MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS, MARCH 20, 1962

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, in executive session, with David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: David E. Finley
Douglas W. Orr
William G. Perry
Ralph Walker

Charles H. Atherton, Asst. Secretary
C. L. Martin, Counsel
Susan E. Bennett, Admin. Secy.
Gilbert Halasz, Recorder

I. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of Next Meeting

The members set the next meeting of the Commission for April 18, 1962 at 9:30 a.m. with an executive session on April 17, at 2:00 p.m.

2. Minutes of February Meeting

Mr. Perry suggested that page 3 of the minutes of the meeting of February 20th, regarding the discussion of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, should be amended to state definitely that the members of the Commission voted unanimously to disapprove the design submitted by the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission. The Commission agreed with Mr. Perry's suggestion and approved the minutes with the addition of the suggested statement.

3. President's Memorandum In Re Conflicts of Interest - Status

The Chairman reported that the Bureau of the Budget had replied to the Commission's letter of February 28th, which inquired as to the applicability of the President's Memorandum of February 9, 1962 to the Commission of Fine Arts. The Bureau of the Budget advised that the Commission should bring any legal questions about the memorandum to the attention of the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice.
EXHIBIT A

Subsequently the Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice, suggested that an informal inquiry be made.

Note: The gist of a telephone call from the Office of Legal Counsel, after the meeting adjourned, has been included in a memorandum for the record prepared by the Chairman. EXHIBIT B

4. Commission's Tour of Inspection of the State Rooms of the White House

The members briefly discussed their tour of inspection, on February 21st, of the changes which Mrs. Kennedy has made in the decoration of the State Rooms in the White House. They agreed that the changes were generally tasteful and could be approved by the Commission as was done in the Chairman's letter of FEBruary 23, 1962. EXHIBIT C

In regard to the mantel piece for the fireplace in the State Dining Room they thought that a reproduction in marble should be made, if the original mantel could not be found. They also thought that colored marble would be more appropriate than pure white marble for the mantels throughout the first floor rooms.

The Chairman said that he would report the members' suggestion concerning the marble mantels to Mrs. Kennedy.

5. Proposed Office Building and Court of Claims Building on Lafayette Square - Status

The Chairman recalled that he had sent to the members a memorandum concerning recent developments in the program for the proposed projects. His memorandum indicated that Mrs. Kennedy, with the approval of the President, intended to write the Administrator of the General Services Administration and ask him to direct the joint venture architects to prepare a new design, in an Eighteenth Century style, for the Executive Office Building facing Jackson Place, and to order that the present Court of Claims Building not be demolished. EXHIBIT D

The members asked Mr. Perry to remain for the discussion and to relate any new developments. Mr. Perry reported that the joint venture architects had met with the President and had secured his approval of designs for the building on both sides of the Square, but a day or so before the Commission's meeting they had been ordered by the General Services Administration to stop all work on the plans. As a result, he said, there was no progress to report at the present time because the architects are awaiting further instructions.

There was a general discussion of the appropriateness of designing an 18th Century style office building along Jackson Place. The members agreed with Mr. Perry that a building of that type, 800 feet long, would be a great mistake and would subject the President and all concerned to ridicule. They also agreed that it was possible to restore Lafayette Square to its appearance in the early years of the Nation's history by reproducing a series of small individual buildings, but that this was not the program presented to the architects. Thus, it was pointed out that the criticism of the approved designs should in reality be directed toward the program and not at the work of the joint venture architects.

The architect members of the Commission stated that in their opinion the Commission of Fine Arts should firmly state their views to the President in the event he decided to ignore the Commission's recommendation. They also expressed their regret that the President had not invited the Commission to meet with them. The Chairman expressed the hope that the Commission would meet with the President and Mrs. Kennedy. No action was deemed necessary at this time.

6. Draft of Letter to Secretary of Commerce Hodges In Re Historic Preservation

The Chairman read a draft of a letter to the Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges expressing the Commission's concern over destruction of historic sites and objects by the Federal Highway Program; and recommending that the Bureau of Public Roads take steps to employ an expert in the history of art and architecture, whose job it would be to advise State Highway Departments of the dangers and prevent destruction of such sites and objects. He reminded the members that the same suggestion had been made previously but nothing had come of it. The members agreed that the presence of such an official could be of material benefit to the Federal and State governments, and that another effort was warranted to secure the position. The letter was approved as drafted. EXHIBIT D-1

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. United States Navy and District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic

Relocation of Statue of Doctor Benjamin Rush

The Chairman told the members that the Department of Highways and Traffic would begin letting contracts for the approach roads to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge within 60 days; and that the Rush Statue, presently located north of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery at 23d and E Streets, N.W. must be moved to a new site. It did not appear that a location on park land in the District of Columbia was possible at this time, but it would be possible to move the statue a short distance south of its proper location nearer to the central building and further away from the edge of the cut on E Street. The Chairman reviewed requests for this statue from Dickenson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania and from Saint Elizabeths Hospital. He also said that he had received a call from an administrative aide to Illinois Senator Everett Dirksen, who asked if it would be necessary for the Senator to introduce a bill in Congress to authorize moving the statue to Chicago, Illinois, on a site near the Rush Medical Center. The Chairman told the Senator's aide that, in his opinion, an Act of Congress would be necessary to authorize moving the statue out of Washington but that the Commission of Fine Arts was against moving the statue out of the City of Washington and would oppose the bill.

After some discussion the Commission agreed to recommend to the Secretary of the Navy that the statue of Doctor Rush be moved nearer to and facing the entrance of the building of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. The Chairman was asked to send the Secretary of the Navy a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT E

2. Smithsonian Institution and District of Columbia Government Department of Buildings and Grounds

National Zoological Park, Master Plan for Redevelopment

A portfolio of drawings, maps and plans of the proposed changes in the ten-year master plan for the redevelopment of the Zoological Park were provided for individual study by the members prior to the meeting with the sponsors and the designers. Action was therefore reserved until the following day.

3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, and Smithsonian Institution

a. National Portrait Gallery - Remodeling of Old Patent Office

The members reviewed the drawings and sketches of the proposed changes to the Old Patent Office Building, located between F and G Streets at 7th and 9th Streets, N.W., which will become the National Portrait Gallery, and will also house the National Collection of Fine Arts upon completion of a new Civil Service Building at 23d and C Streets, N.W. Changes to the exterior were confined to truck entrances on G Street, and an emergency exit with steps to the sidewalk on F Street.

The members were particularly interested in the design of the outside staircase near the southwest corner of the building which they felt could be located in another position so as not to detract from the ordered appearance of the Greek Revival building. They resolved to suggest to the architect that if possible another location of the staircase be found in a less conspicuous spot.

b. General Services Administration Regional Office Building, 7th and D Streets, S. W. - Proposed Refacing - Letter from Architect

The Chairman read a letter from Mr. Nicholas Satterlee, architect, expressing his disappointment concerning the Commission's recommendation to the Public Buildings Service that plans for remodeling the exterior of the building with a pre-cast concrete screen of Mr. Satterlee's design not be utilized. Mr. Satterlee felt that, in his absence from the meeting, his plan had not been properly presented to the Commission. He asked to be allowed to appear before the Commission to represent the scheme personally. EXHIBIT F

The members were of the opinion that the material presented at the February meeting was adequate and had been clearly presented. They did not believe any new presentation would change their minds, but agreed that if the General Services Administration requested further consideration of the proposed project they would agree to reconsider their recommendation. A letter was authorized to be sent to Mr. Satterlee explaining their decision in the matter. EXHIBIT G

c. Federal Office Building, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma - Progress on Sculptural Reliefs

It was reported that Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director of the Architectural and Structural Division, General Services Administration, had inquired if it would be possible for the sculptor, Mr. Bernard Frazier, to seek the assistance of Mr. Felix de Weldon, sculptor member of the Commission. Completion of the design by this sculptor was behind schedule, and this method seemed logical to hasten it.

The Commission had no objection to Mr. Frazier's request for Mr. de Weldon't assistance and directed that a letter be sent to Mr. Snyder to that effect. EXHIBIT H

d. Federal Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah - Selection of Alternative Sculptor

It was reported that Mr. Millard F. Malin, who had been selected to execute exterior sculpture for the building upon recommendation of the Commission, had withdrawn thus occasioning the need to select another sculptor.

Photographs of examples of the work of three sculptors - Maurice E. Brooks, Russell Forester, and Stephen Zakian, were submitted for consideration. Of the three the members preferred the work of Russell Forester, but they agreed to leave final choice to the architect. A letter was authorized to be sent to Mr. Snyder. EXHIBIT I

4. Department of the Army, Office of the Quartermaster General, Heraldic Branch

a. Department of Defense

(1) Antarctica Service Medal (U.S.Navy)

The Commission considered proposed designs for the obverse and reverse of the medal. The submitted designs were essentially unchanged from those disapproved by the Commission on October 17, 1961. A letter from the Chief of the Heraldic Branch stated that the designs had been coordinated with the requesting service at the secretarial level and represented the desires of that service and the potential awardees.

The members expressed their disappointment that their advice that a competent sculptor be hired had not been followed. The changes to both sides of the medal were insignificant, and they agreed that they could not approve the design. In their opinion the design lacked imagination because it continued to be the result of a committee action in which the perspective recipients of the medal had determined what symbols would be appropriate to commemorate service in the Antarctic and a draftsman had drawn a literal representation of the objects selected such as a plane, a tractor, etc.

In the course of their discussion of the medal the members criticized the predominent size of the penguin on the reverse side. They suggested that the penguin on the obverse side be used as a decorative border around the medal, and that the words "courage, devotion, and sacrifice" be placed in the center. On the reverse they suggested that the human figure be shown standing on ice or snow, and the map and geodetic circles be used as a background for the lettering on the reverse.

The Assistant Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT J

(2) Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal

The members inspected proposed designs for the obverse and reverse of the medal. The obverse design was an eagle clasping a sword shown superimposed on a compass rose. The members were of the opinion that the eagle was portrayed in an awkward position with the wings of the bird ill proportioned and poorly related to the rest of the figure. They suggested an eagle with raised wings would have more effect of strength.

Different means of integrating the lettering and shield on the reverse side of the medal were discussed. The members finally recommended that the size of the shield be enlarged, and the title be both superimposed across the face of the medal and shield.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendations. EXHIBIT K

b. National Aeronautics and Space Administration

(1) Distinguished Service Medal, Revised Design

The members looked at a proposed design for the obverse side of the medal. The designs were presented pursuant to the recommendation of the Commission to the Aeronautics and Space Administration on June 5, 1961, that the Heraldic Branch be requested to design a new medal. This action by the Commission followed criticism of the Distinguished Service Medal awarded to Commander Alan Shepard, who made the initial United States Space flight. That medal was a copy of the Administration's seal and had

not been presented to the Commission.

After inspecting the sketch the members approved the general design of the medal but made several suggestions concerning certain refinements which they felt would improve it.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT L

(2) Outstanding Leadership Medal

The members looked at a sketch of a proposed design for the medal consisting of a hand holding a torch superimposed upon a laurel wreath and a scroll bearing the initials "N.A.S.A."

The symbolic representation was considered to be unobjectionable, but the members thought the relationship of the torch to the wreath was somewhat cramped, especially where the medal would be attached to the decorative ribbon. They thought that the latter, as well as other details should be given further study and refinement.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT M

c. National Cultural Center
Proposed Seal

The members were shown several sketches of proposed designs for a seal for the National Cultural Center prepared by artists of the Heraldic Branch. The Assistant Secretary reminded the members that in April, 1960 a design had been submitted which the Commission had regarded as inadequate and had disapproved. At that time the Commission recommended that the Board of Trustees of the Cultural Center enlist the assistance of the Heraldic Branch.

After carefully examining each of the proposed designs in turn the Commission concluded that none of them met the artistic standards which they believe should prevail in a seal of such importance. In fact, the members concluded that the design previously disapproved in 1960 showed greater promise of being developed into an acceptable seal than those more recently submitted. They agreed that the Commission should recommend to the Board of Trustees that a sculptor of national reputation be employed to execute the design.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT N

III. LEGISLATION

Proposal to Establish a Memorial to the United States Breakthrough Into Space

The Chairman read a letter from Senator Alexander Wiley requesting the views of the Commission on a proposal to erect a memorial in Washington commemorating the breakthrough into outer space by the United States.

EXHIBIT O

After some discussion the members concluded that it was as yet too soon to determine the best manner in which to commemorate the achievement of the United States' exploration of outer space.

The Chairman said that he would inform Senator Wiley of the Commission's view.

Note: Following the meeting the Chairman spoke with a representative of Senator Wiley's office. A memorandum of his conversation prepared by the Chairman is included as EXHIBIT P.

IV. District of Columbia Government - Department of Licenses & Inspections

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. Report of Actions on Building Applications

The Assistant Secretary reported the actions taken, after receipt of the recommendation of the Shipstead-Luce Panel of Architects, on the Shipstead-Luce applications forwarded for review by the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections since February 20, 1962. This report was dated March 20, 1962 and comprised Appendix 1 of the Order of Business. After noting the individual cases the favorable actions as shown in Appendix 1 were confirmed by the members. Confirmation of the unfavorable actions and recommendations for changes were given in the following cases:

S.L. 2480	619 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Waffle Shop
S.L. 2481	603 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Pennsy Carry Out Shop
S.L. 2482	2137 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Gulf Oil Company Gas Station
S.L. 2483	2200 P Street, N.W. Gulf Oil Company Gas Station
S.L. 2487	1345 E Street, N.W. Republic Savings and Loan Association

b. Preliminary Submissions

(1) Proposed Office Building at 15th Street between F and G Streets, N.W.

The Commission met withMr. Jules A. Guedalia and Mr. LeRoy L. Werner, representatives of the Cafritz Construction Company to discuss preliminary plans for an office building proposed on a site immediately east of the Treasury Building.

It was explained that the owner proposes to set the building back from the street approximately 20 feet and hopes to secure zoning changes to permit the building to rise to 130 feet. Mr. Werner and Mr. Guedalia showed the members sketches of four types of buildings for their comments.

The members sought to impress upon the architectstheir concern that the office building would be located in a most important location, across the street from the Treasury Building and overlooking the White House grounds. They emphasized that the building should not compete in importance with its surroundings by drawing attention to itself. They suggested that the building should be designed to minimize its height, and emphasize its horizontal lines. They felt that the fenestration should contain more stone and far less glass than the four designs shown to them. There was a general discussion of the manner of achieving the type of building which would be appropriate for the location.

After the architects had departed the members discussed the question of the Commission's position in regard to a change in the zoning to permit a 130 foot building. Counsel pointed out that zoning changes granted in 1961 by the Zoning Commission upon application of the owners, would permit a building of 110 feet on the site, but that a variation would have to be secured from the District Commissioners under the Zoning Act of 1910 to permit a 130 foot building. After discussing the matter the Commission concluded that even with a 20 foot setback the height should be limited to 110 feet, the present height of many buildings in the area. The members agreed that the Commission, at the proper time, should write to the Board of Commissioners and state its opposition to any variation in the schedule of buildings heights adopted under the 1910 Zoning Act which would permit a building of 130 feet in height in that vicinity.

(2) Proposed Headquarters Building for Reserve Officers Association at 250 Third Street, S.W.

The members were shown drawings and a rendering of the proposed building which is located on a triangular site bounded by Third Street, C Street, S.W., and the Central Leg of the Inner Loop. The Assistant Secretary read to the members a report from the Shipstead-Luce Panel of Architects, dated March 15, 1962, which raised certain questions

relating to the general design, treatment of the elevations, scale and materials. This report was prepared following a review of the design attended by Mr. Alex Van Buren, architect of the firm of Mills, Petticord and Mills, and the Executive Director of the Reserve Officers Association, Colonel John T.Carlton, USAR. The report suggested that the proposed design did not measure up to its prominent location and recommended that the Commission request further preliminary design studies. EXHIBIT Q

The members considered in turn each of the criticisms made in the Panel's report. They concluded that while they agreed with the Panel's comments relating to the site and the use of the white marble proposed, they liked the general concept of the architectural design and did not believe further preliminary design studies were necessary.

The Assistant Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forthe Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT R

(3) Resolution on Water Gate Town Project

The members were told that a public hearing would be held by the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia on April 13, 1962 on an application seeking certain zoning variances. The project is to be located on a site near the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway and the intersection of Virginia Avenue and New Hampshire Avenue, N. W.

A draft resolution opposing the requested zoning changes was considered. The members unanimously agreed that they could not approve the proposed development plan in its present form. They approved the resolution as drafted and directed that it be presented to the Zoning Commission at the hearing.

(4) Proposed Revision to the Shipstead-Luce Map - Status

Counsel reported that the National Capital Planning Commission, at its meeting on March 1, 1962 had approved a plat revising the boundaries of the Shipstead-Luce Area as requested by the Commission in its letters of February 2, 1962 and May 6, 1959. The revised plat must now be approved and signed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to become effective.

(5) Proposed Amendments to the Shipstead-Luce Act - Status

Counsel reported that he was preparing a draft bill to amend the Shipstead-Luce Act in accordance with the objectives approved by the Commission at its meeting on January 23d, 1962. He also reported that the National Capital Planning Commission had authorized its staff to confer with the staffs of the District Commissioners and the Commission on the proposed changes. No action was requested.

2. Old Georgetown Act, Public Law 808, 81st Congress

a. Report of Actions Taken on Old Georgetown Act Applications

The Assistant Secretary reported the actions taken, after the recommendations of the Old Georgetown Panel of Architects, on the Old Georgetown Applications forwarded for review by the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections since March 13, 1962. This report was dated March 20, 1962 and comprised Appendix 2 of the Order of Business. After noting the individual cases, the favorable actions as shown in Appendix 2 were confirmed. Confirmation was given to the unfavorable action and recommendation in the case of O.G. 3119, 1426 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., London Cleaners.

b. Proposed Office Building at 1044 31st Street, N.W. - Preliminary Submission

The members discussed a proposed design for a six story office building which will be located immediately north of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal at 31st Street, N.W. Under existing commercial zoning the owner is permitted to erect a building to a maximum of 90 feet in that cornice line location. The drawings submitted were of a building 60 feet in height to the/ with a penthouse an additional 15 to 20 feet high.

The Assistant Secretary explained that the drawings submitted reflected suggestions made by the Old Georgetown Panel of Architects in an attempt to minimize the bulk and height of the building.

After discussing various architectural details of the design the members expressed the opinion that it was extremely difficult to design a building of the size and height proposed that would be in the spirit of the Old Georgetown Act because such large buildings did not exist in the initial years of the Nation's Capital. They therefore resolved to propose to the proper District of Columbia officials that changes be made in the height restrictions applicable to the Georgetown Waterfront area which would prevent buildings 90 feet in height in the future.

The Secretary was authorized to prepare a letter reflecting the Commission's views. EXHIBIT S

Thereafter, at 5:30 p.m. the meeting was recessed until 9:30 a.m. the following day.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. Martin

C. L. Martin, Counsel

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
20 March 1962

AM
2:00 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

2. ADMINISTRATION

a. Date of Next Meeting: 18 April 1962

Executive Session: 17 April 1962

b. Approval of Minutes of February, 1962 Meeting

letter to Mr Hodgson re Highways

c. Report by the Chairman on Status of Proposed Projects on Madison and Jackson Place facing Lafayette Square

3. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

a. United States Navy and District of Columbia Government Department of Highways and Traffic

Relocation of Statue of Benjamin Rush

Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Shipstead-Luce Act

(a) Building Applications - Appendix 1, dated 20 March 1962

(b) Proposed Sidewalk Cafe at 619 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. (SL 2480)

(c) Preliminary Submissions

3:00 1. Proposed Office Building at 15th Street between F and G Streets, N.W. (Daniel Bell, National Savings and Trust Company; Mr. Guedalia, Cafritz Construction Company)

done

2. Proposed Headquarters Building for Reserve Officers Association at 250 Third Street, S.W.

3. Proposed Apartment House at 2756 Macomb St., N.W.

(d) Resolution on "Water Gate Town" project for Zoning Hearing on April 13, 1962.

(e) Proposed Revisions to Shipstead-Luce Map - Status

(f) Proposed amendments to Shipstead-Luce Act - Draft

(2) Old Georgetown Act

(a) Building Applications - Appendix 2, dated 20 March 1962

(b) Preliminary Submission - Proposed Office Building at 1044-31st Street, N.W.

b. Smithsonian Institution and D.C. Government (Department of Buildings and Grounds

National Zoological Park, Master Plan

c. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service and Smithsonian Institution

(1) National Portrait Gallery - Proposed remodelling of Old Patent Office

(2) GSA Regional Office Building, 7th and D Streets, S.W. Proposed Refacing (Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Architectural and Structural Division, GSA, PBS; Mr. Nicholas Satterlee, Architect)

(3) Federal Office Building, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma - Inspect progress on Sculptural Reliefs

(4) Federal Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah - Proposed Sculpture

d. Department of the Army, Office of the Quartermaster General, Heraldic Branch

(1) Department of Defense

(a) Antartica Medal (U.S.Navy)

(b) Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal

(2) National Aeronautics and Space Administration

(a) Distinguished Service Medal, Revised Design

(b) Outstanding Leadership Medal

(3) National Cultural Center

Proposed Seal

4. LEGISLATION

Proposal by Senator Wiley to establish a Memorial to the United States Breakthrough into Space.

5. DISCUSSION

President's Memorandum In Re Conflicts of Interest - Status

Report to The President
Activities of the Commission of Fine Arts for the Month of March 1962

1. Statue of Doctor Benjamin Rush

The Commission adopted unanimously a resolution recommending that the Navy retain possession of the statue of Dr. Benjamin Rush, relocating it from its present position in the path of the 395 Street Expressway, to a nearby location facing the entrance of the Old Naval Observatory.

2. National Portrait Gallery

The Commission gave general approval to the plans for the remodeling of the Old Patent Office Building to provide space for the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts. Only a minimum of change will affect the exterior appearance of the existing building.

3. National Zoological Park

The Commission approved in principle an extensive architectural plan to improve facilities at the National Zoo over the next ten years.

4. Medalic Institute

The Commission made recommendations regarding the design of the following medals:

Antarctic Service Medal (U.S. Navy)
Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal (Department of Defense)
Distinguished Service Medal (National Aeronautics and Space Administration)
Outstanding Leadership Medal (National Aeronautics and Space Administration)
Official Seal, National Cultural Center

The Commission again pointed out the need for obtaining artists of recognized ability to execute medals of a national character, as evidenced by the unsatisfactory designs of all the medals presented.

Report to the President
Activities of the Committee of Four with the Heads of Farm Loan

1. Review of Farmer Borrower Needs

The Committee adopted unanimously a resolution recommending that the Farm Credit Commission of the Congress of the United States reconsidering its from the present position in the light of the "Old Farmer Movement", to a study Committee review the operations of the Old Farm Commission.

2. Standard Farmers Contract

The Committee gave general approval to the plans for the possibility of the Old Farmer Credit Building to provide space for the National Farmers Delivery and the National Cooperative of Farm Bureau Fed., a division of Energy will affect the relative importance of the existing buildings.

3. Commodity Marketing Data

The Committee approved in principle an approach to commodity-and plan to improve facilities in the Statistical area where the work has grown.

4. Operation Facilities

The Committee made recommendations regarding the status of the following research:

Economics Service Board (Economy)
Farm Bureau Organization Study (Economics of Marketing)
Interdepartmental Farmer Study (Farmers Committee and "Farm Interests")
Commodity Exchange Study (Commodity Exchanges and Commodity Futures)
Cooperative Study, Farmers Cooperative

The Committee again pointed out the need for providing service of research activity to Congress review of a National Commission, as recommended by the Agricultural Commission, Congress of all the Farm Problems.

4. LEGISLATION

Proposal by Senator Wiley to establish a Memorial to the United States Breakthrough into Space.

5. DISCUSSION

President's Memorandum In Re Conflicts of Interest - Status

(f) Proposed amendments to Shipstead-Luce Act - Draft

(2) Old Georgetown Act

(a) Building Applications - Appendix 2, dated 20 March 1962

(b) Preliminary Submission - Proposed Office Building at 1044-31st Street, N.W.

b. Smithsonian Institution and D.C. Government (Department of Buildings and Grounds

National Zoological Park, Master Plan

c. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service and Smithsonian Institution

(1) National Portrait Gallery - Proposed remodelling of Old Patent Office

(2) GSA Regional Office Building, 7th and D Streets, S.W. Proposed Refacing (Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Architectural and Structural Division, GSA, PBS; Mr. Nicholas Satterlee, Architect)

(3) Federal Office Building, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma - Inspect progress on Sculptural Reliefs

(4) Federal Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah - Proposed Sculpture

d. Department of the Army, Office of the Quartermaster General, Heraldic Branch

(1) Department of Defense

(a) Antartica Medal (U.S.Navy)

(b) Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal

(2) National Aeronautics and Space Administration

(a) Distinguished Service Medal, Revised Design

(b) Outstanding Leadership Medal

(3) National Cultural Center

Proposed Seal

c/o Thelen

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
20 March 1962

AM
2:00 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

2. ADMINISTRATION

a. Date of Next Meeting: 18 April 1962

Executive Session: 17 April 1962

b. Approval of Minutes of February, 1962 Meeting

c. Report by the Chairman on Status of Proposed Projects on Madison and Jackson Place facing Lafayette Square

3. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

a. United States Navy and District of Columbia Government Department of Highways and Traffic

Relocation of Statue of Benjamin Rush

Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Shipstead-Luce Act

(a) Building Applications - Appendix 1, dated 20 March 196

(b) Proposed Sidewalk Cafe at 619 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. (SL 2480)

(c) Preliminary Submissions

3:00 1. Proposed Office Building at 15th Street between F and G Streets, N.W. (Daniel Bell, National Savings and Trust Company; Mr. Guedalia, Cafritz Construction Company)

2. Proposed Headquarters Building for Reserve Officers Association at 250 Third Street, S.W.

3. Proposed Apartment House at 2756 Macomb St., N.W.

(d) Resolution on "Water Gate Town" project for Zoning Hearing on April 13, 1962.

(e) Proposed Revisions to Shipstead-Luce Map - Status

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

MAR 1 1962

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman, The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your letter of February 28, 1962, inquiring as to the application to the members of the Commission of Fine Arts of the President's memorandum of February 9, 1962, relating to prevention of conflicts of interest on the part of advisers and consultants.

The Department of Justice, rather than this office, had principal responsibility for development of the President's memorandum. The memorandum indicates that legal questions raised by the employment of particular experts or consultants should be brought to the attention of the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice. In order to insure consistent and authoritative interpretation of both the memorandum and the statutes it is suggested that your questions in regard to the applicability of the memorandum to the Commission, and the conformity of present Commission practices to the criteria established in the President's memorandum, be directed to the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Seidman

Harold Seidman
Acting Chief, Office of
Management and Organization

EXHIBIT A

21 March 1962

Memorandum for the Record:

I had a talk today with Miss Patricia Collins, of the Attorney General's Office, with reference to the Memorandum which was sent to various agencies including the Commission of Fine Arts, with reference to possible Conflict of Interest. Miss Collins said that inasmuch as the members of the Commission do not award contracts, there seemed to be no necessity for them to disclose their holdings of stocks, bonds, and other investments. I also told her that firms headed by architect members of the Commission occasionally receive contracts from the Government for architectural work, but that the Commission member involved always absents himself from any discussion concerning any project on which his firm is working and which has been submitted for the Commission's advice.

After consulting with one of the other members of the Office Staff, she said she thought it would be sufficient if I circulated the Memorandum to the various members of the Commission so that they would be informed about it, but that it would not be necessary to present the matter in a formal letter to the Attorney General's Office. A copy of the Memorandum has been given to each member of the Commission.

David E. Finley

David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT B

23 February 1962

Dear Mrs. Kennedy:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were very glad to accept your kind invitation to view the rooms at the White House at the time of their meeting here on February 21. They particularly appreciated your thoughtfulness in arranging for them to see the Monroe Room and the Lincoln Room on the second floor, as well as the State Rooms and the ground floor rooms.

They asked me to say that they were delighted with the appearance of the White House and particularly impressed with the restraint and dignity with which the decoration has been made. They were also most interested in seeing the many historic and beautiful pieces of furniture, as well as the paintings, which you have acquired for the White House in the last year. The members hope you will call on us for any assistance we can give, and with grateful appreciation of the work you are doing, I am

For the Commission of Fine Arts,

Sincerely yours,

David L. Finley
Chairman

Mrs. John Fitzgerald Kennedy
The White House
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

19 February 1962

Memorandum for the Files:

Last week, Mrs. Kennedy asked that I meet her on Thursday morning, February 15, at eleven o'clock and walk with her around Lafayette Square. She said that both she and the President were very much concerned with the changes to be made on Madison Place and Jackson Place. She asked if it were necessary that the Court building be erected on Madison Place. I said this had been approved by Congress and also the Commission of Fine Arts. She expressed the strong hope that the building would not be out of line with the other buildings on the Square, and suggested it might be preferable to continue the Treasury Annex rather than having a building of contemporary architecture in this place.

I told her that the Commission of Fine Arts had approved the plan submitted by the two firms of Boston Architects, which had also been shown to the President. She said she would like to have the Commission of Fine Arts give further consideration, first to retaining the houses on Jackson Place, using them for small agencies with gardens where the tall buildings have been erected. She did not object to a high office building being erected on 17th Street, but felt that the buildings on Jackson Place should not be out of keeping with the 19th century architecture of Lafayette Square. She was also very firmly of the opinion that the Old Court of Claims Building should be retained as well as the building on the corner of Jackson Place and Pennsylvania Avenue. If the architects' plans are to be carried out, I think she would wish, and I understood from her that it was also the President's wish, that the small square building to be erected on Jackson Place should be in the feeling of Decatur House and not a great deal higher.

EXHIBIT D

She asked me who decided these matters, and I said our recommendations were advisory only and that the final decision was made by the Administrator of General Services. She asked why the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts could not be mandatory and I told her the Act that established the Commission provided that its powers should be advisory only, and that I felt it was wiser that this should be the case. She said she would like to strengthen the position of the Commission in any way possible, and that the President would also. I told her that a draft of an Executive Order had been for two or three years in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget and that it would, I hope, reach the President in due time through channels. She would like to have a copy of the Executive Order and said she wished to read it and discuss it with the President, so that it might be expedited.

Later in the afternoon, I discussed these matters with Mr. Broadbent who said that he would see that a copy of the Executive Order reached Mrs. Kennedy immediately; also that he would call up the two or three agencies which had not yet replied and tell them he must have an answer at once.

Mrs. Kennedy also said that she would like to have Congress pass a law establishing something on the order of Monuments Historiques in France by which certain designated buildings of historical or architectural importance could not be destroyed. I told her of the Act of 1930 which gave some authority to the National Park Service to make a survey and preserve such buildings where possible. I also said I would talk with Mr. Conrad Wirth of the Park Service , and ask that he give consideration to strengthening the existing law.

David E. Finley
Chairman

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

21 March 1962

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Secretary:

In 1957 and 1958 I had some correspondence with the then Secretary of Commerce, Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, and the Federal Highway Administrator, Honorable Bertram D. Tallamy, with reference to avoidance of damage to our architectural and historic monuments and scenic areas in carrying out the Federal Highway Program. This correspondence is on file in the Bureau of Public Roads.

I was advised by Secretary Mueller and Mr. Tallamy that the work had been decentralized and put into the hands of State Highway Officials who made decisions in these matters. Consequently nothing was done along the lines we suggested and the destruction has continued as before. The Commission of Fine Arts is constantly receiving requests for help from persons throughout the country who are alarmed at the destruction of historic and scenic areas which could easily be avoided if care were taken in the matter sufficiently in advance of the completion of plans and working drawings for such projects. The Commission of Fine Arts has no jurisdiction and is not in a position to be of help in these matters.

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts are concerned that the Federal Highway Program is still being carried out in such a way as to inflict unnecessary damage to architectural and historic monuments in the affected areas. I know, of course, that this is not the intention of the Administration, and that it would be your desire and that of the President, to safeguard the program in every possible way. Efforts are now being made, by means of legislation, to prepare lists of buildings, objects, and areas that are important from an architectural or historic point of view. Even if such legislation is passed, it will take some time to prepare such lists. There does exist, however, much information in the files of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, and in the files of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Meanwhile, great damage is being done at places, such as Sacramento and elsewhere.

The Commission of Fine Arts suggested to Secretary Mueller and Mr. Tallamy that some unnecessary destruction might be avoided if one or more qualified persons were appointed to the staff of the Bureau of Public Roads who was familiar with important scenic areas or architectural and historic monuments in this country and could advise State Highway Departments and perhaps exercise some restraining influence in the same manner as the Fine Arts and Monuments Officers advised our army during World War II. There was organized at that time, as you may recall, the American Commission for the

EXHIBIT D1

Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas. Justice Owen J. Roberts was Chairman of the Commission; I was Vice Chairman; and the Commission headquarters were established in the National Gallery of Art in Washington. As one of its services, the Commission recommended to the United States Army, the names of museum officials and art historians who could assist the Army, so far as was consistent with military necessity, in protecting works of cultural value in countries occupied by our Armies. In this way, much unnecessary destruction of art treasures and architectural monuments was avoided. The report of the Commission was published by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, in 1946.

The Commission of Fine Arts believes that in peace-time, our Bureau of Public Roads should have the same kind of expert advice in carrying out their tremendous project which has such possibilities in the way it will affect our cities, our countryside, and our own historic monuments. We hope that this suggestion may receive favorable consideration.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Luther H. Hodges
The Secretary of Commerce
Department of Commerce
Washington 25, D. C.

26 March 1962

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts has recently learned that the District of Columbia Government proposes to invite bids within 60 to 90 days for the construction of the approach roads to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge that will pass through the northern grounds of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, United States Navy. The Commission is also aware that this highway construction will necessitate the relocation of the statue of Dr. Benjamin Rush, which now stands on the grounds of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, near 24th and E Streets. Northwest.

As you know, the statue of Dr. Rush was a gift of the American Medical Association to the people of the United States, and was accepted by President Theodore Roosevelt at dedication ceremonies held on June 11, 1904. The statue has occupied its present location north of the central building which was once known as the United States Naval Museum of Hygiene and Medical School, and which was a part of the Old Naval Hospital. Thus, for nearly 58 years the Rush statue has been associated with its present location near the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

The Commission of Fine Arts has given careful consideration to the relocation of the Rush statue, and has concluded that it would be possible to move the statue nearer the building, well out of the right-of-way for the new approach road. At its meeting on March 20, 1962, the members of the Commission concluded that it would not now be logical and desirable to relocate the statue in some other part of the City if it could be easily moved to a new site on the same grounds with which it has been so long associated. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that the statue be retained on the grounds of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and that it be moved from its present location to a site south of its present site of and facing the entrance of the building. It is believed that the statue will be enhanced if it is turned to face in a southerly direction.

EXHIBIT E

It is our understanding that the Department of Highways and Traffic of the District of Columbia Government will assume the responsibility for the moving of the statue to another site. A copy of this letter is being sent to the Engineer Commissioner for his information. The Commission will be glad to advise as to details of placing the statue in the recommended new location.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Fred Korth
The Secretary of the Navy
Department of the Navy
Washington 25, D. C.

cc- Engineer Commissioner for the
District of Columbia

American Medical Association, Wash. Office, Dr. Roy T. Lester
Bureau of the Budget

Finley
Wilson
Atherton
Martin
Bennett
Lurkey
Shaw

SATTERLEE & SMITH ARCHITECTS
3 DUPONT CIRCLE WASHINGTON 6, D. C. HOBART 2-3515

NICHOLAS SATTERLEE, AIA

CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH, FAIA

March 19, 1962

Mr. David E. Finley
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
7000 Department of Interior Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my plea on the question of the "face-lifting" design for the Region 3 GSA Office Building. As I explained, I felt that we had not come to the February Fine Arts review with the proper presentation. Since I was under the impression, from the previous Fine Arts Commission review, that the suspended screen proposal was approved as a basic scheme, my presentation was geared to illustrate only the refinement of the screen treatment, as we had been requested to do. Therefore, with the blessing of my client, GSA Region 3, I should be delighted if I could have the chance of explaining our design in terms of the effect of the screen design on the mass, proportions, profile and skyline of the buildings, which I feel to be an essential approach toward solving the problem of making the building compatible with its new surroundings. Having known the building intimately for the ten years in which we have been doing work in the Southwest, I am convinced that any kind of surface treatment, whether paint, new windows, applied stone, or other similar scheme, would not affect the existing major and minor projections, unhappy parapet line and relation of the building to its base. As you may remember, at our first Fine Arts review, we presented three schemes, two of which were essentially surface solutions, and your Commission turned them down in favor of the third scheme which was a suspended screen design. I should be happy to bring in such material as will best illustrate the relation of the proposed design to the mass of the existing building, and the relation of the building to adjacent new and proposed buildings in the F.O.B. and Southwest programs. A block model, plus photographs of renderings of some of the F.O.B. designs would give the proper illustration

EXHIBIT F

and show in addition, our proposal for roof treatment of the GSA building.

I was distressed to find that the sectional model which we brought in did not correctly explain our stone wall base nor the planting between this wall and the building face, and I should like to revise this since it is a part of and does affect the overall design.

In our Shipstead-Luce sessions, we are frequently frustrated in our attempts at conscientious and reasoned review by the lack of proper illustrative material. I should not like to be guilty, through an erroneous assumption on my part, of the same error.

Though I am aware that the Planning Commission favors demolition of the GSA building (their block models, site plans and renderings of this area, incorporating a new proposed building crowding the GSA building immediately to the South testifies to this) and from your statement that your Commission would like to see it go at some time in the future, nevertheless I believe it realistic to assume that the building will be with us for some time to come. The GSA has put quite a sum into the interior to date, and the building is not only built like a fortress but its structural bay spacing makes it suitable to the flexibility of arrangement required of any office building being constructed today. I therefore firmly believe that it is more justifiable economically to spend a million dollars on a "face-lifting" which will make it consonant with both new federal office buildings and the new structures in the Southwest, than to spend the same sum (according to the GSA estimate) to demolish it, and then have to appropriate a very substantial sum to build new space for the GSA. As the building now stands, it is an eyesore, and I am convinced that a cosmetic treatment such as has been proposed would not correct this, and hence would be a waste of money. Though I agree with the argument that a thorough face-lifting would tend to prolong the life of the building, the fact, which I think must be accepted, that it will not be pulled down in the immediate future justifies to me the necessary expenditure for a treatment which would make it compatible with its new neighbors. My own feeling, which is admittedly prejudiced, is that the suspended screen design will make of it a building as acceptable as any in the new F.O.B. program, and that the Planning Commission plan for this area should recognize this, and be revised accordingly.

I understand that a meeting of GSA officials and the architect is to be called shortly to decide on the direction to be taken, and I very much hope they will agree with me on the value of a review of augmented pre-

sentation material in proportion to the time required for it.

Again, thank you for your time and attention on this matter.

Yours very truly,

Nicholas Satterlee

NS/bb

Nicholas Satterlee

Copies to: Mr. Van Vranken
Mr. Hunter
Mr. Snyder

27 March 1962

Dear Mr. Satterlee:

I spoke to the members of the Commission at our meeting last Wednesday about your visit to my office, and I also read your letter in which you gave the reasons you hoped further consideration could be given to your proposal for resurfacing of the General Services Administration Regional Office Building in Southwest Washington.

The members of the Commission expressed their doubt that any new information would result in changing their recommendation. The Commission has always tried to adhere to a position opposing the decoration of buildings, or as you express it in your letter, the "facelifting" of architecture, for the sake of bringing the style up-to-date or into some other framework of conformance. Although the comparison may be somewhat exaggerated, there is something in this situation that is akin to the desire of some architects to reface the Old State, War and Navy Building, in order to bring the building into harmony with the Treasury and the White House by adding columns and removing the chimneys and other Victorian detail, to which I know you are personally opposed.

The members asked me to tell you that they thought Mr. Meyers of your office had made a very thorough presentation of the problem, and that the material he presented was more than adequate to form the basis for their judgment. If, on the other hand, the officials of the General Services Administration request the opportunity to present additional material for the advice of the Commission, we would, of course, be glad to have them do so.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Nicholas Satterlee
3 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

EXHIBIT 6

27 March 1963

Dear Mr. Satterfield:

I spoke to the members of the Foundation at our meeting last Saturday about your visit to my office, and I also read your letter to them. In this you gave the reasons you began further consultations could be given to your proposal for reorganizing of the General Services Administration Regional Office building in Southwest Washington.

The members of the Foundation expressed some doubt that any new information would result in changing their recommendation. The Foundation has always taken pains to adhere to a position opposing the demolition of buildings, or any portion of it in your letter, the "desirability" of substitutes. For the sake of bringing the matter to a close or lay some other framework of understanding. Although the conferees may be somewhat disappointed, there is something in this situation that is akin to the desire of some architects to preserve the old house, the old barn building. In order to bring the building into harmony with the Jefferson and the White House by adding columns and remodeling the entrance and other structural details, to which I know you are personally committed.

The members asked me to tell you that they thought Mr. Lapham of your office has done a very thorough presentation of the problem, and that his material is presented has been fully adequate to form the basis for their judgment. If, on the other hand, the officials of the General Services Administration request the opportunity to present additional material for the review of the Foundation, we would, of course, be glad to have them do so.

For the Foundation of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Charles Satterfield
7 Lincoln Circle, S.E.
Washington 6, D.C.

26 March 1962

Dear Mr. Snyder:

I am writing in regard to your discussion with the members of the Commission of Fine Arts on March 21, 1962 concerning the progress of the models for the sculptural reliefs for the exterior of the Courthouse and Federal Office Building at Oklahoma City, Oklahoma by Mr. Bernard Frazier, sculptor.

At that time, you indicated that the building was nearing completion and that the stones where the reliefs are to be carved have been set in place, but that Mr. Frazier had not submitted any further development of the design since the small scale sketch models were shown to the Commission in June, 1961. In order to hasten the work, you asked whether Mr. Frazier could seek the assistance of the sculptor member of the Commission, Mr. Felix de Weldon.

Mr. de Weldon, as you know, is abroad at the present time and will not return until May. If you will send us some sketches of the work, we shall endeavor to have them reviewed.

I note that photographs of the designs considered at the meeting of the Commission on June 20, 1961 have not been as yet supplied. We again request these photographs to complete our record.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

Mr. J. Rowland Snyder
Director, Architectural and Structural
Division, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D.C.

EXHIBIT H

27 March 1962

Dear Mr. Boutin:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on March 21, 1962, considered a request of the Public Buildings Service for advice in selecting a sculptor to execute exterior sculptural decoration for a new federal office building in Salt Lake City, Utah.

The withdrawal of Millard F. Malin, who have been previously commissioned for this work, occasioned the selection of another sculptor. The names of three sculptors, namely, Maurice E. Brooks, Stephen Zakian and Russell Forester were proposed to replace Mr. Malin. After carefully inspecting the photographs of their works in turn, the members were favorably impressed with the work of Russell Forester, and they recommended that he be considered for this commission. The members expressed the hope, however, that the final choice of a sculptor should be made by the architect, or at least that the architect should be agreeable to the sculptor chosen.

We hope that when preliminary studies of the proposed sculpture are prepared they will be brought to the Commission for its consideration.

The material submitted for the Commission's use is returned herewith.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Bernard Boutin
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D.C.

EXHIBIT I

27 March 1962

Dear Colonel French:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on March 20th, gave further consideration to your request for advice on the proposed designs for the obverse and reverse sides of the proposed Antarctica Service Medal. Practically the same designs had previously been considered by the Commission on October 17, 1961, at which time the designs were disapproved.

The members of the Commission understand that the proposed designs are favored by the representatives of the organizations participating in the Antarctica Operations, but we must repeat the views stated in our letter of November 2, 1961 that good medals cannot be achieved by merely assembling the ideas of interested parties. The Commission believes that such approval as this medal may have received is possibly based on a general misunderstanding as to the purpose of a commemorative medal.

As you know, a medal is intended to commemorate, through the use of appropriate symbols, qualities that go beyond the dimensions of mere representation and portrayal. It is well understood, for example, that in the medal under consideration, the objects depicted on the reverse side of the medal, such as the tractor, ship and airplane, played an important role in the Antarctic operations, yet, the purpose of this medal is to honor the abstract qualities of the men who were associated in the expedition with these objects, not the objects themselves. Similarly, the penguin might be considered as appropriate subject matter related to the Antarctic operations, but it too, by its predominance in the composition, detracts from the central idea of the medal. In fact it does so to such a degree that in combination with the words around the border of the medal, one might very well assume the subject of the medal and the text was the penguin itself.

The Commission recognizes the effort to symbolize the courage, devotion and sacrifice that typified the Antarctic operations and believes that to achieve this it is essential to give the figure of the man sole emphasis, eliminating the extraneous descriptive

EXHIBIT J

27 March 1966

Dear Colonel Francis:

The Foundation of Pine City, at its meeting on March 22th, gave further consideration to your request for grants to you proposed studies for the Service and Research office of the proposed Security Audit. Especially the case studies and statistics been now delivered by the Foundation on October 23, 1966, at which time the studies were discussed.

The members of the Foundation reviewed both the proposed studies and followed by the representatives of the Foundation participation in the operation Foundation, and so also regards the above related to our Center of Research, in fact that you would monitor to assistance by mainly concerning the lines of interrelated studies. The Foundation believes that such assistance as this could be provided in probably based on a general consulting-advisory as to the purpose of a commencement study.

As you know, a model is intended to demonstrate, through the use of appropriate symbols, qualities that is regard the elements of some representation and principle. It is well understood, for example, that in the model under consideration, the objects included in the reverse side of the model, such as the function, goal and also plans, played an important role in the security activities, yet the purpose of this model is to bring the general qualities of the was not very associated in the specialties with some objects, and the objects themselves. Similarly, the models edge to consider as appropriate subject matter relative to the internal operations, and it has, by the predominance in the organization, intimate the central line of the model. It does it does or by some a degree that in evaluating with the work around the center of the model, one might very well assume the subject of the model and the was the problem itself.

The Foundation recognizes the effort to consider the security, function and activities that regulate the internal operations and follows that to achieve that it is essential to give the flows of the two main subjects, illustrating the relationship diagrams

elements on both sides of the medal. If the penguin is to be used at all, it should be reduced in size and possibly combined with other elements in the design. It should not become the predominant subject matter in any case. For instance, a stronger statement of the intend of the medal could be achieved by placing the words "courage, devotion, and sacrifice" in the center of the reverse side, possibly surrounded by a decorative border consisting of a penguin design. The representation of the human figure could be shown standing on ice or snow rather than on the map of Antarctica. If it is desired to use the map and the geodesic circles, the members of the Commission suggested that it might be incorporated on the reverse side as a background for the lettering of the text.

The Commission asked me to say, as we have said in other letters, that there is no substitute for the inspiration which a sculptor instills in his work; and to repeat that the services of distinguished American sculptors should be utilized in designing important official medals. We would, in this way, not only achieve variety and excellence of design, but we would also recognize our own creative artists, who would feel honored to serve their government in this way.

The importance of this can be seen by viewing the collection of distinguished medals, created over many centuries, which are on exhibition in the National Gallery of Art as fine works of art, worthy of preservation by a great art museum.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Lt Colonel J. T. French
Heraldic Officer
Office of the Quartermaster General
Department of the Army
Washington 25, D.C.

EXHIBIT U

23 March 1962

Dear Colonel French:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on March 20th, considered the proposed designs for the obverse and reverse sides of a medal to be known as the Armed Forces Expeditionary Service Medal.

The members of the Commission noted the accompanying explanations of the design which indicated that the eagle is intended to be symbolic of the strength of the armed forces. They do not feel, after inspecting the designs, however, that the representation of the eagle with its wings in a lowered and somewhat awkward position will achieve the effect of strength which is desirable for this medal. They would recommend, instead, that the eagle be shown in a more upright and forceful pose, with the wings raised in the customary manner.

Regarding the reverse side of the medal, the members thought that the shield had not been well-integrated with the lettering within the circular shape of the medal. They discussed a number of ways to overcome this objection; the most promising being to enlarge the shield to more nearly the size of the medal face and superimpose the title of the award with slightly raised lettering across the shield. They believed that in this manner the overall composition would be considerably strengthened by combining what formerly were two elements into one single design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Lt. Colonel J. T. French
Heraldic Officer
Office of the Quartermaster General
Department of the Army
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT K

23 March 1962

Dear Colonel French:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on March 20th, examined the drawings of the designs proposed by the Heraldic Institute for the Distinguished Service Medal to be awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The members of the Commission approved the general design of the medal, but felt that the medal could gain further distinction by giving a slight flair to the ends of the saltire and pattee. They suggested that a shallow V-shaped indentation terminate the ends of the pattee while the alternating ends of the saltire should be somewhat pointed.

As to the lettering they would hope that the style could be considerably refined and that the spacing of the words should be more regular, thus reducing the area between the letters "N.A.S.A." and the words "Distinguished Service."

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Lt. Colonel J. T. French
Heraldic Officer
Office of the Quartermaster General
Department of the Army
Washington 25, D.C.

EXHIBIT L

30 June 1962

Dear Colonel Frenzel:

The Coordinator of Film Arts at the meeting on June 26th, reviewed the drawings of the designs proposed by the Possible Pictures for the Photographic Service Medal to be awarded by the Secretary Administrator and Chief Executive Officer.

The members of the Coordinator approved the general design of the medal, but felt that the actual medal design further formalizing by having a Eagle Claw to the side of the medallion and ribbon. They suggested that a medium relief Lightning Bolt emanating the rays of the globe while the alternating rays of the medium should be semi-dull finished.

As to the lettering they would have liked the style would be semi-formally refined and that the spacing of the words should be more regular. Some reduced the space between the Lightning Bolt and the words "Photographic Service."

For the Coordinator of Film Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David L. Fluhr
Chairman

Lt. Colonel A. L. Frenzel
Presidio Office
Office of the Quartermaster General
Department of the Army
Washington 25, D.C.

23 March 1962

Dear Colonel French:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on March 20th, considered the designs proposed by the Heraldic Institute for the medal to be awarded for Outstanding Leadership by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The members of the Commission do not object to the symbolic representation of the subject through the use of the torch superimposed on the laurel wreath, but they regard the design elements as poorly composed. The relationship of the torch to the wreath and the rendering of the hand are all in need of restudy. They would also like to suggest that the length of the torch be increased and more strongly inclined away from the point of attachment at the top of the medal.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Lt. Colonel J. T. French
Heraldic Officer
Office of the Quartermaster General
Department of the Army
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT M

27 March 1962

Dear Colonel French:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on March 20, 1962, examined the drawings of five proposed designs for an official seal to be adopted and used by the National Cultural Center Board of Trustees.

On April 19, 1960, the Commission was shown a design for a seal which was prepared for the Board of Trustees of the Cultural Center under private contract. At that time, the Commission recommended that the Cultural Center's Board enlist the assistance of the Heraldic Branch of the Quartermaster Corps, U.S. Army, in preparing additional designs for the proposed seal. Consequently a number of studies have been submitted to the Commission since that time.

Upon reviewing the most recent submissions, however, the members of the Commission found little improvement in the quality of the designs. They believed that the design presented in 1960 was superior to those that followed, and would prefer it, even though the Commission had originally disapproved it. This preference was based largely on the belief that the graphic character of the first submission was more adaptable as a seal, while the latter proposals would seem more fitting as sculptural forms.

The Commission agrees, as you state in your letter of March 15, that the seal adopted by the National Cultural Center must meet the most demanding aesthetic criteria. They continue to believe that only by securing the very best talent available can this be achieved. They recommended, therefore, that every effort be made to engage an artist or artists of nationally recognized ability to submit new designs for the seal.

Such a broadened effort, in their opinion, would not only increase the prospect for a superior design, but also would be a much more representative symbol of the intended national character of the Cultural Center.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Lt Colonel J. T. French
Heraldic Officer
Office of the Quartermaster General
Department of the Army
Washington 25, D.C.

EXHIBIT N

27 March 1962

Dear Colonel Fremont:

The Coordinator of Film Arts, at his meeting on March 26, 1962, reviewed the drawings of five proposed designs for an official seal to be adopted and used by the National Cultural Center Board of Trustees.

On April 19, 1961, the Coordinator was shown a design for a seal which was prepared for the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, private sector. At that time, the Coordinator recommended that the National Guard Bureau notify the secretaries of the Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, as well as the Secretary of the Army, Department of the Navy, in preparing additional designs for the proposed seal. Consequently, a number of studies have been submitted to the Coordinator since that time.

Upon reviewing the most recent submissions, however, the members of the Coordinator's Fine Arts Committee felt that there was no improvement in the quality of the designs. They believed that the design presented in 1961 was superior to those that followed. Not wishing further to prolong the Coordinator's deliberations, they unanimously recommended that the design presented in 1961 be adopted as the seal, with the latter proposal serve more fitting as an alternate design.

The Coordinator concurs, as you state in your letter of March 13, that the seal adopted by the National Cultural Center must meet the most exacting aesthetic criteria. They must endure to future ages not only by reflecting the very best taste available but also by achieving. They must, therefore, take every effort to avoid to engage in artists or artists of mediocrity participation ability to submit new designs for the seal.

Such a structured effort, in their opinion, would not only increase the prospect for a superior design, but also would be a more appropriate method of the intended national character of the Cultural Center.

For the Coordinator of The Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Ralph G. Martin
Chairman

Lt Colonel L. T. Fremont
Executive Officer
Office of the Quartermaster General
Department of the Army
Washington 25, D.C.

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON
AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

March 2, 1962

Mr. David E. Finley
Chairman, Commission on Fine Arts
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Chairman Finley:

I am writing to respectfully urge a special study to determine a fitting monument, statue, or other memorial to commemorate the U.S. "breakthrough" into Space.

The successful orbiting of "Friendship 7," manned by Colonel John Glenn, represents -- in my judgment -- one of the greatest, most historically-significant events in the progress and history of the United States.

The creation of a memorial -- depicting, perhaps, the orbit, and featuring the pioneer astronauts -- is well warranted. Symbolizing a significant feature of national accomplishment, it would deserve, I believe, a prominent place -- in the Statuary Halls of Congress, or elsewhere -- in the Nation's Capital.

Following a study -- and acceptable recommendations -- I would be happy to do all I can to encourage and support the erection of a memorial commensurate with the significance of the first successful manned orbit of the U.S. Space Program.

Looking forward to getting your evaluation of these recommendations, and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Alexander Wiley

Alexander Wiley

AW:kmh

EXHIBIT O

22 March 1962

Memorandum for the Record:

In answer to a telephone call this morning from Mr. Mick of Senator Wiley's office, I told him of the action of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts on March 21st with reference to the Senator's inquiry as to the time and manner of erecting in Washington a monument to the recent "breakthrough" in Space. I told Mr. Mick the members thought it was a little too early to erect such a monument and that it might be better to await further developments.

I said that, if some private organization could arrange to preserve the likenesses of the astronauts either by portraits or portrait busts, it would be desirable since no public funds were available in the Space Agency for this purpose.

I also said that if and when the monument is authorized, it would be necessary to follow the usual course of establishing a commission with authority to select a sculptor and architect, and also to obtain a site on government-owned land in Washington for the memorial.

David E. Finley

David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT B

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

REPORT DATE: 15 March 1962

TO : Members, Commission of Fine Arts

FROM : Members, Panel of Architectural Consultants for S. L. Act

SUBJECT: Reserve Officers' Association Memorial Building, Preliminary Design

Mr. Alex Van Kuren, architect, representing the firm of Mills, Petticord, and Mills, conferred with members of the Shipstead-Luce Panel of Architects regarding the preliminary design for a Memorial Building of the Reserve Officers' Association to be located at 250-3rd Street, S. W. adjacent to Independence Avenue, S. W. and facing the Botanical Garden, the third House Office Building, and the Capitol. Also in attendance was Colonel John T. Carlton, USAR, Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

After careful consideration of the site plans and elevation drawings of the building, and after questioning the architect as to siting, materials, etc., the Shipstead-Luce Panel would like to report to the Commission the following:

1. General Design: The general design of the building, in the opinion of the Panel, would, because of its rather close approximation to classical formality and proportions, be most difficult to relate to such an irregular and restrictive site as presently proposed. The rectangular pedestal crowded the corner of Third and "C" Streets, and at the same time directly abutted the curved open trench of the proposed Central Leg of the Inner Loop. The Panel would recommend that if such a general architectural character is desired, either a larger site or a site more accommodating to the rectangular shape of the building and pedestal be obtained.

2. Elevations: As to the treatment of the east and west elevations, the Panel believes that the arrangement of the vertical strips of glass and bronze spandrels, alternating with equal areas of white marble, produces a pattern which competes with rather than supplements the colonnade. In addition the pattern of sunlight through the roof between the colonnade and the surface of the building might, in their opinion, further complicate the total effect.

3. Scale: Discrepancies between the measured elevation drawings and perspective drawings should be noted by the architect. Thickness of the fascia and other details are at variance with each other in several instances as indicated on the two drawings.

EXHIBIT 9

4. Materials: The use of wire glass in the skylights over the colonnade is questionable; the use of white marble as the dominant material is also open to question, and should be thoughtfully considered in relation to the adjacent government structures, especially if it is intended that the marble is to be heavily veined or streaked.

In summary, the Panel would like to see further preliminary design studies taking into consideration the relationship of the character of the building with special regard to the site. The Panel considers this site in its proximity to the United States Capitol and other government buildings as especially important; the design, at this stage, has not measured up to its prominent location.

For the Panel of Architectural Consultants for Shipstead-Luce Act:

CHAtherton

Charles H. Atherton
Assistant Secretary

CHA:mm

LCW

(NOTE: Above Report confirmed by members of S. L. Panel by telephone on 3/16/62.)

copy forwarded to SL Panel 3/19/62

March 28, 1962

Mr. Julian P. Green
Chief, Permit Branch
Dept. of Licenses & Inspections
108 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

Dear Mr. Green:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on March 20th gave informal consideration to the designs for the proposed Memorial Headquarters Building for the Reserve Officers Association, to be located on the northwest corner of Third and "C" Streets, S. W. The Shipstead-Luce Panel of Architects also reviewed the design on March 15th, when Mr. Alex Van Kuren, architect of the firm of Mills, Petticord and Mills, and Colonel John T. Carlton, USAR, Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association, explained the plans.

The Commission liked the general concept of the architectural design, but had certain reservations about the siting and landscaping, especially where the terrace abuts the open trench of the proposed central leg of the Inner Loop. They thought that the terrace and pool appeared somewhat cramped in its proximity to the freeway, although they realized the desirability of having such a feature in that location in order to reduce the effects of the depressed road.

The Commission also recommended that the architect select a shade of marble less brilliant than the one indicated in the rendered perspective. Important government buildings, including the Capitol and the new building for the House of Representatives are situated in prominent locations nearby. They must be given thoughtful consideration in every aspect of the design of the new building. A sample of the material should be sent us with the next submission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sth

CHA:mLL

Charles H. Atherton
Assistant Secretary

EXHIBIT R

March 29, 1962

Mr. Julian P. Green
Chief, Permit Branch
Dept. of Licenses & Inspections
108 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

Dear Mr. Green:

I am writing in regard to the series of informal submissions that have been made for the designs of a proposed office building to be located at 1044-31st Street, N. W., just south of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument.

Mr. Vlastimil Koubek, the architect of the proposed building, has conferred on a number of occasions with members of the Board of Architectural Consultants for Old Georgetown. During these conferences, the board made certain architectural recommendations which have been incorporated by the architect in the design of the building.

At a meeting of the Board on March 13th, the members still expressed concern over the massive character of the design of the five-story building. The architect was so informed when he met with members of the staff, at your request, on March 14th, and was asked to make a study showing the top story of the building as a mansard roof with dormer windows. The board made several other suggestions regarding the treatment of all the openings, all of which were calculated to reduce the massive and heavy quality of the facades.

A revised scheme incorporating the above recommendations was presented at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on March 20th. After careful consideration, the members decided that the addition of a mansard roof would not sufficiently reduce the mass of the building, as had been hoped, but rather would tend to complicate further and draw attention to the facades. The other recommendations that had been incorporated into the design were considered, however, to be improvements. The members would therefore like to see these changes retained, but further study should be applied to the treatment of both the fifth story and the penthouse in its previous rectangular form. The height of the building would probably be less offensive if allowed to assume the more simple profile.

The members of both the Board and the Commission want to stress the problem of the building height, not only for this particular building but for the others that will inevitably follow throughout the Waterfront area.

EXHIBIT S

Without some revision to the limits of height and bulk as presently set in the zoning regulations, the proper rendering of architectural advice as regards the Old Georgetown Act will become nearly impossible. If the intent of Congress is to be followed in preserving and protecting the character of the early Federal period of the National Capital, then it will certainly be necessary for some change.

In the near future the Commission of Fine Arts will be ready to present to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia proposed revisions to the height limitation for the area of Georgetown south of "M" Street. It is hoped that the most thoughtful consideration will be given to these proposals.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

by _____
Charles H. Atherton
Assistant Secretary

CHA:mll

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 2/20/62 3/20/62

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
2480	619 Penna. Ave., NW Waffle Shop	Sidewalk Cafe Canopy, red & white canvas. Suspended from bldg. with fixed iron frames & posts above front entr.

ACTION: Disap'd: although there is no objection to tables & chairs & a covering awning in this location, there is objection to a fixed shed-type enclosure that would extend across the sidewalk throughout the year, whether in use or not. It is recom'd. that roller type awning of a single colored fabric be substituted for the fixed shed-type awning so that it can be retracted when not in use, 3/20/62.

2481	603 Penna. Ave., NW Pennsy Carry Out Shop	1 blue canvas awning; suspended from bldg. over front entr. & window; no fixed iron frames or posts.

ACTION: Disap'd: exist. disorderly conditions on bldg. do not lend themselves to the attachment of an awning. Recom. eliminating project. showwindow & to provide suitable window treatment within orig. wall opening, 3/15/62.

2482	2137 Virginia Ave., NW Gulf Oil Co. Gas Station	1 d-f sign. 40 sq-ft total. (Note: Sign was erected on pole to show exact location & size).

ACTION: Disap'd. Attachment to pole of larger round illuminated sign gives cluttered effect. Exist. signs exceed maximum square-footage recom'd. Business is adequately advertised with exist. signs, 3/15/62.

2483	2200 P St., NW Gulf Oil Co. Gas Station	Same as SL 2482.

ACTION: Same as SL 2482.

2484	201-03-05 D St., NE, 225 Mass. Ave., NE, & 327-2nd St., NE - 201 Associates	Rev. to SL 2479, for alterations, add'ns. & renovations to apts. Add 1-story to exist. structure at 225 Mass. Ave. Raze 2 exist. bays at 201-03-05 D St.

ACTION: App'd. as revised on drawing dtd. 3/5/62, 3/15/62.

2485	300 New Jersey Ave., SE Congressional Hotel	Replace 2 exist. windows with doors.

ACTION: App'd., 3/8/62.

APPENDIX 1

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
2486	201 Penna. Ave., SE Metropolis Bldg. Assn.	Provide new alum. entr. doors & new metal grilles in all 2nd-story windows to match exist. 1st-story grilles. On 2nd St., revise 2 openings & provide new metal grilles in all 2nd-story windows to match exist. 1st story grilles.

ACTION: App'd., 3/15/62.

2487	1345 E St., NW Republic Savings & Loan Assn.	1 s-f, 25-3/4 sq-ft sign. Stainless steel ltrs. back-lighted with 2 rows of white neon. Base to be cut-out ltrs., backed with white plexiglas, lighted internally.

ACTION: Disap'd; recom. uniform size ltrs. to be distributed across length of overhang above entranceway, as shown in earlier architectural drawings; sign to be opaque, back-lighted ltrs., 3/15/62.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 3/13/62 3/20/62

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
3102	3321 R St., NW A. L. Wheeler	New 3-story brick & frame dwelling; 7' wood sapling fence; 2' high rear ret. wall.

ACTION: Recom'd., as revised on drawing dtd. 2/28/62, provided that windows on 3rd fl. rear are spaced approx. the same as 3rd-fl. rear windows are spaced in dwelling #3. (NOTE: Action does not apply to air conditioner unit on roof which should be located elsewhere.), 3/8/62.

3103	3323 R St., NW A. L. Wheeler	New 3-story brick & frame dwelling; 7' wood sapling fence in rear yard.

ACTION: Recom'd., as revised on drawing dtd. 2/28/62, provided double window on 3rd fl. rear is replaced by 2 single windows, the space between being at least 18". (NOTE: Action does not apply to air conditioner unit on roof which should be located elsewhere.), 3/8/62.

3104	3325 R St., NW A. L. Wheeler	3-story brick & frame dwelling; 7' wood sapling fence in rear yard.

ACTION: Recom'd. for parts visible from public highway, as revised on drawing dtd. 2/28/62. (NOTE: Action does not apply to air conditioner unit on roof which should be located elsewhere.), 3/8/62.

3105	3327 R St., NW A. L. Wheeler	New 3-story brick & frame dwelling; 7' wood sapling fence; 2' high rear ret. wall.

ACTION: Recom'd. for parts visible from public highway, as revised on drawing dtd. 2/28/62. (NOTE: Action does not apply to air conditioner unit on roof which should be located elsewhere.), 3/8/62.

3116	1417-28th St., NW Georgetown Floor Coverings	1 black canvas awning over front entr. Suspended from bldg. with fixed iron frames.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided awning be retractable type; & color be dark green instead of black, 3/13/62.

3117	1720-34th St., NW Miss Vivian M. Campbell	Remove exist. frame porch & steps, erect new brik platform & steps; brick-pave walk to sidewalk. Install new front entr. trim & door, also pine window shutters. Paint brick-work of front elevation, also all woodwork.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided 6-panel door be used with 2 top panels glazed, 3/13/62.

APPENDIX 2

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 3/13/62 (Continued) 3/20/62

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
3118	1693-34th St., NW Mr. Walter Schier	2nd-fl. addition. Lower 1st-fl. windows. Close up stairway to basement.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided width of muntins on 2nd story, front elevation windows, is approx. 3/4", also recom. reducing height of parapet walls on north & south elevations by 3 courses of brick, 3/13/62.

3119	1426 Wisc. Ave., NW London Cleaners	Install new front on doorway to 2nd fl.

ACTION: Not recom'd; reduce width of frame & simplify trim around entranceway; also increase size of lamp approximately 1½ times, 3/13/62.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 2/20/62

MAR 13 1962

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
3092	1403-30th St., NW Mrs George Blow	Install 2 outside wall brackets at entrance.

ACTION: Ret'd. for indication, i. e., photograph, sketch, of proposed bracket, 2/27/62.

3095	3003 M St., NW Goat & Compass Pub	Install 2 outside brackets, 7'-6" above sidewalk, on each side of front door of bldg.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Installation of lamps on narrow brick jambs would interrupt brick wall surface & give constricted effect. Suggest single wrought-iron lamp on brackets over entr; or a lamp hanging, or bracketed, in transom, of a design which would be appropriate for this important early Georgetown bldg., 3/6/62.

3096	1426 Wisc. Ave., NW London Cleaners	1 s-f sign, 25 sq-ft. Gold ltrs. on black bckgd. Cut-out ltrs. Marine plywood. Exist. signs to be removed.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Recom. sign of rectangular form extending between top of showwindow & bottom member of cornice; also recom. using Roman style ltrs, executed in gold leaf, 3/6/62.

3097	3233 N St., NW Odd Fellows Home Assn.	Remove window - replace door. Remove window, close with cinder-block. Brick up opening with brick & c-block to provide closet.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided brick arch over doorway align to opening on left of door. Brickwork to match original brickwork, 2/27/62.

3098	3432 P St., NW Catherine Shelton	Hang 2 light fixtures--1 on front & 1 on rear of bldg.

ACTION: Recom'd., 2/27/62.

3099	2722 P St., NW Gladys Gaskins	Install 1 fixture on exist. outlet (light).

ACTION: Recom'd., 2/27/62.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 2/20/62 (Continued) MAR 13 1962

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
3100	1601 Suter's Lane, NW J. F. Harris, III ACTION: Recom'd., 2/27/62.	7' cedar sapling fence & gates.
3101	1214-30th St., NW Ira Glackens ACTION: Recom'd., 2/27/62.	Install 1 ornamental iron railing on roof of front bay window.
3106	1311-35th St., NW LeRoy T. Morgan ACTION: Recom'd. (See attached ltr. dtd. 2/27/62 to Ch., Permit Br., D. C. Dept. of L & I.), 2/27/62.	Reface exterior frame structure in aluminum siding.
3107	2920 M St., NW Pierre Gaunoux ACTION: Recom'd. for parts visible from public highway, 2/27/62.	Enlarge window in 1st fl. rear & door in basement; build an addn. & w. i. balcony.
3108	2913 M St., NW Rue Royale Restaurant ACTION: Recom'd., 2/27/62.	1 awning over main entr. door. 3 awnings over 3 front windows. Vinyl canvas. White with 1" gold border on scallop. Suspended from bldg. with fixed iron frames.
3109	1251-35th St., NW Helen Loftus & Frances A. Casey ACTION: Recom'd., for parts visible from public highway, 2/27/62.	Remodel: Replace wood window sills with brick; replace window & door. No change in opening.
3110	1229-33rd St., NW Dorothy M. Weaver ACTION: Recom'd., 3/6/62.	7' brick fence, side adjoining sidewalk & back adjoining alley-(casement). To replace rotting wooden fence.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 2/20/62 (Continued) MAR 13 1962

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
3111	1601 Wisc. Ave., NW Gulf Oil Corp. Gas Station	1 d-f sign. 40 sq-ft total. (NOTE: Sign was erected on pole to show exact location & size).
ACTION: Not recom'd. Attachment to pole of larger round illuminated sign gives cluttered effect. Exist. signs exceed maximum square-footage recom'd. Business is adequately advertised with exist. signs, 3/6/62.		
3112	1512-30th St., NW Rose-Marie A. Harris	6' split cedar fence.
ACTION: Recom'd., 3/6/62.		
3113	2804 Dumbarton Ave., NW Helen Woodcock	Lower basement fl; replace door & window on front with new casement sash; build uncovered side porch; remove front porch.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided new siding around new windows matches old siding, 3/6/62.		
3114	1721 Wisc. Ave., NW Tino's Continental Restaurant	Rev. of OG 3084 for 1 s-f sign, wood, painted black; non-illuminated.
ACTION: Recom'd., 3/6/62.		
3115	1403-30th St., NW Mrs George Blow	Resubm. of OG 3092 to install 2 outside wall brackets at entrance.
ACTION: Recom'd., 3/6/62.		

27 February 1962

Mr. Julian P. Green
Chief, Permit Branch
Dept. of Licenses & Inspections
108 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

Dear Mr. Green:

I am writing further regarding the application of Mr. LeRoy T. Morgan, to sheath his frame house at 1311-35th Street, N. W. with aluminum siding--O. G. 3106.

Although the action taken on this project was favorable, I would like to point out that there were some misgivings expressed about Mr. Morgan's plans to apply this contemporary treatment to this frame house which dates from the early part of the 19th Century. There would have been no question about resheathing this house with wood, a material authentic to the period the house was built, or the period it was resheathed with so-called German siding. If aluminum siding is used, it may be well to point out that the use of this material will require careful attention to maintain reveals of window and door frames as far as possible. Corner boards of the proper width should be used at all corners to give the effect, as much as possible, of the original appearance.

It is suggested that someone possessing knowledge of these preservation and appearance factors give close supervision to the work, and not leave these decisions to the installing workmen.

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

LRW-MYL