
MEETING MINUTES

SUBJECT: Meeting with AFRH Section 106 Consulting Parties: Master Plan and PA

DATE/TIME: September 25, 2007; 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

LOCATION: AFRH-W, Sherman Building, 1st Floor Conference Room

ATTENDEES:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)

Katharine Kerr

Advisory Neighborhood Council 4 (ANC)

Timothy Jones

Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH)

Bill Jentarra

W.A. Sinnott

Bill Malcomb

Committee of 100 (C100)

Barbara Zartman

Crescent Resources (CR)

Stacy Outlaw

Bobby Zeiller

D.C. State Historic Preservation Office (DCSHPO)

Tim Dennee

Ehrenkrantz, Eckstut, & Kuhn (EE&K)

KC Dutton

Weiren Chen

EHT Traceries (EHT)

Emily Eig

Carrie Barton

General Services Administration (GSA)

Tim Sheckler

Koetter, Kim and Associates (KKA)

Mark deShong

National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)

Jeff Hinkle

Nancy Witherell

National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)

Tom Mayes

Elizabeth Merritt

Staubach

Pam Wessling

United Neighborhood Coalition

Sandra Hoffman

The Section 106 Consulting Parties for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) met on Tuesday, September 25, 2007, from 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM to review the updated plans for all development zones and discuss the Programmatic Agreement. The meeting was held at the Home.

Introductions were made. Tim Sheckler (GSA) reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Mr. Sheckler noted that Joe Woo (AFRH) was not able to attend the meeting because he is out of town. Mr. Sheckler will update Mr. Woo after the meeting.

ZONE A

Bobby Zeiller (CR) presented the updated plan for Zone A, including a finalized parcel plan, road reconfigurations, and pasture enhancements.

- All or part of parcels G, L, R, P, and C were relocated or eliminated to address concerns about the preservation of internal views, trees, open space, and historic character. Density was shifted to parcels K, H, O, I, S, D, and E.
- Three roads were changed.
 - *The north-south road through the historic pasture (1st Street extended)* was eliminated from the plan to provide more continuous open space through the historic pasture. The hotel will now be served on the east side of the Forwood Building.

- **The AFRH-W access road** will be routed to the north of Pershing Drive. Tim Sheckler (GSA) reported that he, Mark deShong (KKA), and Carrie Barton (EHT) walked the site to determine the most appropriate route for the road based on tree preservation, topography, and the configuration of the golf course. The route chosen preserves the Pershing Drive Street trees, as well as mature trees on the southern end of the golf course. The one-lane road will be used for AFRH-W traffic only and will not require AFRH-W vehicles to go through check/security points.
- **The eastern termination of Pershing Drive** was reconfigured to route one lane of traffic with parking around the new open space (OS-5). The one lane of traffic will provide service access to parcels F and P, as well as better accessibility to the bike path that will be located on the perimeter of the property at this location. The new open space will help preserve the character of Pershing Drive, as well as the existing mature trees located in the southwest corner of the property.

There were no specific questions or comments about Zone A.

AFRH ZONE

Mark deShong presented the updates to the plans for the AFRH Zone:

- **Chapel Woods:** New development in Chapel Woods will not require any change to the topography of Chapel Woods or to the tree line. This is unchanged from the last meeting.
- **AFRH-W Service Road:** The AFRH-W service road was routed to the north of Pershing Drive. This configuration will allow the entrance from Irving Street and Pershing Drive to serve both Zones A and B.
- **Development on the Grant Quadrangle:** Building design guidelines are being created as part of the Master Plan to guide all development, including any new development to be located on the site of the former Sheridan Building on the west end of the Grant Quadrangle. A proposed massing was superimposed on a 1921 aerial photograph of the quadrangle to show how it would fit into the fabric of the campus.

The Consulting Parties had the following comments and questions about the AFRH Zone:

- Elizabeth Merritt (NTHP) would like to know the dimensions of the former Sheridan Building inside the porches.

ZONE C

Mark deShong (KKA) presented the updates to the plans for Zone C:

- The western portion of the proposed development in Zone C has been moved farther south without compromising the trees around the lake and channel in order to create more open space in the northern portion of the zone.

The Consulting Parties had the following comments and questions about Zone C:

- Tom Mayes (NTHP) would like the view from the Randolph Street Gatehouse to the northernmost portion of the proposed development in Zone C to be taken into consideration in the landscape design for that area.
- Sandy Hoffman (UNC) wanted to repeat that John Parsons announced at the NCPC information session that Zone C could be purchased for public park land. Ms. Hoffman also stated that the

updated proposal for development in Zone C is much improved and is acceptable in lieu of public park land if the purchase is found not to be feasible.

ZONE B

Mark deShong (KKA) presented the updates to the plans for Zone B:

- The southwest corner of the development has been softened by pulling back the building footprint in response to comments from the previous Section 106 meeting.
- Elevations were provided to address questions about impacts on views.

The Consulting Parties had the following comments and questions about Zone B:

- Betsy Merritt (NTHP) would like to know what types of trees screen the view from Scott Statue to Zone B.
- Sandy Hoffman (UNC) is concerned about the compromise to the Home's role as green space in the city. She stated that the Director of Transportation (later corrected to Director of Planning) told community members that there is a possibility to bring North Capitol Street to grade and to transfer the clover leaf to the Home for development. Ms. Hoffman would like to know whether that land could be used rather than the land in Zone B. Tim Sheckler (GSA) stated that representatives from the Home had met with the Director of Planning and the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development and had been informed of these plans. At those meetings, it was discussed that the City would be responsible for developing the concept further, but the Deputy Mayor for Economic Planning clearly stated that the city "did not want to interfere in the Home's process". Mr. Sheckler also explained that the timing of the city's plans is an issue, since the plans are not planned for the immediate future and since Zone A is the first zone to be developed at the Home. Mr. Sheckler also said that the bisecting of the development and the Home by North Capitol would also be an issue. He will approach the Home about how to address this issue, but the Home intends to go forward with the Master Plan.

The Consulting Parties went to Scott Statue to study the views to Zone B. A crane was in place to show the impacts of different building heights on views from Scott Circle. The basket of the crane, which was located at the highest point on Zone B (in the northeast corner of Zone B) was visible at 82 feet. The maximum height of development in Zone B is 85 feet, measured from the southernmost point of the development. The topography of Zone B slopes to the south. A stake has been placed at the location of the crane, and Mark deShong (KKA) will use the data to calculate the proposed height of the building at that point. An updated section showing the appropriate building height will be developed and sent to the committee.

AFRH LANDSCAPE PROJECTS

Mark deShong (KKA), in Joe Woo's absence, presented the three landscape projects proposed by the Home for the AFRH Zone. Marsha Wiley, a landscape architect, is assisting the Home with the design.

- ***Eagle Gate Entrance:*** The modern gatehouse at Eagle Gate will be moved or rebuilt in a new median at the center of the entrance. New landscaping will be planted in the median and along the sides of the entrance, and flagpoles will be placed as a focal point at the eastern end of the entrance, directly west of the Bandstand.
- ***Sherman Promenade:*** The promenade between Scott Building and Sherman Building will be re-landscaped, and a new, formal promenade will connect the existing promenade to the Sheridan Building.

- **Scott Building Grounds:** New landscaping will be added around the south patio of Scott Building to provide a more defined edge between the Scott Building Grounds and the meadow to the south.

The Consulting Parties had the following comments and questions about the landscape projects:

- Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) suggested that the proposed flag poles would be too formal for the location shown in the plan. The flag poles would be more appropriate in front of the Administration Building.
- Nancy Witherell (NCPC) would like to know more about the character of the proposed guardhouse and the impact on views in from Eagle Gate.

GENERAL MASTER PLAN

Mark deShong (KKA) presented the updates to the overall Master Plan.

- **Security:** A map showing the locations of the new security fences and the security check points was presented. The connection between the new AFRH-W service road (at the south end of the golf course) and Zones A and B will require further study.
- **Parking:** The proposed parking allocation was presented by zone.
- **Street Types:** The street types to be included in the Master Plan were presented.

The Consulting Parties had the following comments and questions about the Master Plan:

- Sandy Hoffman (UNC) would like to know the ratio of spaces to units for Zone B. Pam Wessling (Staubach) said that the ratio was one space per 1,000 ft² unit.
- Nancy Witherell (NCPC) asked whether all street types were based on city streets with curbs and gutters. Mark deShong (KKA) answered that all street types except service roads would have gutters and curbs and that the Type 3 street is the only street type that does not conform to DDOT standards.
- Barbara Zartman (C100) stated that previous Section 106 discussions involving Lisa Burcham resulted in a decision that the new roads would not have an urban/rectilinear character and would not conform to DDOT standards. Pam Wessling (Staubach) explained that the Master Plan guidelines will meet DDOT standards in the case that the roads ever become public. Ms. Wessling added that parking for public access to the pasture and the addition of bike lanes requires the streets to have a more urban feel but that the proposed roads have not conformed to a rectilinear grid.
- Nancy Witherell (NCPC) asked why the Type 3 road does not conform to DDOT standards. Mark deShong (KKA) explained that DDOT requires a wider right-of-way than is necessary for service roads, even though the lanes will be the standard 12-ft width.
- Sandy Hoffman (UNC) asked how public parking is handled in Zone A and whether the proposed parking plan accommodates public access to the pasture. Bobby Zeiller (Crescent) explained that the street sections shown in the plan show street parking for most proposed street types. He added that more detail in the number and location of parking spaces can be refined now that the parcel configuration is close to being finalized.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mark deShong (KKA) presented excerpts from the Building Design Guidelines proposed for inclusion in the Master Plan. The Consulting Parties had the following comments and questions:

- Elizabeth Merritt (NTHP) would like more detailed design guidelines provided for parking structures.
- Barbara Zartman (C100) would like more detail presented for the fenestration guidelines.
- Nancy Witherell (NCPC) asked what the proposed LEED level for Zone A would be. Bobby Zeiller (BZ) said that they were planning for Silver for commercial and LEED certified for residential.
- Tim Dennee (DCSHPO) would like the design guidelines to be flushed out much more. He does not want to get too specific about design guidelines that are dependent on the range of conditions at the Home.

PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

Tim Sheckler (GSA) reviewed updates to the PA. Barbara Zartman (C100) would like maintenance issues addressed in the PA, transaction documents, or Master Plan. Elizabeth Merritt (NTHP) asked why Crescent has been deleted as a signatory. Katharine Kerr (ACHP) said she requested for Crescent to be removed because she wants the language in the PA to be generic enough to apply to all possible future developers and tenants, as well. She also did not want Crescent to have the authority to terminate the PA. Pam Wessling (Staubach) explained that the transaction documents will bind Crescent to the PA even though Crescent will not be a signatory.

NEXT STEPS

Tim Sheckler reviewed the next steps for the Section 106 review process for AFRH-W.

- The next draft of the PA will be distributed to the Consulting Parties on September 28, 2007. The comment period will end on October 26, 2007.
- The next draft of the Master Plan will be distributed to the Consulting Parties on October 19, 2007. The comment period will end on November 15, 2007. The Master Plan will be reviewed by NCPC in February and is due 60 days prior to the hearing.
- The EIS will be published in the National Register on November 2, 2007.

Tim Sheckler announced that there are no Section 106 meetings planned for the coming months. Additional meetings will be scheduled if substantial issues arise with the PA or Master Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM.