed their concern about how this might be carried out and stated that they expected more information about this. They requested that the Landscape Study include security treatment options and recommendations for landscaping within and around all new development.

Process

NCPC, ACHP, and DC SHPO indicated that they wanted to see the draft RFP in advance, and that they would like to see the RFQ responses as well.

Tim Dennée stated that he felt that the biggest problem in the process has been the sequence. AFRH wants the market to generate the plan, and this is the reason that none of the documents discussed are more detailed and therefore effective. But he feels that the documents should be detailed and proscriptive, and that they should dictate what the developer is to do. He also stated that he did not see that the minimization of impacts was a genuine concern in the process at all, as indicated by the above approach.

Formal meeting concluded, 3:25 PM.