THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING 441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

ΑM

202-504-2200 202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 May 1995

10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes:

20 April 1995

- B. Public Law No. 181, legislation establishing the Commission of Fine Arts; approved 17 May 1910.
- C. Dates of next meetings:

15 June 1995 27 July 1995

- D. District of Columbia Arena: Information presentation by the architects and representatives of the District of Columbia Government and Abe Pollin Organization.
- E. Letter from Leslie N. Boney, Jr. FAIA: Proposed stamp commemorating 75th Anniversary of Lincoln Memorial.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of the Army

CFA 18/May/95-1, Pan Am Flight 103 Memorial Cairn, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia. Commemorative text. (Previous: CFA 16 March 1995-3.)



B. <u>Department of the Army</u>, <u>Military District of Washington</u>

CFA 18/May/95-2, Fort Myer, Virginia. Renovation of sixteen NCO quarters.

C. <u>Department of the Treasury</u>

- 1. CFA 18/May/95-3, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, 14th and C streets, S.W. Long-range plans, including new visitors' center, renovation of west entrance and removal of Liberty Loan Building.
- CFA 18/May/95-4, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, 14th and C streets, S.W. Replacement of windows.

D. <u>District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs</u>

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

- a. S.L. 95-38, 748 Jackson Place, N.W. Plaque in honor of Jacqueline Kennedy in front of the Decatur House. Permit.
- b. S.L. 95-33, 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Clock. Revised design. Permit. (Previous: CFA 20 April 1995.)
- c. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

- a. O.G. 95-63, 1554 35th Street, N.W. Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School. Master Plan. Conceptual.
- b. Appendix II.



APPENDIX I

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT				
S.L. 95-30 HPA. 95-207	200 Maryland Avenue, N.E. Veterans of Foreign Wars of U.S. VFW National Memorial Building	Handicapped access ramp - conceptual				
ACTION: No objection to concept of handicapped access ramp at proposed location as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 May 1995, which indicate elimination of wall between ramps. Submit working drawings for review when ready.						
S.L. 95-35	4001 17th Street, N.W. Congregation of St. John the Baptist Russian Orthodox Church	Shed - (existing) - permit				
	bjection to issuance of permit for hed. New shed will match existing color.					
S.L. 95-37 HPA. 95-243	224 2nd Street, S.E. National Indian Gaming Assoc.	Alterations - conceptual				
ACTION: No o visible from p when ready.	visible from public space. Submit working drawings for review					
S.L. 95-39 HPA. 95-253	2041 Rosemount Avenue, N.W. Mira N. Marshall Residence	Rear deck and enclosure of rear porch - conceptual				
of first floor	bjection to concept design for prop of rear porch and addition of wood drawings for review when ready.					

APPENDIX II

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT				
O.G. 95-26 HPA. 95-79	2527-2531 Q Street, N.W. Sandoz and Lamberton Apartment building	Alterations, driveway and roof terrace - revised concept				
ACTION: No objection to concept for alterations to existing apartment building as shown in supplemental drawings as marked. Note is made that there is still room for design development which should be resolved with the submission of final working drawings.						
O.G. 95-64 HPA. 95-193	3106 M Street, N.W. Earl Myerson Urban Shade	Sign - revised design - permit				
attached.) No	DRAWN by written request of the a objection to existing window display out permit review.					
O.G. 95-66 HPA. 95-217	3338 O Street, N.W. Vedat Odabas-Geldiay Apartment building	A/C grilles flush on wall - permit				
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed masonry openings to allow installation of individual A/C units.						
	bjection to issuance of permit for					

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed work is not visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board. See concept submission (O.G. 95-48).



18 May 1995 APPENDIX II

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT					
O.G. 95-68 HPA. 95-223	1677 31st Street, N.W. Stephen Wells/Jane Wilson Residence	Alterations and roof deck - permit					
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and roof deck. Application does not include alterations to garage on alley. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 94-157).							
O.G. 95-69 HPA. 95-226	3009 P Street, N.W. Finn Residence	Alterations and fence - conceptual					
	jection to concept design for propo bmit working drawings for review wh						
O.G. 95-70 HPA. 95-227	3019-3021 M Street, N.W. Germar Properties Commercial	Alterations to storefront - revised concept					
ACTION: No objection to revised concept design for alterations to storefront. Submit working drawings for review when ready.							
O.G. 95-71 HPA. 95-228	1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Britches of Georgetown Britches Great Outdoors	Alterations to storefront - revised design - revision to permit					
approved desig	ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for revision to approved design as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 May 1995.						

18 May 1995 APPENDIX II

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 95-72 HPA. 95-229	1310 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. St Elmo's Partners Ltd. il Pappagallo Enoteca	Alterations, awnings and signs - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for alterations, awnings and signs. Recommend careful study of relationship of existing entrances as well as exact nature of proposed window replacements at curved bay. Recommend elimination of one of three proposed signs and reduction in length of south awning. Submit working drawings for review when ready.

O.G.	95 - 73	3229 R Street, N.W.	Swimming
HPA.	95-230	Peter and Joanne Ackerman	pool -
		Residence	permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed in-ground swimming pool behind previously approved fence will not be visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

	: 9		

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING 441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200 202-504-2195 FAX

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS PRE-MEETING TOUR

18 May 1995

CONVENE: 8:00 AM, Pension Building, Suite 312,

441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

- 1. Bureau of Engraving, 14th Street Side. Proposed Visitors' Center and Entrance.
- 2. World War II Memorial. Alternate sites:
 - a. North side of Tidal Basin, near paddle boat rental facility
 - b. East side of Constitution Gardens, 17th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.
 - c. Eighth Street and the Mall, cross-axis, possible additional site
 - d. West of Grant Memorial and reflecting pool at east end of Mall
- 3. Return at 9:00 AM to Commission offices for discussion of World War II Memorial sites and urban design/location considerations for proposed D.C. Arena.

Members Present: J. Carter Brown, Chairman

Harry G. Robinson, III, Vice Chairman

Rex Ball

Carolyn Brody

Jeannine Smith Clark

Eden Rafshoon Susan Porter Rose

Staff Present: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary

Sue A. Kohler



THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING 441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001 202-504-2200 202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 May 1995

The meeting was convened at 10:35 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at the Pension Building, 441 F Street, N.W., after a tour of project sites.

Members present: Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman

Hon. Harry G. Robinson III, Vice-Chairman

Hon. Rex M. Ball Hon. Carolyn Brody

Hon. Jeannine Smith Clark

Hon. Eden Rafshoon Hon. Susan Porter Rose

Staff present: Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary

Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson

Mrs. Sue Kohler

Mr. José Martínez-Canino

National Capital Planning Commission

staff present: Mr. Ray Short

Prior to the public meeting, the members discussed the Commission's position on the proposed site for the District of Columbia Arena, and four possible sites for the World War II Memorial that they had seen on their pre-meeting tour.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes of the 20 April 1995 meeting. Mrs. Clark asked for several corrections: she noted that in her reference to a bridge in Rock Creek Park, during the discussion of the Georgetown hotel pedestrian bridge, CFA 20/APR/95-2, the street mentioned should have been Tilden rather than U Street (page 5); she asked that the word "insulating" be put in front of "glass" in the discussion of the renovations to FOB #6, CFA /20 APR/95-4, (page 6); and she asked that the minutes reflect that she recused herself from voting on the Museum of American History submission, CFA 20/APR/95-7, because of her position as a regent of the

Smithsonian (page 11). These corrections were agreed to and subsequently made.

Mrs. Rose said she would like to have a comment she had made about the clock at 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.L. 95-33, added to the minutes, but would speak to Mrs. Kohler about it. The Chairman said the change would have to be approved at the next meeting.

B. <u>Public Law No. 181, legislation establishing the Commission of Fine Arts; approved 17 May 1910</u>. The Secretary noted for the record the establishment of the Commission of Fine Arts eighty-five years ago.

C. Dates of next meetings, approved as:

15 June 1995 27 July 1995

- D. District of Columbia Arena: Information presentation by the architects and representatives of the District of Columbia government and the Abe Pollin organization. The Secretary began this presentation by noting that in its discussion of the Arena at the April meeting, the Commission had been reacting to a document—the draft Environmental Assessment for the D. C. Arena issued by the District Government—and at this time he wanted to bring a discussion of the project to a public meeting and find out just what was being proposed. He introduced James E. Kerr from the District Government as the first speaker.
- Mr. Kerr said he had been appointed by the Mayor as project manager for what he considered a very exciting project for the District. He said Mr. Pollin's company, Newco, would bear the entire cost of financing, designing, constructing, and operating the Arena; the District would pay for the Metro tie-in, costs associated with land acquisition, the demolition of its office buildings on the site and the relocation of its employees. He discussed the financing, involving the issuance of about \$92 million in bonds, the terms of the lease, and the payments to RLA for land acquisition. He said approvals of the design would be required from the Commission of Fine Arts, the Planning Commission, and the D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board.
- Mr. Kerr said the Arena was a very good business deal for the District. It was expected that in the first year the facility would generate \$115 million in new economic activity and \$8 million in new tax revenue; additionally, it would be a catalyst for the redevelopment of the east side of downtown. He said the District would have to put up \$40-50 million at the beginning to cover its responsibilities. Mr. Kerr then introduced Wes Unseld from the Pollin organization.
- Mr. Unseld reviewed briefly the history of the project, saying that Mr. Pollin did not intend to finance the Arena at first, but



when the District's financial problems became apparent, agreed to do so; he said this commitment represented a vote of confidence in the District's future. He said he believed there was real excitement about this project in both the sports and business communities, and it was expected that it would create a large number of new jobs and also bring suburbanites back to downtown. He said his organization remained committed to Gallery Place as the only feasible site, and he thought the Arena might be the city's last chance for real economic revival.

Architect Colden Florance, from Florance Eichbaum Esocoff King, was the next to speak. He began by pointing out on a map the relationship of Gallery Place to other points of interest: the Capitol, White House, proposed convention center site, National Museum of American Art and National Portrait Gallery, Union Station, and the Downtown Historic District, which included Chinatown. He noted that the design would have to be approved by the usual review boards, as well as RLA and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, since it was subject to the Section 106 process of the Historic Preservation Act. Citizens groups would also have to be brought into the design process.

Mr. Florance then discussed the schematic design that his firm had developed. He said the site contained 5 1/2 acres and would occupy all of Square 455 and 125 feet of Square 454 to the north, thus requiring the closing of G Street between 6th and 7th streets. He noted that the Metro connections were very good--right at the door -- with connections to three lines. The two entrances would be on F Street and at the Chinatown Metro, at the northwest corner; truck and automobile entrances would be on 6th Street. building would have 20,600 seats, including 110 executive suites and 3,000 club seats, with the rest being general admission seats. The main event floor would be 25 feet below sidewalk level, bringing the patron access point about midway up the bowl. Mr. Florance noted that the bowl would be oriented in an east-west Mr. Florance described the placement of stairs and direction. escalators to bring patrons to the various tiers of seats and separate concourses for the executive and club seating areas. He noted also that there would be two parking levels, for a total of 300-400 cars, within the building. Restaurants and other retail stores would be located at sidewalk level on F, 6th and 7th streets.

Mr. Florance then discussed the current version of the exterior design, noting that its character was still undecided, but emphasizing that it would be "very much a Washington building"; it would acknowledge its relationship to the L'Enfant Plan and be responsive to its immediate context. He described the facades, saying that the north and south would be the more important architecturally, since they would contain the principal entrances. The south (F Street) facade would be essentially classical, columniated, and have a large amount of glass providing views into

the concourses; there would be four sculpted sports figures above the entrance. The north facade would be different in design, and would feature sports figures in panels. As this facade would face Chinatown, there would perhaps be some acknowledgement in the choice of sports, possibly representations of T'ai Chi or pingpong. A 30-foot-wide pedestrian way in front of this facade would separate the Arena from a future building to the north. Mr. Florance said signage and inscriptions on the facades would be worked out later when the Arena had been given a name.

The east and west facades would be considerably plainer and lower, with no piers or columns; the primary material would be beige brick, in contrast to the light-colored stone and precast on the north and south. There would be setbacks before the facades rose again in an attic story. On the west, the facade would be organized asymmetrically so that it would not compete with the Old Patent Office. Turrets, in the form of light beacons, would acknowledge the line of G Street on both the east and west facades, and bowed window areas would express the form of the bowl inside. Restaurants would be at ground level along 7th Street; truck and auto entrances would be on 6th Street. Mr. Florance noted that the stores and restaurants would have sidewalk entrances and would be open during regular hours.

Mr. Florance showed a model and talked about the height of the building. It would be 125 feet at its highest point, 80 feet at the north and south entrance facades, and 70 feet (plus an 8-foot balustrade) on the east and west. He said it would be a background building, keeping the dominance of the Old Patent Office in the area. A question was asked about electronic signage, and Mr. Florance said that had not been worked out yet, but possibly it would be on the blank wall spaces on the east and west facades.

As the presentation was for information only, the members commented only briefly on the design. The Chairman said the sight lines from the street level would be important in bringing down the apparent height of the building; he noted how effective this was in masking the huge size of the Pension Building. Mrs. Clark commented on the concern expressed about the Arena fitting into the neighborhood, saying that the old Turner Arena in Washington had been especially successful in that way. Mrs. Rose thought a heavy planting of trees would help bring down the scale of the building and make it seem less massive, especially where it would face the Old Patent Office building. Vice-Chairman Robinson said he was pleased with the energy and variety in the facades and thought they would take the curse off what would be a very large building. said one of the Commission's primary concerns as the design developed would be its urban design aspects. Mr. Ball said he realized this project was on a fast track, and it was gratifying to have it brought to the Commission at the earliest possible stage. He, too, was concerned about urban design and hoped that the whole area would be redeveloped.

The Chairman expressed his pleasure that the Arena would be in downtown Washington, and said the Commission would look forward to working with all those involved. Mrs. Clark closed the discussion by reading a quotation from George Washington that had been placed in the members' folders:

I have never had but one opinion on this subject [the development of Washington] and that is that nothing ought to justify a departure from the engraved plan but the probability of some great public benefit or unavoidable necessity.

She said she thought the Arena would provide that "great public benefit".

E. Letter from Leslie N. Boney, Jr. FAIA: Proposed stamp commemorating 75th Anniversary of the Lincoln Memorial. The Secretary said Mr. Boney, a private citizen especially interested in the Lincoln Memorial, had written him to ask if the Commission would support such a stamp. Mr. Atherton said that in view of the fact that the Lincoln Memorial was the Commission's first major project he thought it would be appropriate; he noted also the popularity of Daniel Chester French's sculpture of Lincoln in the Memorial and thought that might also be included. It was agreed that the Commission should support the stamp, and Mr. Atherton said he would convey this to Mr. Boney. Mr. Ball said he would like to see a series of stamps with some of Washington's monuments depicted, much like the series that had been devoted to American architecture. Exhibits A, A-1, A-2

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of the Army

CFA 18/MAY/95-1, Pan Am Flight 103 Memorial Cairn, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia. Commemorative text. (Previous: CFA 16/MAR/95-3.) (The Chairman left the meeting briefly and turned the gavel over to the Vice-Chairman.) Staff member Jeffrey Carson recalled that the Commission had asked to see the text for the inscription that would be placed on the base of the cairn. He passed out copies, noting that the actual typeface used would be different.

There was a consensus that the inscription was too long. Changes were also requested in several words and phrases, and generally, it was requested that the references to violence and terrorism be kept to a minimum. Mr. Carson said the staff would rewrite the inscription and show it to the members for their approval. This was done later, during the luncheon recess, and the staff was then directed to forward the revised, approved version to the applicants. Exhibit B

B. Department of the Army, Military District of Washington



CFA 18/MAY/95-2, Fort Myer, Virginia. Renovation of sixteen NCO quarters. Mr. Carson showed photographs of the quarters and said the proposed renovation would include adding a second floor to a one-story section as well as changes to the rear of the houses and interior restructuring. He said there were several representatives from the Military District of Washington who would speak about the project.

Mr. McCormack said there were eight two-unit buildings, occupied by personnel with families who were required to live on the post. The square footage was below current requirements, and additional bath and bedroom space was needed. He said all modifications would be in conformance with existing Fort Myer structures, noting that the dwellings had been built in the 1930s and were of secondary importance in relation to the main historic area.

The architect then showed photographs and drawings, saying that the most important addition visually would be a bedroom addition above an existing one-story sunroom; there would also be a small screened porch and kitchen addition at the rear. He said he had been working with the State Historic Preservation Office and had their approval. (The Chairman returned to the meeting at this point.)

The Vice-Chairman said he liked the proposal and thought the units would be very pleasant in appearance. This was the consensus, and the project was unanimously approved. Exhibit ${\tt C}$

C. Department of the Treasury

- 1. <u>CFA 18/MAY/95-3</u>, <u>Bureau of Engraving and Printing</u>, <u>14th and C streets</u>, <u>S.W. Long-range plans</u>, <u>including new visitors center</u>, <u>renovation of west entrance and removal of Liberty Loan Building</u>.
- 2. <u>CFA 18/MAY/95-4</u>, <u>Bureau of Engraving and Printing</u>, <u>14th and C streets</u>, S.W. Replacement of windows.
- Mr. Carson introduced both these projects, stated that the members had visited the site, and then asked Lenore Clarke from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to give the members some background information. Ms. Clarke said the Bureau wanted an integrated design approach to problems of visitation, circulation, and a general upgrading of its image, and had gone to the NEA for help in setting up a design competition. She said they were very enthusiastic about the results, and then asked architect Amy Weinstein to discuss her architectural proposals.
- Ms. Weinstein showed a site plan, pointing out the main building, the Liberty Loan Building to the south (which would eventually be demolished under the plan) and the annex across 14th



Street. She said the latter two buildings defined the street, but the main building, with its bays and deep courtyards, did not. She noted that it was the only active industrial building in the monumental core, and its design represented a skillful interweaving of monumental and industrial elements; she showed photographs of the classical, colonnaded facade facing 15th Street and also of the industrial 14th Street facade, observing that some stripped-down classicism remained on the pavilion ends, but disappeared entirely in the courtyards.

Ms. Weinstein said her plan was to place a visitors center in the middle courtyard, and open metal screen walls, using the Roman grille pattern seen elsewhere in the building, in the north and south courtyards to screen large pieces of equipment; the screens would be set back from the face of the building. The entrance to the visitors center would be set forward slightly to emphasize its entrance function and to complement the Holocaust Museum entrance just to the north. Changes would also be made at the 15th Street facade; it would be reopened as a main visitor entrance and connected with the new visitors center. Within this center, core functions would be placed at the entrance front and rear, with an exhibit area in the center court and an orientation theatre on the second floor; catwalks would allow visitors to observe the engraving and printing operations while at the same time keeping them out of the crowded, insecure working area.

The Chairman was concerned that the new 14th Street entrance was neither a grand statement nor a real entrance, but a near miss; he thought the cornice should be dropped and the whole element pulled back farther from the street so that it would defer to the main building. Mr. Ball commented that the Bureau really acted as a gateway to the city; he noted that after coming across the bridge, the wings of the building tended to slow down the rhythm along 14th Street. To ensure that this rhythm was respected, he thought the screen walls should be kept below the first cornice line and the entrance minimized. Ms. Weinstein said the rendering exaggerated the projection of the entrance, and she said she had tried very hard to keep the new elements subordinate to the old; however, she said it was a real problem with visitors to find the entrance, especially with the Holocaust Museum entrance projecting forward, and it had to be easily identifiable.

The Vice-Chairman said he liked the scheme; he thought the new additions would act as jewel-like elements in a large industrial building and he liked the staccato effect. He did not think they would be obtrusive as one moved along the street. Mrs. Brody also liked the building, but she questioned Ms. Weinstein about the function and design of the entrance canopy. Ms. Weinstein said it was for weather protection and entrance indication. Both the Chairman and Mrs. Brody thought the design was a little flippant for its location, and Ms. Weinstein said it had not really been adequately studied yet. Mrs. Clark asked if

the visitors to the Bureau were mostly children; Ms. Clarke replied that about half of them were. She added that visitation had increased with the opening of the Holocaust Museum.

There were no further questions. The Chairman commended the applicants and the architect on the presentation and said the Commission realized that the plans as presented were only conceptual. He said the Commission would like to see more drawings showing the cornice line relationship and details of the canopy; he said a model would also be helpful. With these requests, the concept design was unanimously approved.

Landscaping plans were also part of the submission and were addressed by landscape architect James Urban. He showed a plan for landscaping all the Bureau's buildings, on both sides of 14th Street, with each side being treated in a slightly different manner. On the 14th Street side of the main building, the considerable grade change, as the land fell off to the south, dictated a planter wall to minimize the sloping effect; it would also provide seating. Underground circulation and the presence of an old streetcar turnaround precluded normal tree planting on either side of the entrance, so the trees there would be placed in raised containers; those to the north and south would be planted in specially prepared beds.

On the 15th Street side, the planting would be sympathetic to the monumental colonnade. A base for the building would be created using a retaining wall designed to equalize the existing slope of the street. Plantings behind this wall would include a grouping of magnolias at either end, as well as an American holly hedge, flowers, and a weeping beech at the two corners.

Mr. Urban said the planting on the other side of 14th Street, in front of the annex, would not undergo any great changes; it would be primarily a tree and grass landscape with flowers. There were no objections to Mr. Urban's concept, and it was unanimously approved.

Ms. Weinstein then discussed the window replacement. She said the windows would be brought back to their 1914 appearance, but improved energy conservation and security aspects would be added. She said the design had been discussed with the SHPO and there was no objection. With that, the window replacement was unanimously approved. Exhibit D

D. <u>District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs</u>

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. <u>S.L. 95-38, 748 Jackson Place, N.W. Plaque in honor of Jacqueline Kennedy in front of Decatur House. Permit.</u>

Staff member José Martínez prefaced his introduction of this submission by recalling the Commission's long-standing interest in Lafayette Square, the active role it played in the renovation, and the location of the Commission's offices on Jackson Place for many years.

He showed photographs and a plan, saying that there would be a new planting bed on the corner of Jackson Place and H Street, with the plaque being placed on a pedestal in that location. Mr. Martínez then introduced Richard Moe, president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, to comment.

Mr. Moe said the history of Lafayette Square was well-known to the Commission, but for the record he documented the construction of Decatur House in 1819 and the retention of its residential use until 1950, when the long-time owner, Marie Beale, gave it to the National Trust. He reviewed the plans to build government office buildings on the Square in the late 1950s/early 1960s, which called for the demolition of all the old structures with the exception of Decatur House and the Blair-Lee houses; he noted the role of the Commission of Fine Arts, its chairman, David Finley, and First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy in preventing that from happening, and said that Mrs. Kennedy's decisive role had never been recognized. He said she had been one of the truly great figures in the historic preservation movement.

Mr. Moe showed drawings of the proposed limestone pedestal and bronze plaque. The text on the plaque would dedicate the view down Jackson Place to the White House in Mrs. Kennedy's memory, and the pedestal would be oriented so that the reader would be facing that view. The text on the plaque would be: "When the historic character of Lafayette Square was threatened during her husband's administration, it was preserved by the vision and dedication of Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy. This view is dedicated to her memory."

The Chairman commented that the design of the pedestal was too reminiscent of the Bauhaus for its location; he thought it should be more compatible with the Federal architecture of Decatur House; the other members agreed. He also mentioned the role of David Finley in getting Mrs. Kennedy involved, and he thought by substituting the word "with" for "by", the role of others could be implied. Mr. Moe agreed with these changes.

There was no further discussion, and the plaque was approved with the recommendations made. Exhibit \underline{E}

b. <u>S.L. 95-33, 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Clock.</u>
Revised design. <u>Permit. (Previous: CFA 20 April 1995.)</u> Staff member Sue Kohler recalled that in answer to the Commission's request for a change in the proportions of the clock to the Tasmanian Devil figure, revised designs had been sent to each member, with a request for comments. As there had been some

question on the part of the majority of the members as to whether the Commission's recommendations had been followed, it was put on the agenda again. Mrs. Kohler noted also that a material sample board was available for color selection, and that Linda Aronson from LaSalle Partners, owners of the building, was present to answer questions.

After a brief discussion of the overall size and relation of the clock to the cartoon figure, it was decided that it was an improvement over the original submission and was acceptable. The members looked at the various color samples and selected a verdigris finish. Ms. Aronson said she would report the Commission's decision to Warner Brothers. Exhibit E

c. Appendix I. The appendix was approved without objection.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. <u>O.G. 95-63, 1554 35th Street, N.W. Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School. Master Plan. Conceptual</u>. The Assistant Secretary reported that as the school intended to add a gymnasium, pool and other buildings to the campus, a new master plan was being developed. He showed the plan, noting that the new structures would be built around a quadrangle, and the parking lot in the middle of the campus would be moved to the northwest. He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed the plan and liked it generally, but had asked for screening around the parking lot and terracing where there would be a change in level around a proposed amphitheatre.

The members liked the plan, agreed with the Board's comments, and unanimously agreed that the Commission would adopt the Board's report. Exhibit ${\sf E}$

b. $\underline{\text{Appendix II}}.$ The $\underline{\text{Appendix was approved without objection.}}$

The meeting was adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton Secretary



aleigh harlotte

ilmington

Leslie N. Boney, AIA 1880 - 1964

Villiam J. Boney, AIA 1922 - 1993

ie N. Boney, Jr., FAIA larles H. Boney, FAIA aul Davis Boney, AIA les H. Boney, Jr., AIA mes A. Claywell, AIA atherine N. Russ, AIA ge J. Jernigan, Jr., AIA nneth M. Phelps, AIA Kevin B. Utsey, AIA

120 S. Fifth Avenue P.O. Box 2047 gton, NC 28402-2047

'HONE 910.763.9901 FAX 910.763.7852

1 Capital Center Drive Suite 310 leigh, NC 27606-3393

PHONE 919.851.9393 FAX 919.851.1336

2115 Rexford Road Suite 316 rlotte, NC 28211-3476

PHONE 704.366.5132 FAX 704.366.7832

Founded in 1922 by Leslie N. Boney Architect 1880 - 1964 Mr. Charles Atherton Pension Building, Suite 312 401 F Street, NW Washington, DC 20001 202/504-2200

Dear Charles:

It was nice to see you at the Atlanta AIA Convention. I enjoyed talking with you about a celebration of the 75th Anniversary of the dedication of the Lincoln Memorial on 30 May 1997.

My immediate concern is that we secure approval of the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee to issue a stamp which would feature not only the Lincoln Memorial but also the architect Henry Bacon. I have spoken to Ms. Cindy Tackett with the Stamp Advisory Committee. She tells me that the Commission will be meeting soon to consider the 1997 stamp subjects.

It would be nice if the Fine Arts Commission could endorse the idea.

Perhaps you could handle this as I do not know how often your Commission meets and I wonder if the nature of my suggestion is such that you could give the Commission's general endorsement to the idea. In any event, you know of my concern.

I am urging the AIA to take a lead in organizing some special activity for this important time in the history of our nation and of architecture in the United States.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

1 . 1 .

elia N. Ronay Ir

LNBJ/g

cc: Mr. Chester A. Widom, FAIA

Mr. George M. White, FAIA

Mr. Raymond Post, Jr., FAIA

MAY 15 1995

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS



ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING 441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

2 June 1995

202-504-2200 202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A-1

Dear Dr. Noelke:

The Lincoln Memorial will have been completed and dedicated seventy-five years ago on 30 May 1997. It is undeniably one of our greatest national monuments, and would seem a fitting subject to be commemorated at that time.

We recently received a letter from Leslie Boney, FAIA, an architect with a longstanding interest in the preservation of the Memorial. It was largely due to his efforts that the original design was not permanently altered to add the names of Hawaii and Alaska, some years ago, an act that would have greatly diminished the historical integrity and symbolism of the building. He asked that we take up the cause of proposing Since the Lincoln Memorial was the a commemorative stamp. first major project to come before the Commission after it was established in 1910, it seemed an appropriate thing to do, and at its meeting on 18 May, the members enthusiastically endorsed his idea. The Lincoln Memorial was a notable achievement of the Commission and set the standards that have quided the development of the Capital over the last eightyfive years.

I enclose a copy of Mr. Boney's letter in which you will note his particular interest in honoring the name of the architect, Henry Bacon. As you know the sculpture of Lincoln by Daniel Chester French is certainly as well known as the building and no less revered by the American people. Whether both artists could be identified on the stamp is probably a matter of design. In our opinion, however, it would not seem appropriate to recognize Bacon without an equal acknowledgement of French.

A number of years ago, the Postal Service issued stamps honoring American architecture. Perhaps a similar issue could feature other public monuments, of Washington along with the Lincoln Memorial. I look forward to hearing the Committee's reaction to this proposal.

Least / roals

Charles H. Atherton

Secretary

Sincerely,

Dr. Virginia Noelke Chairperson, Stamp Advisory Committee U.S. Postal Service 475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20260-6753



June 20, 1995

RECEIVED

JUN 4 1 1775

Mr. Charles H. Atherton Secretary The Commission Of Fine Arts the Pension Building, Suite 312 441 F Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20001-2728

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Dear Mr. Atherton:

Thank you for your recent letter expressing support for the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring The Lincoln Memorial and other public monuments of Washington.

Please be assured that the nomination of The Lincoln Memorial and other public monuments of Washington will be placed before the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee. This Committee is responsible for reviewing stamp proposals and making subject and design recommendations to the Postmaster General.

Each year, we receive thousands of letters suggesting hundreds of different topics for new stamps. Since 1957, the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee has reviewed many worthy subjects and has recommended a limited number based on national interest, historical perspective and other criteria.

For your information, the Committee works two to three years in advance in order to meet stamp design and production requirements. A public announcement is made approximately six months prior to the year in which the stamp will be issued.

We appreciate your interest in our stamp program.

Sincerely,

Manager

James C. Tolbert, Jr.

Stamp Management

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING 441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001 202-504-2200 202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

5 June 1995

Dear Mr. Metzler:

During its meeting of 18 May 1995, the Commission reviewed the proposed wording of the commemorative text for the Pan American Flight 103 Memorial cairn. The members recommended shortening the text which in its current form lacks the power inherent in more concise wording. In addition, the Commission strongly recommended against any reference to "international terrorists" which in its estimation gives undue recognition to the perpetrators of terrorism.

With this in mind, the Commission recommended specific changes to the text and included those changes in the document attached. In the meantime, the Office of the Secretary of the Army phoned to inform us that there may be precedence for including reference to terrorists on commemorative plaques. The members will be happy to discuss this further with you on 15 June.

Sincerely,

J./ Carter Brown

Chairman

Mr. John C. Metzler, Jr. Superintendent Arlington National Cemetery Arlington, Virginia 22211-5003

cc. Mrs. Deirdre Fortune Dr. John H. Zirschky, Army

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING 441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001 202-504-2200 202-504-2195 FAX

ON 21 DECEMBER 1988, PAN AMERICAN AIRLINES FLIGHT 103 WAS DESTROYED OVER LOCKERBIE, SCOTLAND, KILLING ALL ON BOARD AND 11 ON THE GROUND. THE 270 SCOTTISH STONES WHICH COMPOSE THIS MEMORIAL CAIRN COMMEMORATE THE INDIVIDUALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THIS ATTACK AGAINST AMERICA.

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING 441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001 202-504-2200 202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

5 June 1995

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

During its meeting of 18 May 1995, the Commission reviewed and approved additions to and the renovation of eight duplex structures as upgraded housing for sixteen senior noncommissioned officers and their families at Fort Myer. The Commission commends the architects for their sensitive approach to these 1930s brick dwelling units.

Sincerely,

Carter Brown

Chairman

Richard C. Armstrong, P.E. Chief, Engineering Division Directorate of Military Programs Department of the Army U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

cc. Murray Geyer
Richard S. Corner
CMSS Architects



ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING 441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001 202-504-2200 202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

5 June 1995

Dear Ms. Clarke:

The members were pleased to meet with you to discuss current and long-term plans for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing during the 18 May 1995 meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts. The members were especially pleased by the comprehensive master-planning guidelines developed not only for your complex in particular but with reference to the surrounding area in general.

There is no doubt that the Bureau is a primary element in defining the "gateway" experience for those approaching Washington from Virginia via the 14th Street corridor. The concept provided by the architect, Amy Weinstein, and the landscape architect, James Urban, shows an excellent appreciation of this fact.

In light of your immediate plans, please consider the proposed restoration of the original 1914 window appearance approved. Meanwhile, the Commission looks forward to working closely with you as the designs for the long-term projects develop. The staff will be available should any questions arise prior to your next submission.

Sincerely,

1000

Chairman

Ms. Lenore L. Clarke
Project Director - Southwest Gateway
Department of the Treasury
Bureau of Engraving and Printing
Washington, D.C. 20228

cc. Amy Weinstein James Urban

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

18 May 1995

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT					
S.L. 95-33 HPA. 95-212 PADC 95-02		Wall mounted clock - permit					
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed clock at building corner as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 9 May 1995. Approval extends to the proposed patina #10 Bronze G/B.							
S.L. 95-38 HPA. 95-251 ACTION: On H	748 Jackson Place, N.W. National Trust for Historic Preservation Decatur House OLD for CFA meeting 15 June 1995.	Plaque and planter area - permit					
O.G. 95-63 HPA. 95-185	1554 35th Street, N.W. Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School	Master plan - conceptual					

ACTION: No objection to concept for establishing a master pan consolidating auditorium and athletic functions in a new quadrangle. Recommend development of the master plan along with concept designs for the new structures. Submit for review when ready. Screening the new parking area from Prospect Street is strongly recommended.