

## **U.S. Park Police H1 Stables Redevelopment**

### **Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting**

**April 15, 2019**

**1:30 p.m.**

### **U.S. Commission of Fine Arts Conference Room**

**Agencies:** Tammy Stidham (National Park Service-National Capital Region); Catherine Dewey, Yue Li (National Park Service-National Mall and Memorial Parks); Vivian Lee, Lee Webb (National Capital Planning Commission); Thomas Luebke, Frederick Lindstrom, Sarah Batcheler, Dan Fox (U.S. Commission of Fine Arts); Andrew Lewis (DC State Historic Preservation Office)

**Attendees:** Beth Purcell (Committee of 100 on the Federal City)

**Project Team:** Claire Sale, Rachel Lloyd, Lauren Tuttle (AECOM)

#### **Introduction**

Everybody introduced themselves.

#### **Presentation**

##### Overview of Undertaking

Claire Sale (AECOM) reviewed the U.S. Park Police H1 stables redevelopment project purpose and need, site context, and background.

##### Site History

Claire reviewed the history of the site as shown in the 1792 L'Enfant Plan, 1851 and 1909 maps, and the 1901 McMillan Plan. The presentation included photographs of the site dating to the early-20<sup>th</sup> century and aerial imagery of the site dating to 1944 to the present.

##### Review of Draft Area of Potential Effect

Claire presented the draft Area of Potential Effect (APE).

##### Site and Building Layout Options

Tammy Stidham (NPS) presented the following four site and building layout options:

- Option 1 – Symmetrical Building
- Option 2 – Asymmetrical Building
- Option 3 – Asymmetrical Building Rotated
- Option 4 – Asymmetrical Detached Building

The presentation included a plan view of each option, as well as a scale comparison to the DC War Memorial and elevation sections from Ash Road and the DC War Memorial.

## Discussion

### Perimeter Fence

Andrew Lewis (DC SHPO) asked if the fence along the southern perimeter of the site would create a visual effect from Independence Avenue. Vivian Lee (NCPC) noted that the fence is currently visible from Independence Avenue during the winter. Andrew asked if the proposed fence would be more visible during the winter and if the fence would be necessary along the stable building's east wall. He stated that the view to the stables building should be encouraged to the degree possible. The group discussed whether an opaque fence was necessary.

NPS stated that a fence surrounding the water treatment plant is necessary to separate the plant, which gives off ozone, from the public.

Andrew noted that the fence lines along the southern boundary of the site could be closer to the parking lot.

### Independence Avenue Entry Driveway

Lee Webb (NCPC) asked if the gate at the Independence Avenue entry driveway would be open during the day. Sarah Batcheler (CFA) also asked how often the driveway would be used. Although the status of the gate during the day is currently undetermined, the driveway would be used on a daily basis for officers arriving and leaving. The driveway would also be used for hay delivery and manure removal a few times a week.

Rachel Lloyd (AECOM) asked if a turn-around area for public vehicles is necessary off of the driveway. NPS has not considered this need before, but wants to keep public vehicles out. The driveway would allow for right-turn in and right-turn out access only.

The entry road on the north side of the project site off of Ash Road would be supported turf for use by emergency vehicles.

### CFA and NCPC Review

Vivian noted that NCPC endorsed Options 1 and 2 at their April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. Lee stated that NCPC requested additional views to help determine indirect effects.

Sarah summarized CFA's feedback from their March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. CFA commented that the symmetrical scheme (Option 1) is the most elegant and the visual impact on the DC War Memorial would be minimal. CFA also supported the inclusion of dedicated visitor space to view the paddocks and a conventional palette of materials.

### Other

Beth Purcell (Committee of 100 on the Federal City) asked how visitors would access the site. Visitors on foot would access the site via Ash Road or the social trail between Independence Avenue and Ash Road.

Beth also asked if the site would include any security/screening for public visitors. Public visitors would only have access to the front part of the stables building off of Ash Road unless visitors are part of an organized tour.

Vivian asked if NPS has a preference for one or two public paddocks. NPS prefers two public paddocks because two paddocks would maximize how many horses could be let out at a time. Only two horses that are compatible with one another can be let out into a single paddock at a time.

Andrew stated that one benefit of the symmetrical building on axis (Option 1) is that less building is visible from the DC War Memorial compared to the asymmetrical building rotated (Option 3). The buildings on axis (Options 1 and 2) are also located farther away from the DC War Memorial compared to the rotated buildings (Options 3 and 4).

Andrew noted that he does not have any concerns regarding the site and building layout. Tom Luebke (CFA) stated that he does not see an adverse effect difference between Options 1 and 2. Andrew noted that Option 2 might have more of an adverse effect, if any, than Option 1, but overall does not believe Option 1 or 2 would have an adverse effect.

Vivian asked if it is possible to minimize the height of the ventilator stacks on the stables. NPS noted that they would talk to the project architects.

Andrew asked if the tall fencing (stockade fence) was needed as far away from the building as shown. He suggested bringing the fence closer to the building. NPS stated they would explore that option.

Vivian asked if the bollards near the existing utilities to the west of the project site would still be needed. NPS stated they do not know, but the utilities and bollards are outside of the project scope.

The Consulting Parties stated that Option 1 or 2 would likely result in no adverse effect. Andrew noted that another Section 106 consulting parties meeting is not necessary if Option 1 or 2 are selected. NPS noted that a preferred alternative will be known after May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019.

### **Next Steps**

- Comments are due April 26, 2019.
- NPS will develop an Environmental Assessment.