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INTRODUCTION

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE McMILLAN SITE

The site for the proposed redevelopment of the McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Plant (McMillan Site) is a 24.69-acre parcel located on the eastern edge of the northwest quadrant of the city. The McMillan Site was once part of the larger 92-acre McMillan Reservoir and Filtration Plant, owned and operated by the United States government. The larger site was comprised of the McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Plant, the McMillan Reservoir, and the McMillan Pumping Station. The McMillan Site is the section of the McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Plant located east of First Street, NW and is defined by First Street to the west, Michigan Avenue to the north, North Capitol Street to the east, and Channing Street to the south. The McMillan Site was divided off from the original property and sold to the District of Columbia in 1987. The federal government retains ownership of the McMillan Reservoir and a small section of the original filtration plant site located west of First Street, which is operated by the Washington Aqueduct Division of the Baltimore District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
The McMillan Site is within the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark (Landmark), which was listed in the District of Columbia Inventory of Historic Sites in 1991.\(^1\) As such, the McMillan Site is protected under the District of Columbia’s preservation law (Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978, DC Law 2-144 as amended). The Landmark includes the 92 acres that were originally associated with the federal property. The property is not currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places but was recommended for listing by the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) as part of the landmark decision in 1991.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE MCMILLAN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The section of the slow sand filtration plant located on the McMillan Site has been non-operational since the 1980s. The District of Columbia (DC) government has targeted this property for redevelopment since its acquisition of the property from the federal government in 1987. After several previous attempts to come to an agreement about plans for the site, the DC Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development (DMPED) issued a Request for Proposals in 2006 with the goal of attracting a developer to partner with the DC government in the development of the site. In 2007, DMPED selected Vision McMillan Partners (VMP) as the Master Developer for the McMillan Redevelopment Project. VMP is composed of several parties, including: Trammell Crow Company; Eakin Youngentob Associates (EYA); Jair Lynch Development Partners; MacFarlane Partners; Smoot Construction; the Alexander Company; and Street Sense.\(^2\)

According to their commitment letter with the District of Columbia and community, VMP seeks to balance the equities of economics with public benefit, preservation, and community amenities on the McMillan Site.\(^3\) As such, the McMillan Redevelopment Project will focus on mixed-use development to include a combination of retail, office, and townhouse-style and/or multi-family residential. It is VMP’s intention that a series of passive and active open spaces will be located throughout the site to provide a diversity of recreational programming. Institutional, cultural, and hospitality uses are also contemplated and will be incorporated based on demand and feasibility. VMP has estimated that approximately 1.8-2.3 million square feet of development will be needed to pay for the required infrastructure and to support new retail uses.

III. PURPOSE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION REPORT

VMP retained EHT Traceries, Inc. to provide research and historic preservation consulting services in the pursuit of approval for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the McMillan Site. This historic preservation report is a record of the information and guidance provided to VMP during this consultation period and is intends to achieve the following:

---

\(^1\) The DC Inventory of Historic Sites lists McMillan Park Reservoir as a Historic District; however, the “Decision of the Historic Preservation Review Board of the District of Columbia for McMillan Park Reservoir (Case No. 90-20)” (August 21, 1991) designates the site a Historic Landmark, not a Historic District.

\(^2\) Trammell Crow Company joined Vision McMillan Partners in 2010.

\(^3\) Letter of Commitment among VMP, DC, and MAG, December 10, 2007.
• **Provide a guide** to the extensive primary and secondary documentation that exists for the site through an extensive bibliography and appendices.

• **Evaluate the historic significance** of the McMillan Site. This report seeks to summarize and expand upon the evaluation of significance provided in 1989 landmark nomination form that was completed for the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark. This evaluation provides a framework for the evaluation of the historic integrity of the McMillan Site and the development of preservation recommendations for the McMillan Redevelopment Project.

• **Evaluate the historic integrity** of the McMillan Site. The historic integrity of the Landmark was evaluated as part of its local landmark nomination in 1989. An updated evaluation of the integrity of the McMillan Site, as a distinct component of the Landmark, is necessary for the development of preservation recommendations for the McMillan Redevelopment Project.

• **Provide recommendations for preservation** of the McMillan Site within the context of the proposed redevelopment. The recommendations are specific to the McMillan Site and are intended to inform a successful preservation strategy for the proposed McMillan Redevelopment Project within the general parameters set by the city and VMP. The recommendations take into consideration the site's significance and integrity and are based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. General recommendations and resource-specific recommendations are included and will be incorporated into the site plan for the redevelopment as appropriate.

• **Provide recommendations for preservation mitigation** for the McMillan Redevelopment Project. EHT Traceries, Inc. is conscious of the various interests of the numerous stakeholders in the McMillan Redevelopment Project. To facilitate the future discussion of preservation within the context of other stakeholder interests, this report provides additional recommendations for the mitigation of the loss of historic fabric and integrity that is possible at the McMillan Site. These recommendations are intended to be taken into consideration by VMP and DCHPO and can be directly incorporated into the amenities package for the PUD as appropriate.

• **Guide the preservation-related approval processes** for the McMillan Redevelopment Project. Because the McMillan Site is part of the larger McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark, any construction or demolition on the site is subject to a variety of preservation-related reviews on the federal and local level. This report seeks to outline these reviews to clarify the approval process for the project.

This report identifies, summarizes, and supplements previous documentation efforts. It is designed to be used as a resource and a tool for VMP in its discussions with the city and community about the appropriate treatment of historic resources, as well as the design of new construction on the site. This report does not attempt to replace or correct the numerous documentation efforts and reports that have addressed the McMillan Site or the Landmark over the last twenty years.
IV. CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION REPORT

This report includes the following:

- **Chapter 1:** A description of the McMillan Site and updated inventory of resource types located within the site. The inventory includes a brief description of each type, a site key, historic images, and current images [A more comprehensive and detailed inventory was conducted by Engineering Science, Inc., in 1990 as required by Section 106. The 1990 inventory provides thorough documentation of all historic resources on the site and is maintained as a public record at the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office];

- **Chapter 2:** A summary and expansion of the history and significance of the Landmark and an evaluation of the historic significance of the McMillan Site.

- **Chapter 3:** An evaluation of the historic integrity of the McMillan Site.

- **Chapter 4:** Preservation recommendations for the treatment of the McMillan Site to inform the preservation strategy for the proposed redevelopment efforts;

- **Chapter 5:** A summary of historic preservation compliance requirements applicable to the redevelopment of the McMillan Site;

- **Bibliography:** An extensive bibliography of all resources and repositories consulted for this report; and

- **Appendices:** Appendices that provide selected plans, photographs, and other documentation collected as part of the research effort for this report.

V. DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this report, the following terms are defined:

- **McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark:** (also Landmark, Historic Landmark) The 92-acre local landmark in the District of Columbia Inventory of Historic Sites that includes the McMillan Reservoir, the McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Plant, and associated open space.

- **McMillan Park:** (also Park) The area designated by Secretary of War Taft in 1906 as “McMillan Park,” which consists of the McMillan Reservoir, the McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Plant, and associated open space. McMillan Park roughly corresponds to the area designated as McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark.

- **McMillan Site:** (also Site, property) The 25-acre section of the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark that is located east of First Street, NW, was transferred from the United States government to the District of Columbia government in 1989, and is slated for redevelopment by the District of Columbia.

- **McMillan Redevelopment Project:** (also Redevelopment Project, Project) The proposed redevelopment of the McMillan Site by VMP as prescribed by the District of Columbia.

- **Planned Unit Development:** (also PUD) A planning tool established by the District of Columbia Zoning Regulations with the intention to “encourage high quality developments that provide public benefits” by permitting “flexibility of development
and other incentives, such as increased building height and density; provided that the project offers a commendable number of quality of public benefits and that it protects and advances public health safety, welfare, and convenience."

- **PUD Stage 1 Submission**: The first phase of materials submitted to the District of Columbia Zoning Commission to illustrate a site’s suitability for use as a PUD, the appropriateness, character, scale, mixture of uses, and design of the uses proposed for the site; and the compatibility of the proposed development with citywide, ward, and area plans of the District of Columbia, and other goals of the PUD process.

- **PUD Stage 2 Submission**: The second phase of materials submitted to the District of Columbia Zoning Commission consisting of a detailed site plan that is reviewed for its compliance with the intent and purposes of the PUD process, the PUD Stage 1 approval, and the PUD regulations.

---

4 Planned Unit Development Procedures, District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, Title 11, Chapter 24, Section 2400.
CHAPTER 1: SITE DESCRIPTION AND RESOURCE INVENTORY

II. SITE DESCRIPTION

The McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark consists of the complex of buildings and structures that were historically used for the purposes of water purification, as well as the designed landscape that transformed the complex into McMillan Park.

BUILT RESOURCES

As listed in the landmark nomination for McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark, those resources that historically contributed to the water purification facility included: the open reservoir (also known as the basin), the circulating conduit, the east shaft gate house, the pumping station, several gate houses, the control house, the laboratory (also known as the office building), several shelter houses, the storehouse (also known as the machine shop), the regulator houses, the engine house, the filtration beds, the sand washers, the sand bins, the clear water reservoir, the chemical tower, the flume building, and several gatehouses.5 Other types of built resources are also found within the landmark, including service courts, service court walls, filter bed portals, ramps, and stairs. A majority of these resources were built between 1901 and 1905 and were part of the slow sand filtration plant. Plans and specifications for the slow sand filtration plant were completed by the Army Corps of Engineers and a team of consulting engineers. The open reservoir was constructed between 1883 and 1888, and some of the secondary structures were added as late as the 1930s. A chemical filtration plant was built west of First Street between 1981 and 1985 and introduced modern construction on the site.

The McMillan Site itself has a trapezoidal footprint defined by First Street, NW, to the west, Michigan Avenue, NW, to the north, North Capitol Street to the east, and Channing Street, NW, to the south. The McMillan Site features two paved service courts that divide the site into a tripartite configuration of expansive open spaces. These grassy open spaces correspond to the roofs of the twenty filter beds that have been covered by a layer of fill. To construct these filter beds, the site’s topography was re-graded, and an extensive campaign of cut and fill created an artificial topography that rises approximately sixteen feet above the level of Channing Street to the south and is depressed approximately ten feet from the level of Michigan Avenue to the north. The paved service courts are depressed approximately five feet into this plateau and are bounded to the north and south by the parapet walls of the subterranean filter beds. These walls function as retaining walls for the fill that covers the roofs of the filter beds. Each filter bed is accessed from the service courts by an arched portal, and a mound in the fill behind each portal corresponds to the subterranean path of a ramp that leads from the portal to the floor of its corresponding filter bed. Within each service court, the sand bins, sand washers, and regulator houses are arranged in a single east-west line. There it a total of twenty sand bins (one for each filter bed), four regulator houses, and twelve sand washers. The tops of the filter beds are accessed from the service courts by several ramps and stairs. Ramps and stairs also connect the tops of the filter beds and the service courts to the adjacent roads at five locations. The expansive open spaces contain

5 As listed in the DC Landmark nomination for McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark, 1989.
approximately 2,100 circular manholes that lead to the filter beds below. A tunnel, similar in style to the filter bed portals, runs under First Street to connect the northern service court of the McMillan Site to the west side of the sand filtration plant.

Most of the built resources are constructed of concrete with varying types of treatments. The regulator houses are constructed of red brick coursed in Flemish bond and feature arched fenestration and hipped roofs covered in terra cotta tiles. Doors and windows, including those of the regulator houses and filter bed portals, are constructed of wood with iron hardware. All of the resources on the McMillan Site reflect the original design and construction of the slow sand filtration plant.6

**DESIGNED LANDSCAPE**

From 1907 to 1911, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. developed the landscape design for the various components of the 92-acre reservoir and filtration plant complex. This landscape plan was substantially implemented between 1907 and 1919. His “General Plan for the Landscape Treatment of McMillan Park,” (March 27, 1908), provides a narrative of his design intentions for the Park. The plan starts by dividing the entire site into three distinct parts -- Part A, Part B, and Part C—which Olmsted described as follows:

---

6 The existing sand washers were installed circa 1910.
Part A: “The area including the covered reservoirs, filter beds, sand-washers and their
appurtences [sic], consisting of a series of engineering constructions of a strikingly
artificial and formal appearance.”

Part B: “The spacious and impressive open reservoir with its enclosing banks and
hillsides, including the curvilinear banks of the filter beds which face toward it.”

Part C: “The southerly part, lying in the main below the dam of the reservoir but
sweeping up gradually to the hill top in the southeast corner of part B.”

The 25-acre McMillan Site comprises the majority of Part A, which is described by Olmsted as
having a

“strikingly artificial and formal appearance which...would be impossible to obscure
by any decoration or planting, which even if not beautiful is certainly very interesting
and full of individual character appropriate to the purposes subserved, and which
therefore should be recognized and emphasized in such slight and subordinate
decoration as may be undertaken in connection with this area.”

Olmsted’s design for Part A was based on the primary physical structures of the site: the
“straight banks” bordering the site; the “formal plain” created by the roofs of the filter beds;
and the architectural elements found in the two service courts. From the 1908 general plan, it
is apparent that one of Olmsted’s primary design intentions was to emphasize and reinforce
the border of the formal plain, through the introduction of a perimeter path and multiple
layers of perimeter plantings. Olmsted started the design with a “low formal hedge
bordering the formal plain and marking the top edge of the bank.” Olmsted specified the
“low” hedge because of his concern that a high, solid hedge would obscure visibility to the site
from the street and would be ill-proportioned to the “straight banks” at certain points. As a
result, he limited the perimeter hedge to three feet in height. Olmsted did not think the small
hedge would “in itself provide as strong an emphasis of the border as the scale of the plain
demands.” Therefore, he also recommended planting a double row of small-scale trees inside
the hedge, “beneath the foliage of which the view could pass and between which a border
path could be provided whence the plain could be overlooked.” This idea of overlooking the
formal plain from a perimeter path, rather than allowing public access on the plain, was
based on Olmsted’s recognition of the dangerous condition created by the hundreds of open
manholes across the plains. (Records indicate that between three and four acres of manholes
would be open at any given time to provide light and air to the workers that were cleaning
the sand in the filter beds below.) Olmsted was so concerned about this condition that he
thought it was “perhaps inexpedient to admit the public to the use of the plain even upon a
fenced path.” In addition to safety issues, Olmsted was also aware of the detrimental effects
the roots of the trees could have on the concrete substructure. Olmsted’s concept for the hedge
double row of trees was implemented, and he addressed his various concerns through the
species and placement of plantings. To avoid having a fenced condition, Olmsted, Jr.

7 Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., “An Outline of the General Plan for the Landscape Treatment of McMillan Park,” March 27, 1908,
Olmsted Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
8 Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.
9 Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.
10 Implementation of the general concept of the 1908 plan is evidenced by Olmsted’s final general plan for the site (1911), as well as
several historic photographs of the site.
created natural barrier around the perimeter path with closely spaced thorny plantings. The 1908 and 1910 planting plans for the site show that Olmsted, Jr. specified Japanese Barberry with one-foot spacing for the hedge and Cockspur Thorns for the double row of trees. Other thorny species (Japanese Climbing Rose, Double-flowering Scarlet Thorne, Dwarf Wild Rose, Early Wild Rose, etc.) were used to frame entry stairs at the four corners of the site. The trees and hedges were planted in straight lines around the perimeter, except at the north side of the site, where the spacing and configuration of the trees were more appropriate for the curvilinear character of the north leg of the perimeter path. Larger species (Yellowwood, American Elm, Pagoda Tree, Catulpa Tree, etc.) were used to mark and frame entrances located at the east and west ends of the two service courts, but in general, Olmsted used smaller plantings to avoid blocking views into the site. Olmsted also designed plantings in the two east-west service courts to emphasize the rhythms created by the arrangement of the sand storage bins. Olmsted, Jr. specified rows of widely spaced Chinese Cork Trees and suggested replacing the Boston Ivy that was already planted along the surfaces of the sand bins, regulator houses, and court walls with "creepers of a...more picturesque and less flatly enveloping habit."

Olmsted’s planting and grading plans for all areas around the reservoir (Part B) reflected the “informal and irregular” character of the reservoir through a more picturesque treatment than was used for Part A. Olmsted intended that all landscape improvements of Part B “should be governed before everything else by the purpose of presenting this expanse of water agreeably to those who use the park—of securing for it an agreeable backgrounds [sic] of foliage and pleasing foregrounds as seen from the roads and paths frequented by the public.” 11 While a majority of Olmsted’s landscape design focused on the enhancement of the water purification complex (Parts A and B), he briefly addressed the land south and southeast of the reservoir (Part C), which he identified as having “no practical functions in the operation of the water works and presenting a distinct landscape unit.” Olmsted sought to shape this area into “an agreeable and consistent piece of informal park landscape with provision at the westerly end for a children’s playground.” 12 As such, this area of McMillan Park was set aside for public recreation and for the installation of a public memorial to Senator James McMillan. Olmsted’s 1908 plan for McMillan Park specifies the provision of a wading pool and a track south of the reservoir. It is not known whether Olmsted’s design for these recreational areas was implemented as planned; however, historic documentation indicates that the Bloomingdale Playground was located in the area south of the reservoir. The playground accommodated numerous community activities, including soccer games, basketball games, baseball games, folk festivals, marble tournaments, Halloween parties, track events, children’s exhibits, kite contests, pet shows, and club meetings. 13 In 1934, the Bloomingdale Playground was officially renamed the “McMillan Playground.” 14 Plans for the renovation of the playground from that same year indicate the provision of tennis courts, volleyball courts, horseshoe courts, and a new field house. McMillan Park was also the venue for military band concerts, which most likely took place in the proximity of the McMillan Memorial Fountain where visitors could find benches on which to sit.

II. INVENTORY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES AT THE McMILLAN SITE

The following inventory provides a catalogue of types of historic resources found at the McMillan Site. This inventory is intended to provide a general background for the recommendations section of this report. The resource types are grouped into the following categories:

- Built Resources
- Landscape Resources
- Site Resources

Each resource type is provided with a description, a site key showing the locations of the individual resources, and historic and current drawings and photographs. The following resource types were identified at the McMillan Site:

**BUILT RESOURCES**

- Service Courts
- Service Court Walls
- Regulator Houses
- Sand Storage Bins
- Stationary Sand Washers
- Filter Beds
- Filter Bed Portals
- Filter Bed Ramps
- Filter Bed Sand
- Manholes and Manhole Covers
- Perimeter Pedestrian Path
- Corner Stairs
- Service Ramps and Stairs
- Tunnel

**LANDSCAPE RESOURCES**

- Perimeter Plantings
- Service Court Plantings

**SITE RESOURCES**

- Site Boundaries
- Site Plan and Spatial Organization
- Topography
- Internal Views
- External Views

---

15 The “Architectural and Archaeological Survey of the Easter Portion of McMillan Water Treatment Plant,” completed by Engineering Science, Inc. in 1990 to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA, provides a detailed record of each of 56 historic resources identified on the property referred to in this report as the McMillan Site. The data is recorded on standard survey forms specifically adopted for DCHPO and the McMillan property, and the full inventory of resources is kept as a public record at DCHPO.
Source information for all historic images used in this inventory is found in the appendices to this report.

Original site plan, c. 1910
**BUILT RESOURCES**

**SERVICE COURTS**

Material: Concrete

Quantity: 2

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The Site features two paved service courts that traverse the Site in an east-west direction. A majority of the above-ground built resources on the Site are located within these courts. The courts sit five feet below the grade of the adjacent plains and are bordered to the north and south by concrete parapet walls that are integrated into the structure of the subterranean filter beds. The courts are accessed by stairs and ramps that lead to the streets and to the tops of the filter cells. Today, the service courts remain paved and in their original locations. The paved surfaces are overgrown with weeds and show previous concrete patches and repairs.

Service Court #3, looking east, 1944
Original Plan of Court No. 3, 1902

Existing conditions of Service Court No. 3 looking west (spring), EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008

Existing Conditions of Service Court No. 2 looking east (winter), EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008
**SERVICE COURT WALLS**

**Material:** Concrete

**Quantity:** 4

**Date:** 1903-1905 (original)

Concrete walls bound the north and south sides of both service courts. These walls are the parapet walls of the subterranean filter bed structures and also function as retaining walls to the fill that was placed on top of the filter beds. The walls have a simple, unadorned concrete cornice but feature no other architectural detailing. Ramps and stairs pierce the wall at several locations in both service courts to provide access from the courts to the tops of the filter beds. Today, the service walls are extant in their original locations, with various degrees of material deterioration in the form of cracking and spalled concrete. Three areas of concrete infill are located where original ramps were previously demolished.

![Service Court #3, looking east, 1944](image-url)
Service Court Walls – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)

Typical crack in wall of service court

Typical crack in wall of service court

Typical wall of service court

Infill of wall of service court where ramp was demolished
REGULATOR HOUSES

Material: Brick, clay tile, wood, concrete

Quantity: 4

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The Site features four regulator houses, with two located in each service court. These one-story masonry buildings are constructed of red brick coursed in Flemish bond and feature terra cotta tile roofs. The houses are detailed with arched entrances and window openings featuring wood doors and windows. The structures of the regulator houses extend below grade with concrete pits and original mechanical systems. These systems were originally used to regulate the speed of pumps and to maintain the desired water level within the adjacent filter beds. Today, all four brick structures are extant in their original locations, and some original wood elements are extant but in various states of deterioration.
Original plans for regulator houses, 1904
Regulator Houses – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)
SAND STORAGE BINS

Material:   Concrete (reinforced)

Quantity:   20

Date:       1903-1905 (original)

The site features twenty cylindrical sand bins that were originally used to store clean sand. There is one sand bin for each filter bed. The bins are constructed of reinforced concrete, and the base of each bin is pierced by an arched opening through which clean sand was collected. The foundations of the sand bins extend approximately ten feet below grade. Each bin features original appurtenances that aided in the collection and ejection of clean sand. Each sand bin also has a ladder leading to the top of the structure. Today, all original sand bins are extant and in their original locations. Some of the ladders and other appurtenances have been removed or have deteriorated.
Sand Bins – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)
STATIONARY SAND WASHERS

Material: Concrete

Quantity: 12

Date: c. 1910

The site features twelve stationary sand washers located in the two service courts. The sand washers are generally aligned with the sand bins and regulator houses except for the westernmost washer in the north court, which is not in line with the other resources. These concrete structures have a unique shape that is generally defined by an upside-down pyramid set within an open concrete box frame. These sand washers were installed in 1910, at which time the original sand washers were removed. Today, all of the 1910 sand washers are extant in their original locations. Some of their appurtenances have been removed or have deteriorated.
FILTER BEDS

Material: Concrete (un-reinforced)

Quantity: 20

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The site features twenty un-reinforced concrete filter beds, each of which is approximately one acre in area. All of the filter beds are concealed beneath a layer of fill and appear from above-grade as flat plains of grass. Each filter bed is independent of the other filter beds and has its own entrance that opens into the service courts. The floors of the filter beds are inverted, groined arches that carry piers with a slight batter near the bottom. The roof consists of elliptical groined arches that are pierced with manholes. The walls of the beds are built in sections not exceeding 30 feet in length, the joints being tongued and grooved. The filter beds have substantial parapet walls along the perimeter that act as retaining walls along the north and south sides of the service courts. For the facility to operate properly, substantial re-grading of the site was completed to make the filter beds level, resulting in a maximum depth of cut of 35 feet and a maximum height of fill of 30 feet. Several of the filter beds that were constructed on fill settled substantially within the first few years of the facility's operation. This rapid settlement led to chronic structural issues that have resulted in partial collapse of some of the filter bed roofs. According to a 2001 structural assessment, approximately eight of the twenty filter beds exhibit severe structural deterioration. Other filter beds show varying degrees of cracking and material deterioration but were said to be stable at the time of the assessment. Several types of previous structural reinforcements are visible within some of the filter beds.
Plan and sections of typical filter bed, 1902

Interior of filter bed, 1944 (see Appendix C for source information)
Filter Beds – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)

Typical interior of filter bed

Interior filter bed No. 24

Interior of filter bed No. 24, collapse of eastern cells.

Cracking and efflorescence of concrete structure
FILTER BED PORTALS

Material: Concrete, wood, and metal

Quantity: 20

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The site features twenty portals that lead to each of the twenty subterranean filter beds. The portals are integrated into the parapet walls of the filter beds that line the north and south sides of the service courts. The portals are constructed of brick and parged in concrete, featuring a denticulated concrete cornice. Each portal has an arched opening fitted with a double-leaf wood door with iron hardware. Many of the original wood doors are extant and intact, with other doors missing or showing various degrees of deterioration.
Portals and Ramps to Filter Beds – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)

Typical iron hardware on filter bed portal

Typical filter bed portal with wood door
FILTER BED RAMPS

Material: Concrete

Quantity: 20

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The site features twenty ramps that lead from each of the portals to their respective subterranean filter beds. These ramps were typical for this type of facility for facilitating the movement of sand in and out of the filter beds. However, at McMillan, a different system of moving sand was developed, and the ramps were constructed primarily as an alternate access point in the case that the sand-handling apparatus failed to perform. The ramp were designed at an incline that accommodates horses, which would have been used to bring wagons into the filter beds to move the sand. Later, these ramps were used to provide access for mechanized sand raking tractors. Today, all twenty filter bed ramps are extant in their original locations with some signs of structural deterioration, primarily in those filter beds that have also deteriorated.
Filter Bed Ramps – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)

Ramp from filter bed to service court

Ramp from service court to filter bed
FILTER BED SAND

Material: Sand

Quantity: Approximately 2,100

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The site features a deep layer of sand at the floor of each of the filter beds. An early description of the construction and operation of the sand filtration plant stated that “the sand is, in a way, the most important part of the filters.” The sand in the filter beds was furnished from a bank at Laurel Maryland on the main line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and went through an extensive preparation process to meet specifications for cleanliness, removing all traces of clay and other undesired particles. The average depth of sand in the filter beds was kept at approximately 38 inches. The resources that are located within the service courts of the facility were used for the sole purpose of cleaning and storing this sand throughout the operation of the plant. Today, all of the filter beds retain a substantial layer of sand. Debris is found scattered across the top of the sand in most filter beds.

The sand washing process
Raking the sand, c. 1940

Typical existing condition of sand, EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008
MANHOLES AND COVERS

Material (manholes): Concrete
Material (covers): Metal

Quantity: Approximately 2,100

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The site features approximately 2,100 manholes spaced evenly across the three sections of open space. These manholes lead to the subterranean filter beds and were used for two purposes: (1) to drop clean sand back into the filter beds; and (2) to provide natural light and fresh air to workers in the filter beds. During operation of the facility, between three and four acres of manholes would be open at any given time during cleaning of the sand in the filter beds below. The concrete manholes are an integral part of the subterranean filter bed structures and are marked above grade by iron covers, most of which are severely deteriorated or no longer extant. Today, all of the original manhole structures are intact in their original locations, except those in the area of the collapsed filter bed in the southwest section of the Site.

Original sections ands plan of typical manhole cover and frame
(see Appendix A for source information)
Manholes – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)

- View of rows of manholes on top of filter beds.
- View of inner and outer covers of deteriorated manhole
- Corrosion of manhole cover
- View of manhole from interior of filter bed
PERIMETER PEDESTRIAN PATH

Material: Concrete

Quantity: 1

Date: c. 1910

The Site features a narrow pedestrian path around the perimeter of the top of the filter beds. When complex was dedicated as McMillan Park in 1906 and Olmsted was retained to design its landscape, Olmsted activated the perimeter of this section of the complex with this pedestrian path, providing a place for visitors to stroll and admire the views across the plans of open space above the filter beds. The east, west, and south legs of the path run in straight lines parallel to the adjacent streets. The north leg is curvilinear to reflect the more picturesque qualities that once defined the character of the land on the other side of Michigan Avenue. Olmsted focused on the enhancement of the pedestrian path in his planting plan, which further emphasized the perimeter of the site. Today, the route of the pedestrian path is still legible, but only remnants of the original materials of the path are extant.
Pedestrian Path – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)

Southern leg of path, looking east at Howard University

Western leg of path, looking north at Soldiers’ Home

View of curvilinear northern leg of path, looking southeast from northwest corner stairs
**CORNER STAIRS**

*Material: Concrete

*Quantity: 1

*Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The Site originally featured four sets of stairs at each of its four corners. These stairs were designed by Olmsted to be the primary access points for the public use of the Site, directly connecting to the perimeter pedestrian path. The stairs at the southwest and southeast corners led up from the public sidewalk to the pedestrian path at the top of the filter beds, approximately 16 feet above First Street. The stairs at the northeast and northwest corners led down from the public sidewalk to the pedestrian path at the tops of the filter beds, which was approximately 12 feet below Michigan Avenue. These stairs were intended solely for the purpose of providing access to the perimeter pedestrian park and were not part of the operation of the slow sand filtration plant. Today, only one of the four corner stairs is extant. The locations of the other three stairs are indicated by slight depressions in the topography at the corners of the site, as well as scattered remnants of concrete.

Plan of stairs at southwest corner of site  View of stairs at southwest corner of site, c. 1910
Corner Stairs – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)

Former location of stairs at southeast corner of site

Former location of stairs at northeast corner of site

Stair remnants at northwest corner of site

Former location of stairs at southwest corner of site
SERVICE RAMPS AND STAIRS

Material: Concrete

Quantity (ramps): 7
Quantity (stairs): 24

Date: 1903-1905 (original), and c. 1910

The site features several concrete ramps and concrete stairs along the service courts. These ramps and stairs provide access from the courts to the tops of the filter beds (19), from the courts to the adjacent streets (3), and from the courts to the perimeter path (4). Two sets of concrete stairs lead from First Street to the tops of the filter beds adjacent to the north service court. These stairs and ramps were used as part of the operation of the facility as workers moved throughout the Site, and many of these stairs and ramps are integral to the structure of the service court walls. Three original concrete ramps leading from the service courts to the tops of the filter beds were previously demolished and their locations in the service court wall were in-filled. The remaining ramps and stairs are mostly intact, with varying degrees of concrete deterioration and possible structural deterioration.
Ramp showing grid pattern in concrete

Stair from service court to pedestrian path

Stair from service court to top of filter bed

In-fill concrete where ramp was removed
TUNNEL

Material: Concrete

Quantity: 1

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

A single tunnel connects the northern service court of the McMillan Site to the service court of the section of the filtration plant located west of First Street. The design of the tunnel is consistent with the architectural detailing of the filter bed portals, with denticulated cornice and flat-arched opening. Although there are most likely pipes and other subterranean connections between the west and east sides of the filtration plant, this tunnel is the only visible connection. Today, the tunnel is intact but is overgrown with vegetation.

Original plan, sections, and elevation of the tunnel under First Street, 1902
**LANDSCAPE RESOURCES**

**PERIMETER PLANTINGS**

Material: Japanese Barberry, Cockspur Thorns, Japanese Climbing Rose, Double-flowering Scarlet Thorne, Dwarf Wild Rose, Early Wild Rose, Yellowwood, American Elm, Pagoda Tree, Catulpa Tree, etc.

Quantity: n/a

Date: 1907-1919 (not extant)

The site historically featured rows of plantings that flanked the perimeter pedestrian path in tightly spaced rows. Olmsted specified the cockspur thorn (Hawthorne trees) and small thorny hedges for these perimeter plantings to create a passive barrier and confine pedestrians to the path. Although scattered remnants of some of these plantings still exist, Olmsted's original plan for the perimeter plantings is no longer legible.
Aerial view of perimeter plantings, c. 1930

Image of perimeter plantings during trench work, July 1946

Existing remnants of perimeter plantings, EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008
SERVICE COURT PLANTINGS

Material: Cork Trees, Boston Ivy, etc.

Quantity: n/a

Date: 1907-1919 (not extant)

The site historically featured plantings within and bordering the service courts. Olmsted specified two east-west rows of evenly spaced cork trees to be planted within each of the service courts, ivy along the tops of the sand bins, and small groupings of shrubs to be planted along the upper part of the parapet wall marking the locations of each of the ramps, stairs, and portals. For the parapet plantings, Olmsted chose species that were to be low to the ground and planted closely together. Olmsted also specified a few instances of taller tree species, but it appears from historic photographs that these species were not planted. Today, the service courts are overgrown, and Olmsted’s original planting plan for the service courts is no longer legible.
Service court plantings, c. 1928

Existing conditions of service court plantings, EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008
SITE RESOURCES

SITE BOUNDARIES

Material: n/a

Quantity: n/a

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

The boundaries of the McMillan Site are defined by: First Street to the west, North Capitol Street to the east, Channing Street to the south, and Michigan Avenue to the north. These streets existed before the facility's construction, and the arrangement of the filter beds within the Site was dictated by the trapezoidal footprint created by these boundaries. Although bounded by city streets, the Site spans approximately five blocks north-to-south and does not continue the adjacent city street grid within its footprint.
SPATIAL ORGANIZATION AND SITE PLAN

Material: n/a

Quantity: n/a

Date: 1903-1905 (original)

In aerial views, the Site has a tripartite organization created by two paved service courts that run east-to-west and divide the Site into three horizontal sections of open space. From the ground level, this tripartite organization is expressed through the linear arrangement of built resources within the service courts that rise above the horizontal plane of the adjacent open spaces. Olmsted’s landscape plan reinforced this tripartite organization by focusing new plantings around the Site’s perimeter and within the service courts. The spatial organization of built resources and open space on the McMillan Site is distinct from that of adjacent areas, with dense urban residential development to the south and east, the city reservoir to the west, and the complex of large hospital buildings to the north.
**TOPOGRAPHY**

**Material:** Concrete and earth

**Quantity:** 1

**Date:** 1903-1905 (original)

The Site’s topography was changed by a major cut and fill operation during the original construction of the facility to create a level grade for the concrete filter beds. Once the filter beds were constructed, approximately two feet of additional fill was placed on their roofs, allowing the flat surface of the filter beds to read as a topographical feature rather than a built structure. The re-grading was confined within the boundaries of the Site, resulting in a flat plateau that is raised approximately 16 feet from Channing Street to the south and depressed approximately 12 feet from Michigan Avenue to the north. There is also a drop in grade at each of the two service courts, which are depressed by approximately 5 feet into the plateau. Further, at the location of each of the filter bed portals, mounds in the plateau correspond to the subterranean path of the ramps that lead from the service courts. Today, the Site retains its artificial topography.

Sections of original topography and proposed topography, 1902
Topography – Existing Conditions (EHT Traceries, Inc., 2008)

View of west side of site, looking north from southwest corner

View of south side of site, looking east from southwest corner
View of west side of site, looking south from northwest corner

View of east side of site, looking south from eastern end of Court 2
View of north side of site, looking east from northwest corner

View of east side of site, looking south from northeast corner
View of northeast corner of site, looking west from northeast corner

View of east side of site, looking north into site from corner of Channing and First streets, NW
INTERNAL VIEWS

Views within the McMillan Site are both afforded and defined by the concentration of built resources in the service courts and the open spaces of the plains above the belowground filter beds. When the facility was first constructed, expansive view sheds existed within the Site, from one side of the filtration plant to the other. Olmsted’s landscape design specifically mentions these view sheds and his intention not to “cut off...the interesting and remarkable effect of the filter bed plain.” To feature these views as part of the park experience, Olmsted designed a “double row of small growing trees...beneath the foliage of which the view could pass and between which a border path could be provided when the plain could be overlooked. Today, the internal views are intact, and the lack of perimeter plantings has re-opened the expansive views across the site.

(This site plan is keyed to the following photographs of existing conditions of views. All photographs were taken by EHT Traceries, Inc., in 2008.)

1. View looking southeast from northwest corner of site (intersection of Michigan Avenue and First Street),
2. View looking northeast from southwest corner of site (intersection of Channing Street and First Street)

3. View looking southwest from northeast corner of site (intersection of Michigan Avenue and North Capitol Street.)
4. View looking northwest from southeast corner of site (intersection of Channing Street and North Capitol Street.

5. View looking east from west side of northern service court
6. View from southern service court looking north to the northern service court
7. View looking west from east side of southern service court
EXTERNAL VIEWS

The McMillan Site has several significant views to landmarks outside its boundaries. The location for the slow sand filtration plant was chosen because of its adjacency to the Washington City Reservoir and because of its central location in the city. Because of this centrality, the Site is surrounded by several landmarks, which are visible outside its boundaries. Some of these view unintended benefits of the site’s artificial topography and the raised elevation at the site’s southern end. Today, most of the historic external views are still intact. The original northward view to the United States Soldiers’ Home (now AFRH-W) has been partially obscured by the development of the hospital complex to the north, but the tower of the Forwood Building at AFRH-W is still visible in an axial view form the pedestrian path.

(This site plan is keyed to the following photographs of existing conditions of views. All photographs were taken by EHT Traceries, Inc., in 2008.)

1. View looking north from the western leg of the path, views north point to the tower of the historic Forwood Building. (1906), which contributes to the Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington Historic District, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and in the DC Inventory of Historic Sites.)
2. View looking southwest from the western leg of the site to the Washington Monument and the western side of the sand filtration plant and reservoir.

3. View looking west from the western leg of the path to the McMillan Reservoir.
4. View from the western leg of the path, views northeast point to the tower and dome of the Basilica of the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception (completed in the 1950s) on the campus of The Catholic University of America.

5. View looking west from the southern leg of the path to the tower of the Main Building (also known as the Founders Library, 1939) of Howard University, which is a National Historic Landmark.
7. View looking east from the northern leg of the path, to the dome of the Main Hall of Trinity University (c. 1897) and to the rowhouses on North Capitol Street.

8. View looking east from the southern and western legs of the path to the rowhouses on North Capitol Street.
9. View looking east from the eastern leg of the path to the Glenwood Cemetery (chartered 1854).
CHAPTER 2: HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

This chapter summarizes and expands upon the DC Inventory of Historic Places nomination for the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark by providing a summary chronology of the history of the Landmark and an outline of its historic significance. This information is then used to evaluate the historic significance of the McMillan Site within the context of the significance of the Landmark as whole.

I. SUMMARY CHRONOLOGY FOR THE MCMILLAN PARK RESERVOIR HISTORIC LANDMARK

The timeline provides a brief chronology for the McMillan Site. The information provided in the timeline is based on numerous previous documentation efforts and does not present new or corrected information about the history of the property.

1898:
Appropriations are made to investigate experimentally the filtration of the Potomac River and to report upon its advantages and cost.

1898:
A feasibility study is completed for water purification system the City of Washington.

1900, July:
The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) holds meeting in London to discuss benefits of rapid sand filtration versus slow sand filtration.

1900, December:
The Medical Society of the District of Columbia submits a report to the Senate District Committee denouncing the rapid sand filtration process and the use of chemical to purify the water supply for the City of Washington.

1901, January:
The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia holds a hearing in New York City to discuss filtration for the City of Washington; the Senate Committee forms an engineering committee to conduct a new feasibility study for slow sand filtration, which recommends the use of rapid sand filtration.

1901, March:
Despite the engineering committee's recommendation for rapid sand filtration, Congress appropriates funds to construct a slow sand filtration plant in Washington.

1901-1902:
A site is selected and plans prepared for a slow sand filtration plant by the Army Corps of Engineers.

1902-1905:
The Army Corps of Engineers constructs a slow sand filtration plant adjacent to the existing Washington City Reservoir.

1905, August:
Limited operation of the slow sand filtration plant begins.

1905, October:
Full operation of the slow sand filtration plant begins.
1906:
Secretary of War Taft renames the Washington City Reservoir and slow sand filtration plant as “McMillan Park” following the death of James McMillan, senator from Michigan and chair of the Senate District Committee.

1906:
Charles Moore, staff of the Senate District Committee, contacts F.L. Olmsted, Jr., to discuss the possibility of a landscape design for “McMillan Park.”

1907:
Olmsted begins plans for a landscape design of “McMillan Park.”

1907-1919:
Olmsted’s landscape design is developed and implemented at “McMillan Park.”

1911:
McMillan Memorial Fountain is installed west of the intersection of Channing and 1st streets, NW.

1914:
“McMillan Park” is added to the schedule of concerts for the Engineer Band and United States Cavalry Band.

1941:
"McMillan Park" is closed to public access for security reasons.

1986:
A rapid sand filtration plant is constructed West of First Street, functionally replacing the slow sand filtration plant.

1987:
The District of Columbia takes control of the eastern section of the slow sand filtration plant.

1988:
All operation of the slow sand filtration plant is abandoned.

1990:
The DC Preservation League submits a landmark nomination for the McMillan Park Reservoir for listing in the DC Inventory of Historic Sites.

1991:
The McMillan Park Reservoir is listed as an individual landmark in the DC Inventory of Historic Sites, and HPRB recommends the property for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

II. HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE McMILLAN PARK RESERVOIR HISTORIC LANDMARK

The following text summarizes and expands upon the evaluation of historic significance of the 92-acre McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark as stated in the DC landmark nomination application. This text is organized based on the evaluation criteria for which the property would be listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), as presented in the HPRB
To provide further context, each evaluation criterion is supported with one or more of the statements provided in the HPRB landmark decision that explain the reasons for which the McMillan Park Reservoir is designated as an individual landmark.

**CRITERION A: ASSOCIATION WITH THE HISTORY OF WATER PURIFICATION**

- [The McMillan Park Reservoir] was the first water treatment facility in the City of Washington, and its operation resulted in the elimination of typhoid epidemics and reduced incidence of other diseases.
- Construction of its slow sand water filtration system represented a triumph of the pure water advocates over those who advocated chemical treatment of water.

During the last half of the nineteenth century, the Potomac River, which was the primary water supply for the City of Washington, was becoming increasingly polluted by household and industrial waste, as well as runoff from the fast developing areas within the watershed. Instances of typhoid fever were high and increasing, and sedimentation of water in the city’s reservoirs was not sufficient to address the types of intestinal bacteria that contaminated the water supply. By the end of the century, the issue of water purification had become imperative. In 1898, Congress appropriated funds for the investigation of filtration options for the Potomac River water, as well as for the completion of a report on its advantages and cost. From 1898 to 1901, a heated debate took place about the method by which water would be purified for use in the District of Columbia. Although several reports commissioned by the Senate District Committee concluded that the use of coagulants was the optimal filtration method, the Medical Society of the District of Columbia adamantly opposed the use of chemical treatments and persistently promoted the use of the slow sand filtration method. The debate over the benefits and drawbacks of the two filtration methods prompted meetings by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) and the Senate District Committee, which was chaired by Senator James McMillan from Michigan. In March 1901, despite a strong recommendation for the rapid sand filtration method by its own committee, Congress appropriated money to construct a slow sand filtration plant with an understanding that the appliances needed for use of a coagulant could be installed subsequently if needed.

The description of the completed site is provided in the 1906 Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers:

The Washington filtration plant consists of a pumping station for raising the water from the Washington City reservoir to the filters; of 29 filter beds of the slow-sand type, having an effective filter area of 1 acre each; of the filtered water reservoir, having a capacity of about 15,000,000 gallons; of the necessary piping and valves for carrying the water controlling the rates of filtration, etc.; of a sand washing and storage system, and of a laboratory for testing the water.
The McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Plant was one of the last slow sand filtration facilities constructed in the United States and represented the success of advocates for the traditional filtration system at a time when new technologies were being introduced into water purification processes.

**CRITERION B: ASSOCIATION WITH SENATOR JAMES McMILLAN**

[The McMillan Park Reservoir] is a memorial to Senator James McMillan who spearheaded development and implementation of the monumental McMillan Park Plan, completing and refining the 1794 Plan of the Federal City in the context of the 1893 City Beautiful aesthetic. 20

In 1906, Secretary of War William Howard Taft officially renamed the Washington City Reservoir and the Slow Sand Filtration Plant as “McMillan Park” in honor of Michigan Senator James McMillan. McMillan is credited as the drive behind the creation of the 1901 Senate Committee report titled “The Improvement of the Park System of the District of Columbia,” which established a comprehensive plan based on the completion, expansion, and enhancement of the 1792 L'Enfant plan for the city. Now widely known as “The McMillan Plan,” the 1901 report was one of the first attempts to implement the City Beautiful Movement, which was born out of the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The McMillan Plan called for the completion of the National Mall, the articulation of ceremonial boulevards throughout the city, the establishment of a comprehensive park and recreation system, and the overall beautification of the city. McMillan’s sudden death in 1901, before the implementation of his plan, was a shock to many in Washington and in his home state of Michigan. As such, James McMillan’s name was given to the reservoir and filtration plant complex in honor of his integral role in the introduction of water purification. The designation of the reservoir and sand filtration site as a publicly accessible park was a testament to his efforts to beautify the nation’s capital by enlarging and enhancing its system of public open spaces as part of the City Beautiful Movement at the turn of the century. A Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. was retained to design a landscape plan that transformed the public works facility into a designed landscape

**CRITERION C: DISTINCTIVE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION AS A PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY AND PUBLIC PARK**

- The McMillan Park Reservoir is a major element of the water system of the District of Columbia, an urban American engineering resource of great historic, cultural, landscape, planning, engineering, and architectural significance. 21

---

20 Designation decision for McMillan Park Reservoir (Case No. 90-20, August 21, 1991).
21 Designation decision for McMillan Park Reservoir (Case No. 90-20, August 21, 1991).
• [The McMillan Park Reservoir] is a major element of the McMillan Park System which envisioned a linkage of green open spaces from Rock Creek to Anacostia through the developing suburbs north of the Federal City.
• The McMillan Park Reservoir] is the result of the collaboration of major figures in the City Beautiful movement who later contributed to the aesthetic and architectural development of Washington.22

In the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century, public utilities were often integrated into a city's built fabric or park system and prominently displayed as evidence of urban progress and accomplishments of design and technology. Today, public utilities are hidden from view, either by burying them underground or locating them outside of the city. These two approaches for the treatment of civic structures strongly relate to the discussion of “infrastructure” versus “public works” as presented by Elissa Rosenberg’s article “Public Works and Public Space: Rethinking the Urban Park.” According to Rosenberg, “infrastructure” is a socially neutral term that is narrowly defined by engineering works that serve public functions; “public works,” however, is more strongly associated with an architectural character capable of contributing to civic imagery and identity to that infrastructure. The McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark stands as a prominent example of Rosenberg’s characterization of “public works.” Both the incorporation of fashionable academic architectural vocabularies and the commissioning of prominent landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., are testaments to the effort to contribute to the aesthetic qualities of the growing City of Washington at the turn of the twentieth century. The philosophy of “public works” is presently not embraced in Washington, D.C., (nor, generally, in the United States) and the design and construction methods featured within the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark make the Landmark and important reminders of the prominence that was given to civic architecture in Washington during the City Beautiful Movement.

The landscape plan of McMillan Park was in itself a symbol of the importance given to the design and aesthetic of the filtration plant and reservoir. In 1906, the Army Corps of Engineers commissioned Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., as the landscape architect for the design of McMillan Park. Olmsted, Jr. was the son of renowned landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted and was himself one of the preeminent landscape designers in the United States in the early twentieth century. Olmsted, Jr. had worked on the 1901 “McMillan Plan,” and was a major advocate of the City Beautiful Movement at the turn of the twentieth century. Olmsted is well known for his extensive work in planning metropolitan park systems and greenways across the country, as well as for his establishment of the first formal training program in landscape architecture at Harvard in 1900.23 The application of landscape design by a prominent landscape architect as a means to enhance utilitarian infrastructure of the District of Columbia’s water system represents the critical understanding of the importance of public works as a part of the City Beautiful Movement. Through the abilities of Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., the slow sand filtration plant and reservoir were transformed into McMillan Park, a place intended to honor Senator McMillan’s extraordinary role in the transformation of Washington, DC.

22 Designation decision for McMillan Park Reservoir (Case No. 90-20, August 21, 1991).
III. HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MCMILLAN SITE

The following text provides an evaluation of the significance of the McMillan Site as part of the larger McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark using the evaluation criteria and information regarding the significance of the Landmark.

CRITERION A: ASSOCIATION WITH THE HISTORY OF WATER PURIFICATION

The McMillan Site contains a majority of the infrastructure associated with the filtration capabilities of the slow sand filtration plant. Therefore, the McMillan Site is crucial to understanding how the slow sand filtration plant operated, as well as to conveying the scale of the slow sand filtration plant as a facility for the water purification for the entire City of Washington.

CRITERION B: ASSOCIATION WITH SENATOR JAMES MCMILLAN

The McMillan Site was planned as a distinct component of McMillan Park, which was a memorial to Senator James McMillan. Within McMillan Park, the McMillan Site was designed to have a unique function as a perimeter pedestrian park through which the public could stroll and visually experience the unusual landscape of the Site’s open plains and structures.

CRITERION C: DISTINCTIVE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION AS A PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY AND PUBLIC PARK

The architectural design and construction methods used within the McMillan Site embody the aesthetics that associate this public works facility with the principles of the City Beautiful Movement. Further, Olmsted recognized and acknowledged that the McMillan Site had a unique character and designed the landscape for the McMillan Site as a distinct component of his overall landscape plan for McMillan Park.

In conclusion, the McMillan Site is significant as a distinct component of the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark and contributes to the significance of the Landmark under each of the criteria for which it was designated.

IV: RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE OF INDIVIDUAL RESOURCE TYPES

Relative Level of Significance (RLS) of individual resources has been developed as a preservation-planning tool to assess the relative importance of resource types, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The RLS ranks each resource based on its contribution to the historic significance of the landmark as a whole. The detailed findings of the evaluation of the relative level of significance of each resource type is included in Appendix I of this report.

The first step in evaluating the RLS of the resources within the McMillan Site is an understanding of the significance of the McMillan Site within the context of the entire McMillan Park Reservoir Landmark. Based on the evaluation provided in this chapter, the following principles are accepted:
The McMillan Site is understood as a distinct component of the McMillan Park Reservoir Landmark and the relative level of significance of the individual resources within the McMillan Site should be evaluated for the resource’s role in conveying this distinction;

The McMillan Site is significant for the same reasons that the Landmark was judged to be significant; thus the relative level of significance of the individual resources within the McMillan Site should be evaluated based on the same criteria.

Using these principles, each of the resource types identified in the Resource Inventory in Chapter 3 was evaluated for its contribution to the significance of the McMillan Site based on the following criteria:

- **CRITERION A**: Association with the History of Water Purification
- **CRITERION B**: Association with Senator James McMillan
- **CRITERION C**: Distinctive Design and Construction as a Public Works Facility and Public Park

The following considerations were then made to determine the RLS of each resource type under each of the above criterion:

- **CRITERION A**:
  - How does/did the resource convey the operations of a slow sand filtration plant?
  - How does/did the resource convey the role of a slow sand filtration plant within the water purification system of the City of Washington?
  - How does/did the resource convey the original operational scale of this slow sand filtration plant?
  - How does/did the resource convey the story of the Site’s construction as a distinct component of the first water treatment facility for the City of Washington?
  - How does/did the resource convey the importance of water purification to the City of Washington?

- **CRITERION B**:
  - How does/did the resource convey the Site’s association as a distinct component of the first water treatment facility within the larger District of Columbia park system that is associated with the leadership of Senator James McMillan?
  - How does/did the resource convey the experience of the Site as a distinct component of McMillan Park and as a memorial to Senator James McMillan.

- **CRITERION C**:
  - How does/did the resource convey the original construction methods of this slow sand filtration plant?
  - How does/did the resource contribute to the Site’s distinctive architectural character and aesthetic and its role as a distinct component of the first water treatment facility for the City of Washington?
  - How does/did the resource convey Olmsted’s design intentions for the Site’s original landscape plan as a distinct component of McMillan Park?
Using these considerations, each resource was then ranked on a scale of 0 to 3 for its contribution to the significance of the McMillan Site under each of the evaluation criterion, with 3 corresponding to the greatest level of contribution. Based on the sum of the rankings for each criterion, the resource type was then assigned an RLS as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>SUM OF RANKINGS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>The resource is of the highest level of contribution to the historic significance of the McMillan Site and is essential to understanding the most significant aspects of the McMillan’s Site’s history and historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>The resource is moderately important to conveying the significant aspects of the McMillan’s Site’s history and historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>The resource is minimally important to conveying the significant aspects of the McMillan’s Site’s history and historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CONTRIBUTING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The resource does not contribute to the historic significance or historic character of the McMillan Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3: HISTORIC INTEGRITY

The 1991 HPRB landmark decision for McMillan Park Reservoir states that the property possessed sufficient integrity to convey, represent, or contain the values and qualities for which it is judged significant. The following provides an updated integrity evaluation based on contemporary professional methodology using the seven aspects of integrity established by the National Park Service: materials, workmanship, design, location, setting, feeling, and association. As stated in Chapter 2 of this report, the McMillan Site is significant as a distinct component of the overall McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark. Therefore, the integrity of this distinct component McMillan Site can be assessed separately from the landmark as a whole. An assessment of the significance statement for the McMillan Site indicates that all seven aspects of integrity are important to conveying the significance of the landmark.

The evaluation is organized into three parts: (1) the integrity of the Site’s slow sand filtration plant; (2) the integrity of the Site’s designed landscape; (3) the integrity of individual resource types at the Site. The slow sand filtration plant was constructed between 1903-1905 as a public works facility. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.’s developed a landscape plan for the Site in response to the dedication of McMillan Park in 1906, and his design was implemented between 1907 and 1919. Once implemented, the designed landscape for the pedestrian park became an integral part of the historic character of the Site as a whole; however, the integrity of the designed landscape can be evaluated separately because it was conceived, planned, designed, and completed as an independent effort. Finally, the integrity of individual resource types was evaluated separately to inform the resource-specific treatment recommendations that are included in Chapter 4 of this report.

I. HISTORIC INTEGRITY OF THE SLOW SAND FILTRATION PLANT

The McMillan Site is occupied by a large section of the slow sand filtration plant, including several below-ground and above-ground built resources associated with the water purification process: filter beds, service courts, sand bins, regulator houses, stairs, ramps, sand washers, and manholes. All of these resources were included in the original plans for the filtration plant and were designed as part of its intended operation for the purification of water.

DESIGN

The design of the Sand Filtration Plant gives the McMillan Site a unique character, defined by its artificial topography, trapezoidal footprint, spatial organization, and utilitarian aesthetic. These design components have remained intact since the original construction of the filtration plant in the first years of the twentieth century.

___

24 This evaluation does not address the integrity of the areas of the 92-acre landmark that are located outside the 25-acre McMillan Site.

25 The current stationary sand washers were replaced in 1910 and are in the same locations as the original. The washers are the only built resources with wholesale alterations since the original construction of the site.
From above, the Site is defined by its large trapezoidal footprint bounded by North Capitol Street to the east, Michigan Avenue to the north, First Street to the west, and Channing Street to the south. Within the trapezoid, the site is divided horizontally by two paved service courts that traverse east-west across the full width of the Site. These service courts create a tripartite organization of expansive open spaces, which correspond to the grassy roofs of the subterranean filter beds. The linear organization of built resources within the service courts makes this tripartite organization of open space legible from the ground, as well, as the buildings and structures rise above the horizontal plane of the adjacent open spaces.

The Site’s original design is also conveyed through the distinct structural forms and rhythms of its above-ground and below-ground built resources. The above-ground resources of the sand filtration plant are confined to the two east-west service courts. A linear configuration of large smooth concrete cylindrical sand storage bins that rhythmically marches east-to-west from First Street to North Capitol Street and are occasionally interrupted by a one-story red brick regulator house with hipped roofs clad in red clay tiles. Several concrete stationary sand washers are also located in the service courts within the east-west lines of storage bins and regulator houses. The service courts themselves are defined by concrete retaining walls, which are punctuated by regularly spaced arched portals that lead to the filter beds below. Various types of arches are evident throughout the site: the passageways through the storage bins, the window and door openings of the regulator houses, and the door openings of the filter bed portals. Once below ground, these arched shapes take on another dimension, where seemingly endless rows of un-reinforced concrete vaults convey the structural system of the site’s subterranean filter beds. The repetition of these strong architectural forms—cylinders, arches, boxes, and vaults—gives the site a strong rhythmic expression, both above and below ground. All of these architectural forms and rhythms are part of the original design of the sand filtration plant on the McMillan Site and are critical aspects of its historic character.

As viewed from surrounding areas, the site is also defined by a unique topography that is a product of the original design of the sand filtration plant. At the beginning of construction of the facility in 1903, the property’s natural rolling topography was re-graded to accommodate a level foundation for the concrete filter bed structures. Once the filter beds were constructed, an additional layer of fill was placed on top, creating a grassy plateau that conceals the concrete structures below. Because the re-grading was confined to the Site, the topography of the McMillan Site is dramatically different from that of the surrounding streets. From points south, the plateau rises approximately sixteen feet above Channing Street. At its north end, the plateau is depressed approximately twelve feet from Michigan Avenue. The decision to apply an additional layer of fill on top of the filter beds allows the McMillan Site to read as having a distinct topographical feature rather than an expanse of concrete structures.

While the distinct architectural forms of the built resources provide visual interest to the Site, the forms of most of the built resources were dictated by their functions. As such, the architectural forms play an important role in conveying the specific purpose each element had in the water purification process. Further, the spatial relationships that create the Site’s characteristic architectural rhythms fundamentally convey the operational relationships of the
various structures and how they were used during the day-to-day operation of the sand filtration plant.

A majority of the Site’s original above-ground and below-ground built resources remain in place, and no new construction has occurred. All material loss due to deterioration or demolition is localized and does not detract from the ability of extant resources to collectively convey the Site’s architectural design, as documented in the original plans and drawings for the filtration plant. The spatial relationships of these resources have also been retained, as no extant built resources have been moved from their original locations. Therefore, the Site has a high degree of integrity of architectural and engineering design.

**MATERIALS**

The sand filtration plant on the McMillan Site was constructed using a variety of materials, including reinforced and un-reinforced concrete, brick, clay tile, wood, and metal. The construction materials give each type of built resource a characteristic color and texture that is consistent for that resource type throughout the site. Cylinders of smooth gray-toned concrete define the sand storage bins, while warmer tones of exposed-aggregate concrete define the walls and portals of the service courts. From afar, red brick walls and terracotta tile roofs make the four regulator houses on the Site stand out amidst gray concrete cylinders of the storage bins. The use of both matte concrete and glazed brick also provides a juxtaposition of texture and color... More subtle blues, greens, and grays define the isolated instances of painted wood in the doors and window screens of the regulator houses and filter bed portals. Although not as visible from afar, various types of metal elements provide some of the most intricate details on the Site, from the portal door hinges to the patterns of the more ornamental manhole covers within the service courts. The grassy roofs of the filter beds provide some relief against the hard, solid character of the masonry service courts and associated resources, and thousands of metal manhole covers rhythmically interrupt the seemingly natural character of these grassy plains, reminding visitors of the artificial character of the Site and the structures below.

Through years of neglect, various degrees of material deterioration and loss have occurred throughout the Site. A substantial amount of material deterioration is due to inherent structural issues that were first documented in a 1906 report by civil engineers Allen Hazen and E.D. Hardy, entitled “Works for the Purification of the Water Supply of Washington, D.C.”26 The report describes the structural deterioration of specific filter beds and identifies the cause of the deterioration to be the inconsistencies in the original cut and fill work for the construction of the filtration plant. The areas of deterioration identified in that report are mostly consistent with the conditions documented in a 2001 structural investigation of the Site, which concluded that eight of the twenty filter beds are structurally unsound. Despite these conditions, all twenty original filter beds are extant on the site. Despite the various degrees of above-ground and below-ground material deterioration, the Site continues to owe a significant part of its historic character to the original palette of materials. Therefore, the Site retains a high degree of integrity of materials.

View of site looking southeast, 2008
(EHT Traceries, Inc.)

View of site looking northeast, c. 1910
(see Appendix A)

Aerial view, 2009 (Google Earth)

Existing conditions map, c. 1905 (see Appendix A)

Service Court, 2008 (EHT Traceries, Inc.)

Service Court, c. 1904 (see Appendix A)
Elements of design, materials, and workmanship at the McMillan Site
(EHT Traceries, Inc. 2008)
WORKMANSHIP

The original workmanship of the sand filtration plant is still evident on both a large and small scale and contributes to the McMillan Site’s historic character. The markings of original formwork provide a linear texture to the otherwise smooth concrete surfaces of the cylindrical sand bins and the concrete vaults of the filter beds. Flemish-bond coursing of the brick walls of the regulator houses gives this public works facility a sense of permanency and high style for an otherwise utilitarian Site. Where original concrete ramps and floors exist, various joint and scoring patterns in the concrete provide additional layers of texture. Evidence of workmanship and attention to detail is one of the primary characteristics that differentiate the McMillan Site from examples of modern civic infrastructure, and the Site retains a high degree of integrity of workmanship.

FEELING

Presently, all structures that were built on the McMillan Site for the specific purpose of facilitating water purification are non-operational, and the Site is not planned to be used again for its intended purpose. However, the forms of the extant structures still convey their original functions within the filtration plant. The adjacency to the McMillan Reservoir further reinforces the retention of the Site’s character as part of a functioning water purification plant. Therefore, the Site retains a high degree of integrity of feeling as a public works facility.
ASSOCIATION
The McMillan Site is part of the facility that was originally and is still referred to as the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant. This name retains the Site’s association with Senator James McMillan, for whom the facility was dedicated in 1906. Further, the Site retains its association with the history of water purification through the retention of a majority of the buildings and structures that were associated with the operation of the sand filtration plant. Therefore, the McMillan Site retains a high degree of integrity of association.

SETTING
The sand filtration plant was constructed on several city blocks that were undeveloped but had been approved for subdivision into residential lots. Therefore, the original setting of the McMillan Site was defined by undeveloped residential plats to the east and south, the Washington City Reservoir site to the west, and the pastoral land of the United States Soldiers’ Home (presently known as the Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington) to the north. Row houses were constructed on the residential plats soon after the filtration plant was constructed; these residential developments still exist and continue to define the setting to the east and south. Further, the reservoir and the section of the filtration plant located west of First Street, although altered over time, continue to define the setting to the west. During the latter half of the twentieth century, the construction of the medical complexes to the north severed the physical relationship that originally existed between the McMillan Site and the Soldiers’ Home and interrupted the once continuous open space of the McMillan Site and Home’s dairy pastures. Despite this intrusion, the Site retains its overall setting as a public works facility placed within the sprawling urban development of the city and in close proximity to large institutions. Therefore, the McMillan Site retains a moderate degree of integrity of setting.

LOCATION
The current site of the filtration plant was one of three locations originally considered by the Army Corps of Engineers in 1902. According to the 1906 report, the Corps selected this site for its central location within the city, as well as its proximity to the existing reservoir. Today, the McMillan Site remains in its original location and retains the characteristics of its location that dictated its selection: the sand filtration plant is still located centrally within the city boundaries and still retains its relationship with the historic reservoir. Therefore, the McMillan Site has a high degree of integrity of location.

CONCLUSION
In summary, the slow sand filtration plant on the McMillan Site retains a high degree of integrity of architectural and engineering design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association and location, and a moderate degree of integrity of setting. Therefore, the McMillan Site and its built resources retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the McMillan Park Reservoir Landmark.
II. HISTORIC INTEGRITY OF THE DESIGNED LANDSCAPE

Landscape resources for the McMillan Site include all resources associated with Frederick Law Olmsted’s landscape plans dating from 1907 to 1911 and implemented between 1907 and 1919. Olmsted’s designed landscape included both plantings, a perimeter pedestrian path, and corner stairs.27

DESIGN, MATERIALS, WORKMANSHIP, ASSOCIATION, FEELING, SETTING, AND LOCATION

The McMillan Site today retains only a few remnants of the designed landscape conceived by Olmsted. A 2002 report prepared by Parsons Infrastructure and Tech (Fairfax, VA) for the DC Office of Planning gives a detailed description of the condition of the remaining elements.28 Parsons states that although the Site is covered in vegetation, extant plantings consist primarily of grasses, as well as annual and perennial herbaceous species. These plants and grasses are “volunteers” and can be classified as weeds. The identified species of the existing vegetation do not represent species that were specified by Olmsted. However, there are some remnants of Olmsted’s plan, mostly in the form of tree and shrubbery stumps, that can be used to ascertain the original patterns of some of his plantings, including the double row of small trees lining the pedestrian path, the larger trees at the Site’s entry points, and the more picturesque configuration of small trees on the north end of the site.

Creepers continue to grow on the many of the structures in the service courts, contributing to the character of the Site as they change colors through the seasons. However, the Parsons report identifies these creepers as Boston Ivy, which was the original species planted on the site, not the species recommended by Olmsted, Jr. The report also identifies two extant trees, an Elm and a Mulberry, that are of sufficient age to have been part of the original design. Despite these remnants, there is material to convey the overall vision of Olmsted’s landscape plan.

Despite the lack of remaining original planting material, there remains more substantial evidence of the built resources associated with Olmsted’s designed landscape are more. Sufficient sections of the pedestrian path remain to allow the original route of the path to be legible. Only one of the original sets of corner stairs is still extant, but the locations of the other three sets of stairs are indicated by depressions in the topography, as well as scattered remnants of material.

CONCLUSION

Because few remnants of Olmsted’s original landscape plan remain, McMillan Site’s designed landscape retains a low degree of integrity of materials, workmanship, feeling, setting, association, and location. Although the remnants that do remain (stumps, spatial voids, concrete remnants) indicate some aspects of the original configuration of plantings in specific areas of

27 The McMillan Memorial Fountain and other built landscape resources were included on the western section of the site, west of First Street.
the site, the overall character of the landscape plan is only evident through historic documentation; therefore, the site's landscape design does not retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance in the history of the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark.

Despite the lack of integrity of the designed landscape, Olmsted’s vision for the site is fully documented and preserved in his professional records. Although past documentation efforts have consulted the Olmsted manuscripts at the Library of Congress, none of the previous reports, including the Parsons report and the landmark nomination, consulted the Olmsted Archives in Brookline, Massachusetts. EHT Traceries, Inc., was given the opportunity to consult these records for the McMillan Redevelopment Project. Records reviewed included Olmsted’s planting plans and lists for all areas of the filtration plant and reservoir. Select plans and lists are provided in Appendix B of this report, along with a full inventory of the records available and consulted at the Olmsted Archives.

III. HISTORIC INTEGRITY OF INDIVIDUAL RESOURCES

The integrity of each resource type was evaluated based on a comparison of historic documentation (plans, drawings, photographs, and narrative descriptions) with on-site investigations of existing conditions. Because this integrity evaluation was completed for the purposes of developing resource-specific recommendations for the proposal that will be part of a PUD Stage 1 Submission, the integrity was evaluated for each resource type listed in the Resource Inventory (see Chapter 1) rather than for individual resources. Therefore, the integrity does not necessarily reflect details of the physical condition of each resource; rather, the integrity evaluation conveys whether each resource type is extant and appears to be consistent with the original location and design that is reflected in historic documentation. Structural integrity was not evaluated as part of this study. Based on this evaluation, each resource type was assigned one of the following levels of integrity. The detailed findings of the resource-specific integrity evaluation are provided in Appendix I of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>All resources within the resource type are extant, in their original locations, and appear to be visually consistent with the historic character of the resource as seen in historic documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>All resources within the resource type are extant and in their original locations, but the general physical condition of the resource type does not fully convey the original character of the resource type as seen in historic documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not all resources within the resource type are extant and/or the general physical condition of the resource type has diminished its overall integrity so that its historic character is not fully legible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Integrity</td>
<td>The resource is no longer extant and retains no material integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4: PRESERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The McMillan Site has a unique character and history. The preservation of this site is an incredible but necessary challenge, and a comprehensive preservation strategy must be developed and implemented as part of any proposed redevelopment project. The recommendations in this report are intended to ensure that the proposal for the redevelopment submitted by VMP incorporates an effective strategy for preservation and protection of the McMillan Site.

Three types of recommendations are provided:

1. General Recommendations;
2. Resource-specific Treatment Recommendations; and
3. Mitigation Recommendations.

The General Recommendations are intended to provide overall preservation objectives for the redevelopment project and establish protections for the Site and its resources as plans for redevelopment are prepared. The Resource-specific Treatment Recommendations address the preservation of individual character-defining features based on the resource type’s contribution to the Site’s historic significance and integrity. The Mitigation Recommendations offer suggestions for balancing any aspects of the development that do not conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. All recommendations are provided at a level of detail intended only to inform the conceptual site plan for the redevelopment as required for the PUD Stage 1 submission. Detailed prescriptions for the treatment or reuse of individual historic resources are not included in this report and will be specified in the PUD Stage 2 process.

EHT Traceries acknowledges that total preservation of the McMillan Site is preferable based on the Site’s unique history and character and high degree of historic integrity. However, EHT Traceries also acknowledges that the District of Columbia has charged VMP with the redevelopment of the Site. Therefore, EHT Traceries does seek to identify what level of development is appropriate for the Site; rather we are providing preservation recommendations to VMP that ensure that the redevelopment plan for the McMillan Site incorporates historic preservation in the most effective manner. Therefore, the recommendations in this report assume the following parameters:

- The 1987 Quitclaim Deed between the United States and the District of Columbia requires that any work on the site be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards;
- The District of Columbia has prescribed a level of development for the 24-acre McMillan Sand Filtration site;
- The Site must be developed in a manner that will accommodate an inter-modal transportation system;
- The development will consist of a combination of residential, retail, commercial/office, cultural, community, and hospitality uses;
- The site plan for the redevelopment will include passive and active open space; and
It is known that an undefined portion of the filter bed structures are structurally unstable, and that further structural and geotechnical analysis must occur to inform the feasibility of preservation of these resources.

I. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following General Recommendations provide overall preservation goals for the McMillan Redevelopment Project. These recommendations will help VMP balance the preservation of the site with other stakeholder concerns and interests in an effort to develop an effective strategy for considering the resource-specific and mitigation recommendations that follow.

1. Pursuant to the 1987 Quitclaim Deed transferring the McMillan Site from the United States to District of Columbia, the redevelopment of the McMillan Site should be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.29

2. The redevelopment on the McMillan Site should allow the landmark to retain sufficient historic integrity to convey the site’s significance to the history of public works, water purification, and landscape design, as well as the site’s association with Senator James McMillan.

3. Preservation of historic resources at the McMillan Sand Filtration Site can and should be a critical component of the success of the redevelopment project.

4. If critical to the preservation of the overall character of the McMillan Site, the preservation of a significant individual feature should be considered regardless of whether it will directly contribute to the ideal use and aesthetic of the redevelopment. The development should err on the side of preservation whenever possible.

5. The redevelopment of the McMillan Site should be based on planning and design principles that are specific to this historic site by reflecting the landmark’s unique aesthetic, character and history in all aspects of the redevelopment.

6. The character, history, and technical operations of the McMillan Site should be celebrated through both preservation and interpretation.

7. The development team should continue to incorporate assistance from qualified preservation specialists throughout the development of the site plan, design development, and construction to ensure that meaningful preservation strategy is coordinated with DCHPO and implemented. Preservation specialists must meet professional qualifications for their respective disciplines, as provided in the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.30

---

29 See Appendix G for the Historic Covenant and Appendix I for the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

8. A structural assessment should be completed by a qualified preservation engineer to evaluate the structural integrity of the site and its resources, including the subterranean filter beds, and to inform recommendations for stabilization, preservation, and/or adaptive reuse.

9. If aspects of the redevelopment are considered necessary but incompatible with the historic character of the McMillan Site, as defined in this report, and inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, DCHPO may determine that these aspects could be mitigated through specific actions. In this case a program of mitigation should be developed in coordination with DCHPO and reviewed as part of the PUD Stage 1 Submission.

II. RESOURCE-SPECIFIC TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Resource-specific Treatment Recommendations are provided for the preservation of individual historic resource types at the McMillan Site. These recommendations are made in an attempt to provide a holistic preservation strategy that preserves those features that EHT Traceries has identified as most significant to the Site’s historic character and integrity. These recommendations should be used by VMP for the purpose of guiding the development of the site plan. Additional or alternate recommendations may be made by DCHPO during the Section 9b consultation process and are not precluded by the recommendations made in this report.

A. METHODS

The methods used to develop Resource-specific Treatment Recommendations for the McMillan Site are designed to be systematic and transparent. Because the 1987 Quitclaim Deed for the transfer of the McMillan Site (see Appendix H) requires that any work on the Site be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards (Standards), these recommendations rely on several tools that were created based on the Standards. The Standards state that choosing a treatment approach for a resource depends on the following factors: “relative importance” of the resource, integrity, proposed use, and mandated code requirements. For the purposes of providing recommendations for the PUD Stage 1 Submission, the methods for developing resource recommendations have been based on these factors and include the following four steps:

1. Evaluate the relative importance of each resource type (see Chapter 2 and Appendix I);
2. Evaluate the integrity of each resource type (see Chapter 3 and Appendix I);
3. Provide a range of treatment approaches for each resource type based on the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (see Appendix J);
4. Determine the preferred treatment approach for each resource type based on a combination of its Relative Level of Significance, the integrity of the resource, and the assumption of a proposed new use.

Because the redevelopment project for the McMillan Site is early in the planning stages, only relative importance, integrity, and proposed use can be evaluated at this time. During the development of the PUD Stage 2 package, relevant code requirements will be incorporated into decisions regarding the treatment of individual resources. Further, although the specific
proposed uses for the resource types have not yet been determined, the treatment approach can assume that the site will be redeveloped and that a new use(s) for the site will be proposed.

(1) Evaluate the relative importance of each resource type

The relative importance of each resource type was determined through the process of evaluating the Relative Level of Significance (RLS) of each resource type. The methodology for evaluating the RLS is outlined in Chapter 2 of this report, and the detailed findings of the RLS evaluation are included in Appendix I of this report.

(2) Evaluate the integrity of each resource type

The methodology for evaluating the integrity of each resource type is outlined in Chapter 3 of this report, and the detailed findings of the integrity evaluation are included in Appendix I of this report.

(3) Provide a range of treatment approaches for each resource type.

A range of treatment approaches is provided for each individual resource type that is listed in the Resource Inventory in Chapter 1 of this report. The Quitclaim Deed that transferred ownership of the McMillan Site from the United States to the District of Columbia addresses the protection of the site. The deed states that any work proposed to take place on the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark must be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation of the McMillan Site may include a variety of treatment approaches for its individual resources. Therefore, the range of treatment approaches proposed in this report for each resource type is based on the four treatment approaches provided in the Standards: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. These approaches are defined as follows:31

- **PRESERVATION**: The act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement, new construction, or exterior additions.

- **REHABILTIATION**: The act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

- **RESTORATION**: The act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

---

• **RECONSTRUCTION**: The act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

(4) **Determine Appropriate Treatment Approach**

The Preferred Treatment Approach is selected for each resource type using the range of treatment approaches provided in this report. The determination of the Preferred Treatment Approach is made using the following guidance provided in the *Standards*:

• **PRESERVATION**: Preservation may be considered as a treatment when the property’s distinctive materials, features, and spaces are essentially intact and thus convey the historic significance without extensive repair or replacement; when depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate; and when a continuing or new use does not require additions or extensive alterations.

• **REHABILITATION**: Rehabilitation may be considered as a treatment when repair and replacement of deteriorated features are necessary; when alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use; and when its depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate.

• **RESTORATION**: Restoration may be considered as a treatment when the property’s design, architectural, or historical significance during a particular period of time outweighs the potential loss of extant materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods; when there is substantial physical and documentary evidence for the work; and when contemporary alterations and additions are not planned.

• **RECONSTRUCTION**: Reconstruction may be considered as a treatment when a contemporary depiction is required to understand and interpret a property’s historic value (including the re-creation of missing components in a historic district or site); when no other property with the same associative value has survived, and when sufficient historical documentation exists to ensure an accurate reproduction.

Using this guidance, a Preferred Treatment Approach is assigned to each resource type based on the combination of its RLS and integrity. When the combination of RLS and integrity of a resource type does not warrant preservation, as when a resource is missing in its entirety or or has so little materiality that it cannot be restored, “n/a” is given as the recommended treatment approach.

As the McMillan Site is owned by the District of Columbia, its redevelopment is subject to Section 9b of the District of Columbia Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act (DC Law 2-144). Section 9b requires the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development to consider comments of the DC Historic Preservation Officer prior to proceeding with a project under her purview. Therefore, an Alternative Treatment Approach that incorporates mitigation is

---

provided to facilitate the consultation process with DCHPO in the case that a Preferred Treatment Approach will not be accommodated by the redevelopment.

The following table lists the Preferred Treatment Approach and Alternative Treatment Approach for each combination of RLS and integrity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>PREFERRED TREATMENT APPROACH</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>No Integrity</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>No Integrity</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>No Integrity</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following tables provide the resource-specific treatment recommendations based on the RLS and integrity assessment of each resource type. The resource-specific treatment recommendations are organized by resource type, including built resources, site resources, and natural landscape resources.

**BUILT RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>PREFERRED TREATMENT APPROACH</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulator Houses</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Bins</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Bed Portals</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Washers</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Beds</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Courts</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Court Walls</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE</td>
<td>RLS</td>
<td>INTEGRITY</td>
<td>PREFERRED TREATMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT APPROACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Bed Sand</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manholes</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Path</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Stairs</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Bed Ramps</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Ramps and Stairs</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SITE RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>PREFERRED TREATMENT APPROACH</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Boundaries</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Organization</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Views</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Views</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATURAL LANDSCAPE RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Preferred Treatment Approach</th>
<th>Alternative Treatment Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Plantings</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Court Plantings</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Mitigation Recommendations

EHT Traceries acknowledges the complex parameters and level of development proposed for the redevelopment of the McMillan Site will most likely require some degree of demolition and development that will be considered incompatible with historic character of the McMillan Site and inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Therefore, the following activities are recommended to mitigate the net adverse effects that cannot be avoided or minimized within the context of the redevelopment. These recommendations are not intended to represent all possible mitigation or to preclude other suggestions for mitigation by DCHPO or any other party. These mitigation recommendations are also not intended to replace all forms of preservation on the site and should be used only to mitigate those adverse effects that cannot be avoided or minimized through the planning and design of the redevelopment. Any proposals for mitigation of adverse effects must be coordinated with the DCSHPO to ensure that the overall mitigation package is enough to sufficiently and appropriately balance the net adverse effect of the redevelopment.

A. General Mitigation Recommendations

In recognition that development is proposed for the McMillan Site, the general mitigation recommendations presented below represent the baseline for mitigation that should be included in the PUD Stage 1 submission. Additional mitigation actions should be identified in coordination with the DCSHPO and also included in the PUD Stage 1 Submission.

- Develop Design Guidelines
- Restore McMillan Memorial Fountain
- Develop Substantive Interpretive Programs that Incorporate the Site’s Resources
- Restore Water as Character-Defining Feature of the Site
- Submit National Register Nomination for the McMillan Park Reservoir property
- Prepare Historic American Engineering Record (HAER)–level documentation prior to any development work and submit to HAER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>MITIGATION RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN GUIDELINES</strong></td>
<td>The McMillan Redevelopment Site is distinguished from the surrounding area by a distinct aesthetic quality created by the site’s architectural rhythms, materials, shapes, textures, and patterns. The introduction of new construction and the demolition of existing resources both pose a potential threat to this quality and the Site’s historic integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design guidelines should be created and followed for the new development to preserve the historic aesthetic quality of the site while allowing for contemporary design. These design guidelines should be reviewed and adopted by HPRB and approved as part of the PUD Stage 2 review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
<td>MITIGATION RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCMLLAN MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN</strong></td>
<td>The McMillan Memorial Fountain, which was originally located west of First Street, was never located on the McMillan Redevelopment Site; however, the fountain and the surrounding memorial was an integral part of the park design by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and was the only physical element that directly associated the site and its namesake. The fountain was removed from McMillan Park in 1941. Although parts of the original fountain have been placed near the reservoir, they have been installed in a remarkably uncereomious fashion. Much of the fountain is still located in off-site storage. The McMillan Fountain should be restored. If possible, the fountain should be re-installed on the McMillan Site to restore its function as a public memorial to Senator James McMillan and a place of public gathering. Any missing pieces to the fountain should be reconstructed, and the general character of the original landscaping plan for the area surrounding the fountain (as designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.) should be reflected as possible in the design of the fountain's new setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER INSTALLATION</strong></td>
<td>The importance of water to the character of the McMillan Site has been lost since the slow sand filtration plant was closed in the 1980s. Water, both as a physical entity and as a concept, should be incorporated into art components, cultural installations, interpretive programs, landscape features, and architectural designs to honor the importance of water to the history and historic character of this public works facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATIONAL REGISTER DESIGNATION</strong></td>
<td>The McMillan Park Reservoir Historic District, which was listed in the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites in 1991, has been informally but not officially determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places but the nomination has yet to be forwarded to the National Park Service. Further, the Landmark is currently designated as significant on a local level, without consideration of the landmark's significance within a national context. The existing nomination for the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic District should be reviewed by DCHPO staff, revised and updated as appropriate (including possible consideration of the landmark within a national context), and forwarded to the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
<td>MITIGATION RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASCE DESIGNATION</strong></td>
<td>The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) has designated one rapid sand filtration site as a Historic Civil Engineering Landmark; however, no slow sand filtration site has been designated at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERPREATIVE PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>The McMillan Site stands as a rare surviving example of a slow sand filtration plant. The character and history of the site is unique and will be difficult to convey to future visitors because of the level of development proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. RESOURCE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The resource-specific treatment recommendations included in this report are made within the parameters of the proposed level of redevelopment, but they do not incorporate specific development objectives of VMP or any other stakeholder concerns; therefore, EHT Traceries acknowledges that all of these recommendations may not be consistent with the interests of the community, city, and developer and that the preferred and/or alternative resource-specific treatment recommendations may not be wholly adopted into the final plan. Therefore, the resource-specific mitigation recommendations provided below should be considered as it becomes necessary to develop a mitigation strategy for the redevelopment of the McMillan Site. These resource-specific mitigation recommendations do not preclude the consideration of other suggestions for mitigation from DCHPO or any other party. In all instances, the level of the adverse effect should be the determining factor in the appropriateness of mitigation. Should a proposed adverse effect be greater than anticipated in these recommendations, mitigation must bear the weight of successfully balancing the adverse effect by providing benefits to the public that counterpoint the loss of irreplaceable historic character and fabric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>POSSIBLE MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corner Stairs</td>
<td>• One or more of the corner stairs could be reconstructed using the guidelines provided in the treatment approach for Reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prominent access points could be designed at each of the four corners of the site to honor the original design intention for public access at the perimeter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Visual interpretive installations could be designed to illustrate the original corner condition and placed at the corner locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Bed</td>
<td>• Visual interpretive installations could be designed to convey the original character and function of the filter bed ramps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Beds</td>
<td>• Preservation or restoration could be chosen as a higher-level treatment approach for retained filter beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Visual and narrative interpretive programs could be designed to convey the character of the filter beds and their role in the filtration process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sections of filter beds could be retained in various stages of preservation and exposure and incorporated into the architectural or landscape design for a new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A retained filter bed could be used for continued filtration of water to preserve the original function of the filter beds and to optimize the ability of the public to interpret the historic resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A retained filter bed could be used as an artifact that is not available for current public interpretation but is preserved in its entirety for future interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE</td>
<td>POSSIBLE MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Filter Bed Sand   | • The importance of sand to the operation of the facility could be expressed throughout the design of the new development by incorporating sand (existing and new) into new landscape and architectural features.  
• An interpretive program could be designed to illustrate the role of sand in the purification process.  
• An interpretive program could be designed to illustrate how sand was moved through the site as it was washed, stored, and used. |
| Manholes          | • The idea of large expanses of regularly spaced manholes throughout the site could be expressed through the design of new architectural and landscape features.  
• Planned open spaces within the site that do not correspond with areas of retained manholes should feature a design element that is indicative of the character of the manholes (spacing, size, etc.).  
• Intact manhole covers could be incorporated into art installations, landscape design, or interpretive programs on the site.  
• A visual interpretive installation could be designed to illustrate the original manhole condition. |
| Perimeter Pedestrian Path | • The existing pedestrian path could be restored using the guidelines provided in the treatment approach for Restoration.  
• The idea of a pedestrian path and/or pedestrian park within the site could be incorporated into the design of the new development. The scale and location of the perimeter path could be adjusted, but the combination of straight and curvilinear sections should be considered.  
• An interpretive program could be designed to illustrate the original perimeter condition and the importance of the pedestrian park to McMillan Park as a whole. |
| Filter Bed Portals | • Restoration could be chosen as a higher-level treatment approach for retained filter bed portals.  
• Existing portal doors and hardware could be relocated and incorporated into the design of new landscape and architectural features.  
• If any existing portals and/or portal doors are not retained, the idea of the portals and portal doors could be incorporated into the design of landscape and architectural features in a way that conveys the original resource's architectural character and the rhythm these resources created along either side of the service courts. |
<p>| Ramps and Stairs  | • Visual interpretive installations could be designed to convey the original condition of the ramps and stairs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>POSSIBLE MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Regulator Houses    | • Restoration could be chosen as the treatment approach for one of the four retained regulator houses using the guidelines provided in the treatment approach for Restoration.  
• A preserved or restored regulator house could be incorporated into an interpretive program that conveys the role of the resource in the water purification process.  
• A preserved or restored regulator house could be used to provide an indoor space for other interpretive programs, community space, or other public use. |
| Sand Bins           | • Restoration could be chosen as a higher-level treatment approach for retained sand bins.  
• Visual interpretive landmarks could be designed to convey the role of the sand bins in the water purification process.  
• The preserved sand bins could be used to accommodate landscape features, art installations, interpretive programs, lighting, or other features to integrate these resources into the design of the new development.  
• An interpretive program consisting of a preserved sand bin and adjacent preserved sand washer could be developed to illustrate how these resources operated in the sand washing process.  
• Replanting of the vines on the sand bins, as implemented as part of Olmsted’s landscape design, could be considered as part of the overall landscape design. |
| Sand Washers        | • The sand washers could be used as landscape features such as planters or fountains to integrate these resources into the design of the new development.  
• An interpretive exhibit consisting of a preserved sand washer and adjacent preserved sand bin could be developed to show how these resources operated in the sand washing process. |
| Service Court Walls | • Any material removed from the service court walls could be reused in the landscape design of the development.                                                                                                      |
| Service Courts      | • Restoration could be chosen as a higher-level treatment approach for retained service courts.  
• The service courts could provide the primary location for cultural installations and site-specific interpretive programs to emphasize the historic role of the corridors as the primary areas of activity.  
• Visual interpretive installations could be designed to illustrate the original condition of the service courts.  
• Where existing service court pavement is missing or severely deteriorated, replacement pavement could be designed as an integral part of an interpretive program or art installation. |
<p>| Tunnel              | • n/a                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>POSSIBLE MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Perimeter Plantings** | • The perimeter plantings could be reconstructed using the guidelines provided for the treatment approach for Reconstruction.  
• The idea of a planted perimeter could be incorporated into the landscape design of the development. A new planting could feature a different species than originally planted but one that is consistent with the general scale and character intended by Olmsted. The spacing of the plantings could be loosened to create a more permeable planting configuration while maintaining a sense of a consistent planting pattern.  
• A visual interpretive installation could be designed to convey the original condition of the perimeter.  
• Olmsted’s original landscape plan and planting plans could be incorporated into an interpretive program for his landscape design for McMillan Park.  
• Species used by Olmsted in his design of the perimeter plantings could be planted and labeled in other locations throughout the site as part of interpretive program for his landscape design for McMillan Park. |
| **Service Court Plantings** | • The service court plantings could be reconstructed using the guidelines provided for the treatment approach for Reconstruction.  
• The idea of the service court plantings could be incorporated into the streetscape or landscape design for the new development, such as street trees or groupings of plantings at access points to the service courts. A new planting could feature a different species than originally planted but one that is consistent with the general scale and character intended by Olmsted.  
• Species used by Olmsted in his design of the service court plantings could be planted and labeled in other locations throughout the site as part of interpretive program for his landscape design for McMillan Park. |
| **External Views** | • Views obscured by a change in topography or by vertical development could be featured in interpretive landmarks to convey the original condition.  
• Views obscured by a change in topography or by vertical development could be made publicly accessible from new construction. |
| **Internal Views** | • Visual interpretive installations could be designed to illustrate significant views lost due to vertical development.  
• Views obscured by vertical development could be made publicly accessible from new construction. |
<p>| <strong>Site Boundaries</strong> | • n/a |
| <strong>Site Plan</strong> | • Visual interpretive installations could be designed to illustrate the original site plan. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>POSSIBLE MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>• A north-south cross section of the topography could be preserved and incorporated into the streetscape or landscape design. This cross section could also be used to preserve an intact north-south section of the filter beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Visual interpretive installations could be designed to illustrate the original topographical condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The original topography could be conveyed through the architecture through green walls, variations in materials, or other architectural features or treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The original topography could be conveyed through new landscape design features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The distinctive mounds at each of the filter bed portals could be conveyed through landscape features or architectural forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEWS

The McMillan Redevelopment Project, as envisioned by VMP, is a complex mixed-use project that must undergo many diverse governmental reviews, including several layers historic preservation review, in order to achieve necessary approvals for implementation.

The following presents an overview of the historic preservation review process of the master plan for the McMillan Redevelopment Project based on the condition that the property is owned by the District of Columbia throughout the planning phase of the project. According to VMP, a forthcoming land disposition agreement (LDA) between the development team and DC will most likely include conditions of sale of McMillan Site to include: (1) approval of the PUD, and (2) approval of land development permits. As such, it must be assumed that the redevelopment plan for the site will be effectively completed prior to the sale of the land to a private owner, and, therefore, the project must go through the review procedures required for projects undertaken by the District of Columbia.33

Because of the projects location in the District of Columbia, historic preservation on the site will be addressed on both a local and federal level. For the redevelopment project to gain the necessary approvals, it must address historic preservation issues as part of the following requirements and procedures:

- Letter of Commitment Among VMP, MAG, and DC (December 2007)
- Historic Resources Covenant Requirements (Deed, September 25, 1987)
- Planned Unit Development (PUD) Zoning Regulations (DC Municipal Regulations, Title 11, Chapter 24)
- District of Columbia Undertaking Review Procedures (DC Municipal Regulations, Title 10A, Chapter 6)
- Building Permit Application Review Procedures (DC Municipal Regulations, Title 10A, Chapter 3)
- Commission of Fine Arts Review Procedures (Executive Order 3524, July 28, 1921)

These requirements and procedures will engage review by the following federal and local governmental entities:

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) (federal)
- Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) (local)
- DC Historic Preservation Office (DCHPO) (local with local and federal responsibilities)
- DC Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) (local with local and federal responsibilities)

---

33 Quinn Evans Architects produced a report in June 2006 for the National Capital Revitalization Corporation (NRCR) regarding the Historic Preservation Reviews for McMillan Reservoir Sand Filtration Site; however, the 2006 report is based on an assumption of private ownership of the site, which does not apply to the current arrangement between DC and VMP. Because historic preservation review requirements are dependent on the ownership structure for a property, the 2006 report should not be used to guide the review strategy for the current redevelopment plans.
Please note that these reviews are relevant only to the development of a master plan for the site. As specific designs for infrastructure and buildings are developed, further reviews related to the filing of permits will be required by the District of Columbia.

I. LETTER OF COMMITMENT (2007)

In December 2007, MAG and VMP executed a Letter of Commitment (LOC) with DC (through DMPED) that defines a formal and structured process for collaboration with and review by the community. The LOC seeks to maintain continual dialogue and cooperation between VMP and MAG in an effort to develop and agree upon a detailed community amenities package for the redevelopment project. This amenities package will address, among other things, historic preservation issues at the site. In accordance with the LOC, VMP meets regularly with the McMillan Advisory Group (MAG), a group comprised of stakeholders such as members of relevant civic associations, ANCs, and other community leaders from DC Wards 1 and 5. The LOC also states that the VMP has a responsibility to formally involve the broader community in the planning process, which is being accomplished through on-going working sessions and meetings. This formal relationship among MAG, VMP, DC, and the broader community has been established to ensure that the McMillan Redevelopment Project is a collaborative and open process that engages all relevant stakeholders in the development of plans for this historically significant site.

In accordance with the LOC among MAG, VMP, and DMPED, all aforementioned parties will be given the opportunity to review and comment on the content and recommendations put forth by this historic preservation report.

II. HISTORIC RESOURCES COVENANT (1987)

The District of Columbia purchased the 24.69-acre (19.89 acres of developable land and 4.8 acres of public right-of-way) McMillan Site from the United States Government by quitclaim deed in 1987 for $9,300,000. No record of a Section 106 review or MOA, as you would expect for a transaction between the federal government and DC for this site, has been found to date. However, there is a historic covenant that accompanies the deed that documents the sale. The historic resources covenant includes the following requirements:

The District of Columbia will be responsible for the creation of an historic resources report to identify and evaluate historic, pre-historic, and “pre-reservoir” resources at McMillan Site. The report will include a determination of eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) for the 19.89-acre property in the context of the entire McMillan Reservoir site;
If determined eligible for National Register listing:
• the DC Historic Preservation Office (DCHPO) will be consulted during the development of any and all plans and specifications for renovation, rehabilitation, demolition, or new construction for the site;
• all final plans and specifications for renovation, rehabilitation, demolition, or new construction on the site must be submitted to DCHPO for review and approval prior to implementation; and
• all rehabilitation and renovation work at the site will be undertaken in accordance with the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings.

The historic resources report required by the historic resources covenant was completed by Engineering Science, Inc., in 1990. The report includes conclusions and recommendations as required by the covenant, as well as a comprehensive and detailed inventory of the historic resources at the site.

The 1990 report concluded that the parcel (the McMillan Site) was eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as an historic district with 56 contributing historic resources.34 As recommended by the report, a historic landmark nomination was filed in 1990 by the DC Preservation League (DCPL), and in 1991 the HPRB designated the entire 92-acre site as a local historic landmark and listed the property in the District of Columbia Inventory of Historic Sites (HPRB Case No. 90-20).35 As a listed DC historic landmark, the property is protected under The D.C. Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978 (D.C. Law 2-144). The HPRB also recommended that the property be forwarded to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for listing as a historic landmark.

After local historic designation, the DC SHPO did not forward the landmark nomination for McMillan Park Reservoir to the NRHP, as was recommended by HPRB in the designation decision. Therefore, there has been no official determination of eligibility by the National Register. As a result of the delay in forwarding the nomination and the lack of a formal determination of eligibility for listing in the National Register, the property is not currently protected under national preservation law (National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Public Law 89-665 as amended); however, this could be easily remedied by DC SHPO forwarding the nomination as recommended by HPRB because the local designation provides a strong case for National Register eligibility.

The 1990 report also concludes that the site has moderate potential to yield prehistoric archeological resources and low to moderate potential to yield historic archeological resources. These potential archeological resources are located under deposits of fill ranging in thickness from 6 feet to 50 feet. The report recommends the completion of a Phase I and II archeological investigation if plans for the development of the project area call for penetration of the fill, as these areas of archeological sensitivity may yield resources eligible for the National Register.36 This study has not yet been conducted.

35 Although the 1990 report recommended the site be listed as an historic district, the designation decision issued by HPRB in August 1991 designates the site an individual historic landmark.
The 1987 deed states that the Historic Resources Covenant runs with the land. Therefore, the development team must consult with and receive review and approval by DC HPO for all plans and specifications associated with the redevelopment regardless of whether it the property is sold to the developer or remains under DC ownership. Further, all plans and specifications must comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

III. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

VMP is pursuing approval for the McMillan Redevelopment Project as a PUD. As stated in the DC municipal regulations, a PUD is a planning tool established by the DC Zoning Regulations with the intention to “encourage high quality developments that provide public benefits” by permitting “flexibility of development and other incentives, such as increased building height and density; provided that the project offers a commendable number of quality of public benefits and that it protects and advances public health safety, welfare, and convenience.”37

Because the McMillan Site is part of a local historic landmark, approval of a PUD application for the McMillan Redevelopment Project requires review by the DC State Historic Preservation Officer (DCSHPO) to assess the impact of the proposed development on the site’s historic resources. 38 Historic preservation concerns will be further taken into consideration as part of the public benefits and project amenities requirement for PUD projects.39 In order for the PUD to be approved, plans must be “acceptable,” if not “strong or superior,” in the category of historic preservation of private or public structures, places, or parks, which is one of several categories of public benefits and project amenities required by the PUD regulations.40

The PUD process includes two stages: Stage 1 will constitute the master planning process for the McMillan Site. Stage 2 will constitute the conceptual design of individual components of the redevelopment, including both the rehabilitation of existing historic resources and the design of new construction. The final version of the draft master plan, which is the subject of VMP’s current effort, will form the basis for an application seeking first-stage PUD approval.

---

37 Planned Unit Development Procedures, District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, Title 11, Chapter 24, Section 2400.
38 Planned Unit Development Procedures, Section 2407.3.
39 Planned Unit Development Procedures, Section 2403.09.
40 Planned Unit Development Procedures, Section 2403.10.
IV. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNDERTAKING REVIEW

On November 15, 2006, the DC Council amended the local Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act (DC Law 2-144) with the passage of DC Law 16-185. As part of this amendment, Section 9b was adopted to establish a new procedure for determining the effects of District of Columbia undertakings on historic resources. Section 9b states:

Before authorizing the expenditure of funds for design or construction or seeking the permit, license or approval for a District of Columbia undertaking, the Deputy Mayor, head of the subordinate agency, or head of the independent agency with direct jurisdiction over the undertaking shall take into account the effect of that undertaking on any property listed or eligible for listing in the District of Columbia Inventory of Historic Sites and shall consult with and afford the State Historic Preservation Officer a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking.

A District of Columbia undertaking is defined as:

A project of the District of Columbia government that involves or contemplates demolition, alteration, subdivision, or new construction affecting a property owned by or under the jurisdiction of a District of Columbia agency, including an independent agency.

The statutory requirement for a historic preservation review of District of Columbia undertakings is modeled on the mandates of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Regulations associated with Section 9b have been drafted but not yet adopted; however, the draft procedures are modeled on the federal regulations implementing Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800).

The Section 9b review process will facilitate, but not constitute, preservation review required for DC agency-filed building permits that will affect historic resources as discussed in the previous section. However, the draft regulations for Section 9b state that the procedures for conceptual design review and permit review outlined in the section above are listed as alternate procedures to achieve Section 9b compliance, and filing for conceptual review with HPRB effectively initiates compliance with Section 9b. Although Section 9b review may be satisfied by conceptual and permit review, DC HPO and HPRB review of projects subject to Section 9b may address preservation issues that are not typically applicable to private properties, such as the consideration of significant interior features or other listed or eligible historic or archeological properties in a surrounding area of potential effect (APE).41

For the McMillan Redevelopment Project, the development of the conceptual plan for the PUD stage 1 application is considered a District of Columbia undertaking. Therefore, compliance with Section 9b for the McMillan Redevelopment Project will be incorporated into the PUD

41 Historic Preservation Procedures, Section 604.
Stage 1 review by DCHPO and will continue through conceptual review of individual components during PUD Stage 2.

V. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

The National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) acts as the federal government’s central planning and development agency in the National Capital Region. NCPC is expected to review the McMillan Redevelopment Project on two levels: (1) the Zoning Commission will give NCPC the opportunity to review and comment on the PUD submission for the project following the Zoning Commission hearing for the PUD, pursuant to Zoning Commission regulations; and (2) NCPC will have approval authority over the McMillan Redevelopment Project pursuant to Section 5(a) of the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, as amended, which states that Federal and District of Columbia agencies must consult with NCPC during the preparation of plans and programs that will affect the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, if the project is paid for in whole or part from Federal or District funds. Although VMP is not receiving funds from the District of Columbia for the PUD, the land is still owned by DC. Therefore, VMP should anticipate that NCPC will invoke its approval authority for the project. If so, because the McMillan Redevelopment Project is intended to require more than one principal building, structure, or activity, NCPC will require review of a master plan prior to preparation of site and building plans for individual projects on the site.42

NCPC will review the PUD submission and Master Plan for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, which was adopted by the Council of the District of Columbia in December 2006. 43

The citywide elements of the Comprehensive Plan address the site for the McMillan Redevelopment Project in two general areas related to preservation:

As part of the historic open space network, created by the significant corridor of federal, District, and institutional open spaces extending from McMillan Reservoir north to Fort Totten, McMillan Reservoir should be protected and enhanced. As future land use changes in this area take place, an integrated system of permanent open spaces and improved parks should be maintained or created (Policy PROS-2.2.1 North-Central Open Space Network).

Views of and from the natural escarpment around central Washington should be protected. NCPC will work with District and federal land holders and review agencies to accommodate reasonable demands for new development on major historic campuses such as McMillan Reservoir in a manner that harmonizes with the natural topography and preserves important views over the city (Action HP-2.5-B Protecting the Natural Escarpment).44

More specifically, the citywide elements of the Comprehensive Plan (2006) identify the McMillan Sand Filtration Site as one of ten large sites in the District of Columbia slated for

---

42 A master plan is an integrated series of documents which present in graphic, narrative, and tabular form the present composition of an installation and the plan for its orderly and comprehensive long-range development, generally over a period of 20 years.
43 NCPC may also require a separate master plan review.
redevelopment over the next twenty years. NCPC recognizes the potential for sites such as McMillan to supply needed community services, create local housing and employment opportunities, remove barriers between neighborhoods, provide large and significant new parks, and improve and stabilize the city’s neighborhoods. As one of several general policies set for these large sites, Policy LU-1.2.7 states that existing assets such as historic buildings, historic site plan elements, important vistas, and major landscape elements should be identified and protected as large sites such as McMillan Site are redeveloped.45

The area elements of the Comprehensive Plan identify the McMillan Sand Filtration Site as a “policy focus area” and provide specific policies for its treatment and future redevelopment (Policies MC-2.6.1 through MC-2.6.5 and MC-2.6.A). Policy MC-2.6.2 specifically relates to historic preservation, stating that redevelopment of the site should:

Restore key above-ground elements of the site in a manner that is compatible with the original plan and should explore the adaptive reuse of some of the underground elements as part of the historic record of the site. The cultural significance of this site, and its importance to the history of the District of Columbia must be recognized as it is reused. Consideration should be given to monuments, memorials, and museums as part of the site design.46

Please note that the Comprehensive Plan should be consulted for policies unrelated to historic preservation that have been set for this site and will be used as guidance during NCPC’s review of the McMillan Redevelopment Project.

VI. COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS REVIEW

The Commission of Fine Arts (CFA) is an independent federal agency that was established in 1910 as an advisory body for matters of the arts and architecture in Washington, D.C. Executive Order 3524 (July 28, 1921) requires the District of Columbia government to seek advice from the Commission of Fine Arts (CFA) on “designs of statues, fountains, and monuments, and all important plans for parks and all public buildings, constructed by executive departments or the District of Columbia, which in any essential way affect the appearance of the City of Washington, or the District of Columbia.”47 Although CFA does not have approval authority for such projects, CFA comments and advises the relevant agencies with approval authority on the plans and merits of design of such projects prior to final approval or action.

The McMillan Redevelopment Plan is a public-private partnership and as stated previously, the District of Columbia will own the land associated with the development throughout most of the planning and design process, with specific conditions for sale to be defined in a forthcoming LDA. Therefore, CFA has review authority over the redevelopment plans for the McMillan site, as well as any designs for statues, fountains, or monuments on the site. CFA should review both the master plan for the site and the conceptual designs for individual

45 LU-1.2.7, Protecting Existing Assets on Large Sites, Citywide Elements, Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, 2006.
47 Executive Order 3524, July 28, 1921.
components of the redevelopment. CFA expects that complex projects such as the McMillan Redevelopment Project will consult with CFA staff prior to review by the CFA board.

**VII. HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROCEDURAL SUMMARY**

The following table summarizes the preservation-related review information outlined above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY / GROUP</th>
<th>LAW/ REGULATIONS/ AGREEMENT</th>
<th>MEETING SCHEDULE OR TIMELINE</th>
<th>SUBMISSION SCHEDULE</th>
<th>PRESERVATION-RELATED POINTS OF REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McMillan Advisory Group (MAG) and broader community</td>
<td>Letter of Commitment (LOC), 2007</td>
<td>Review and consultation throughout planning process</td>
<td>Review and consultation throughout planning process</td>
<td>Reviews preservation-related aspects to community benefits package of PUD Stage 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)</td>
<td>Master Plan: National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (Section 5a)</td>
<td>If applicable, Commission meets first Thursday of each month (no meeting in August)</td>
<td>If applicable, submit 4 weeks prior to meeting; 3 months prior to meeting for submissions requiring referral</td>
<td>Reviews PUD submission for consistency with District of Columbia Comprehensive Plan; possible submission of Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Historic Preservation Office and State Historic Preservation Officer (DCHPO and DCSHPO) And DC Historic Preservation Review Board (at DCHPO discretion for PUD)</td>
<td>PUD: DC Municipal Regulations Title 11, Chapter 24 DC Undertaking: DC Municipal Regulations, Title 10A, Chapter 6 Building Permits: DC Municipal Regulations, Title 10A, Chapter 3 Historic Resources Covenant, 1987 (Quitclaim deed for property)</td>
<td>Consultation with DCSHPO throughout planning process; If applicable, HPRB meets fourth Thursday of each month</td>
<td>If applicable, submit PUD submission to HPRB 4 weeks prior to meeting;</td>
<td>Assesses the impact of the proposed development on the site’s historic resources and considers adequacy of incorporation of preservation in public benefits and project amenities requirement for PUD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission of Fine Arts (CFA)</td>
<td>Executive Order 3524, July 28, 1921</td>
<td>Commission meets third Thursday of each month</td>
<td>Submit 2 weeks prior to meeting</td>
<td>Effect of plan and design on aesthetic quality of city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A:
Original Plans and Specifications for the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

SOURCES

1. **TITLE:** Purification of the Water Supply
   **AUTHOR:** John H. Walker
   **DATE:** 1909
   **DESCRIPTION:** A book containing statements, papers, and reports by various authorities on filtration of water supplies. These drawings were taken from Chapter XII: Works for the Purification of the Water Supply of Washington, D.C., by Allen Hazen and E.D. Hardy (American Society of Civil Engineers), which was taken from the Transactions of the American Society for Civil Engineers, Vol. LVII, page 307. The chapter includes 23 drawings that accompany Hazen’s report of December 1902. At least two of these drawings were provided to F.L. Olmsted Jr., in 1907 and can be found in the Olmsted Archives in Brookline, MA. Eight figures that accompanied the report have also been included, showing plans, elevations, and sections of the different components of the site.
   **REPOSITORY:** Historical Society of Washington, D.C.

2. **TITLE:** Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
   **REPOSITORY:** Archives of the Washington Aqueduct, Dalecarlia Water Treatment Plant, Washington, DC
   **DESCRIPTION:** The archives of the Washington Aqueduct contain photographs and other materials related to all properties within the Washington Aqueduct system, which is managed by the Baltimore District of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Note: The resources included in this appendix are selected based on relevance to the project and do not represent the entirety of the associated collection. Several resources related specifically to the reservoir, the land around the reservoir, the playground, and the filters located west of First Street have been reviewed but are not included in this report because they are outside the boundaries of the project area.

A-1 General Plan Showing Location, Building Lines, and Contours, 1902
A-2 General Sections, 1902
A-3 General Plan Showing Main Pipe Lines, Vaulting, and Wall Sections, 1902
A-4 General Plan Showing Finished Surfaces, 1902
A-5 Park: Standard Sections of Walls and Vaulting, 1902
A-6 Plan of Vaulting against Diagonal Walls, 1902
A-7 Sections of Vaulting against Diagonal Walls, 1902
A-8 Typical Filter Sectional Plan and Elevations, 1902
A-9 Plan and Sections of Filtered Water Reservoir, 1902
A-10 Plan and Sections of Filtered Water Reservoir, 1902
A-11 Plan of Standard and Irregular Inlets and Manholes, 1902
A-12 Filter Details - Entrance and Stairway, 1902
A-13 Steel Pipe Plan and Profiles, 1902
A-14 Cast Iron Pipe Plan and Profiles, 1902
A-15  Exterior Drains, Plans and Profiles, 1902
A-16  Interior Drains, Plans, Details, and Schedule, 1902
A-17  General Plan of Filters 25-29, Surface of Ground, Sections, Vaulting, and Underdrains, 1902
A-18  Sand Washer Piping, Plan and Schedule, 1902
A-19  Sand Washer Piping, Sections, Details, and Specials, 1902
A-20  Plan of Pressure Piping, 1902
A-21  General Plan Identifying Courts, Cells, Bins, Washers 1902
A-22  General Plan Showing Main Pipe Lines, 1902
A-23  Sectional Plan and Elevation of Typical Filter, 1902
A-24  Standard Sections of Walls and Vaulting, 1902
A-25  Representative Plan of Piping in Court, 1902
A-26  Section of Sand Hopper, 1902
A-27  Section, Elevation, and Plan of Sand Bins, 1902
A-28  Washing and Storage of Sand, 1902
A-29  Plat of subdivision for Dobbin’s Addition , on site of current McMillan Sand Filtration Site, 1899.
A-30  General Plan, c.1903
A-31  Finished Surfaces of Service Courts 2 and 3, 1903
A-32  Court 2, 1905
A-33  Court 3, 1905
A-34  Sand Storage Bins, 1905
A-35  Sand Storage Bins, 1905
A-36  Regulator Houses, 1904
A-37  Roofing Plan for Regulator Houses, 1904
A-38  Windows and Doors for Regulator Houses, 1904
A-39  Window Sills for Regulator Houses, 1904
A-40  Ramp from road to Court 2, 1905
A-41  Ramp from Service Courts to Tops of Filter Beds, 1905
A-42  Ramp from First Street to Court 3, 1905
A-43  Tunnel under First Street, 1905
A-44  Stationary Sand Washers, 1910
A-45  Diagram of Sand Washing and Storage Process, c.1910
A-46  Existing Conditions, c.1903
A-47  Differential Settlement Diagram, showing locations of cracks, c.1906
A-48  McMillan Memorial Fountain, c.1911
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A-1: McMillan Park: General Plan Showing Location, Building Lines, and Contours (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-2: McMillan Park: General Sections (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington
A-3: McMillan Park: General Plan Showing Main Pipe Lines, Vaulting, and Wall Sections (1902)


A-4: McMillan Park: General Plan Showing Finished Surfaces (1902)

A-5: McMillan Park: Standard Sections of Walls and Vaulting (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-6: McMillan Park: Plan of Vaulting Against Diagonal Walls (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington
A-7: McMillan Park: Sections of Vaulting Against Diagonal Walls (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-8: McMillan Park: Typical Filter Sectional Plan and Elevations (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington
A-9: McMillan Park: Plan and Sections of Filtered Water Reservoir (1902)

Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-10: McMillan Park: Plan and Sections of Filtered Water Reservoir (1902)

Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington
A-11: McMillan Park: Plan of Standard and Irregular Inlets and Manholes (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-12: McMillan Park: Filter Details - Entrance and Stairway (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-14: McMillan Park: Cast Iron Pipe Plan and Profiles (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington
A-17: McMillan Park: General Plan of Filters 25-29, Surface of Ground, Sections, Vaulting, and Underdrains (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-20: McMillan Park: Plan of Pressure Piping (1902)

Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington
A-21: McMillan Park: General Plan Identifying Courts, Cells, Bins, Washers (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-22: McMillan Park: General Plan Showing Main Pipe Lines (1902)
Purification of the Washington Water Supply, courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington

A-25: McMillan Park: Representative Plan of Piping in Court (1902)

A-26: McMillan Park: Section of Sand Hopper (1902)

A-29: Plat of subdivision for Dobbin's Addition, on site of current McMillan Sand Filtration Site, 1899. courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
A-30: McMillan Reservoir and Sand Filtration Plant: General Plan (c.1903) courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives

A-31: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Finished Surfaces of Service Courts 2 and 3 (1903) courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
A-32: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Court 2 (1905)
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives

A-33: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Court 3 (1905)
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives

courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives

courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
A-40: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Ramp from road to Court 2 (1905)
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives

A-41: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Ramp from Service Courts to Tops of Filter Beds (1905)
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
A-42: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Ramp from First Street to Court 3 (1905) courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives

A-43: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Tunnel under First Street (1905) courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives

courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
A-46: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Existing Conditions (c.1903)
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
A-47: McMillan Sand Filtration Plant: Differential Settlement Diagram, showing locations of cracks (c.1906)
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
courtesy of the Washington Aqueduct Archives
APPENDIX B:
Selected Plans from the Olmsted Archives

SOURCE

TITLE: Records Olmsted Job No. 2840, McMillan Park
DATES: 1907-1911
DESCRIPTION: The records for Olmsted Job No. 2840, McMillan Park, Washington, D.C., contain 42 plans and drawings dated 1907-1911, 1 file folder of planting lists dated 1907-1911, and 1 photograph album including 7 prints dated 1909.
REPOSITORY: Olmsted Archives, Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site, Brookline, MA

Note: The resources included in this appendix are selected based on relevance to the project and do not represent the entirety of the associated collection. Several resources related specifically to the reservoir, the land around the reservoir, the playground, and the filters located west of First Street have been reviewed but are not included in this report because they are outside the boundaries of the project area.

B-0: Inventory of Records for Olmsted Job #2840, McMillan Park, Washington, DC
B-1a Plan #64, Planting Plan for McMillan Park (June 7, 1910)
B-1b Planting List for Plan #64
B-2a: Plan #78, Planting Plan for McMillan Fountain (Nov. 29, 1911)
B-2B: Planting List for Plan #78
B-3: Plan #27C, Details of gutters and walks (March 27, 1908)
B-4: Plan #62, Treatment of McMillan Memorial (January 27, 1910)
B-5: Plan #42, Sketch of McMillan Fountain (May 18, 1909)
B-6: Plan #71, General Plan for McMillan Park (1911)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>May 22, 1908</td>
<td>McMillan Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>September 18, 1907</td>
<td>Topographical Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>October 28, 1907</td>
<td>Washington Aqueduct D.C. Filtration Plant General Plan - Showing Finished Surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>November 13, 1907</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan for North-End Entrances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>January 10, 1908</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan for Southeast Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>January 10, 1908</td>
<td>Alternative Preliminary Plan for Southeast Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>March 9, 1908</td>
<td>Southern Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>March 12, 1908</td>
<td>Study for Revised Preliminary Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>March 16, 1908</td>
<td>Cross Section to Accompany Plans No. 23 and 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>March 16, 1908</td>
<td>Profile to Accompany Plan No. 23 and 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>March 21, 1908</td>
<td>Grading Plan for Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>February 23, 1908</td>
<td>Planting Plan On and Near Filters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>April 1, 1908</td>
<td>Planting Near East Shaft Gate House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27c</td>
<td>March 27, 1908</td>
<td>Details for Walks and Gutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>March 31, 1908</td>
<td>Western Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>April 9, 1908</td>
<td>Northern Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>April 11, 1908</td>
<td>Northeastern Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>May 8, 1908</td>
<td>Grading Study for Northern Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>May 8, 1908</td>
<td>Grading Study for Western Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>June 18, 1908</td>
<td>Details for Shelter Sandcourts and Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>June 19, 1909</td>
<td>Grading Plan for Northern Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38*</td>
<td>June 19, 1909</td>
<td>Profile to Accompany Plan No. 37 and 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>June 24, 1908</td>
<td>Cross Section to Accompany Plan no. 46 and 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>September 9, 1908</td>
<td>Northeast Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42*</td>
<td>May 18, 1909</td>
<td>McMillan Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>June 8, 1909</td>
<td>Grading Plan for Vicinity of Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>June 8, 1909</td>
<td>Cross Section through Walks in Fountain Section to Accompany Plan 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>June 19, 1909</td>
<td>Grading Plan for Northern and Western Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>July 1, 2009</td>
<td>Grading Plan for Eastern Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>July 12, 1909</td>
<td>Profile to Accompany Plan No. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>June 20, 1909</td>
<td>Revised Grading Plan for Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>July 22, 1909</td>
<td>Grading Plan for North Portion Using 5th Street as a Park Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>December 23, 1909</td>
<td>Enlargement of Plan for Construction and Planting of Filter Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>January 27, 1910</td>
<td>Sketch for Treatment About Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64*</td>
<td>June 7, 1910</td>
<td>Planting Plan for Portion around Filter Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>March 17, 1910</td>
<td>Planting Plan for Southern Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>April 7, 1910</td>
<td>Planting Plan for Northern and Western Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>June 3, 1909</td>
<td>McMillan Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71*</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>April 28, 1911</td>
<td>Plan for Planting Around Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>July 12, 1911</td>
<td>Plan for Planting About Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78*</td>
<td>November 29, 1911</td>
<td>Revised Plan for Planting About Fountain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Included in report
*Not accessed
B-1a: Plan #64: Planting Plan for McMillan Park (June 7, 1910), F.L. Olmsted, Jr. (Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)
B-1a: Plan #64: Planting Plan (June 7, 1910), F.L. Olmsted, Jr.
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)
Detail showing plantings in service court and entrance (see planting list for Plan #64)
Note: First number indicates the type of plant (see planting list for Plan #64) and the second number indicates the estimated quantity of plants needed.
B-1a: Plan #64: Planting Plan (June 7, 1910), F.L. Olmsted, Jr.
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)
Details showing plantings proposed for corner stair at North Capitol and Channing Streets and perimeter plantings along First Street, NW
Note: First number indicates the type of plant (see planting list for Plan #64) and the second number indicates the estimated quantity of plants needed.
B-1b: Plan #64: Planting Plan (June 7, 1910), F.L. Olmsted, Jr.  
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)  
List to accompany planting plan (December 31st 1909)
B-1b: Plan #64: Planting Plan (June 7, 1910), F.L. Olmsted, Jr.  
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)  
Planting list to accompany planting plan (December 31st 1909)
B-1b: Plan #64: Planting Plan (June 7, 1910), F.L. Olmsted, Jr.  
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)  
Planting list to accompany planting plan (December 31st, 1909)
B-1b: Plan #64: Planting Plan (June 7, 1910), F.L. Olmsted, Jr.  
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)  
Planting list to accompany planting plan (December 31st 1909)
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)
B-2a: Plan #78: Planting Plan for McMillan Fountain (Nov. 29, 1911), F.L. Olmsted, Jr. (Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)

Detail of planting plan

Note: First number in planting bed indicates the type of plant, (see planting list for Plan #77/78) and the second number indicates the estimated quantity of plants needed.
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)  
Planting list to accompany planting plan
B-3: Plan #27C: Details of gutters and walks (March 27, 1908), F.L. Olmsted, Jr.  
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)
B-4: Plan #62: Treatment of McMillan Memorial (January 27, 1910), F.L. Olmsted, Jr. (Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)  
Detail showing section through stairs leading to fountain
B-5: Plan #42: Sketch of McMillan Fountain (May 18, 1909)
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)
(Olmsted Archives, Brookline, MA)  
Detail of sand filtration site
APPENDIX C:
Photographs from the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

SOURCE

REPOSITORY: Archives of the Washington Aqueduct, Dalecarlia Water Treatment Plant, Washington, DC
DESCRIPTION: The archives of the Washington Aqueduct contain photographs and other materials related to all properties within the Washington Aqueduct system, which is managed by the Baltimore District of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Note: The resources included in this appendix are selected based on relevance to the project and do not represent the entirety of the associated collection. Several resources related specifically to the reservoir, the land around the reservoir, the playground, and the filters located west of First Street have been reviewed but are not included in this report because they are outside the boundaries of the project area.

C-1: Concrete construction of filter beds, 1904
C-2: Concrete construction of filter bed, 1904
C-3: Concrete wall of filter beds, 1904
C-4: Centers for vaulting of filter beds, 1904
C-5: Construction of filter beds, 1904
C-6: On-site concrete mixing plant, 1902-1904
C-7: Form for column capital, 1902-1904
C-8: Form for entrance ramp to filter, 1902-1904
C-9: Door to filter bed, 1902-1904
C-10: Interior of filter bed, 1904
C-11: Looking east through Court 3, 1904
C-12: Interior of filtered-water reservoir, 1902-1904
C-13: Interior of filtered-water reservoir, 1902-1904
C-14: Panoramic view over filter beds, 1904
C-15: Looking north along First Street, c. 1910
C-16: McMillan Memorial, c. 1911
C-17: McMillan Memorial, 1942
C-18: View looking west on Court 3, c. 1928
C-19: Aerial view, 1930
C-20 Aerial view, 1930
C-21: Court 2, looking east from center, 1944
C-22: View of sand washing machine, c. 1944
C-23: View of sand washing machine, c. 1944
C-24: Tractor with filter rake, 1944
C-25: Tractor and filter rake, c. 1944
C-26: View of sand washing machine, c. 1944
C-27: Sand washing machine, c. 1944
C-28: Sand filter bed 14, 1944
C-29: Workmen scraping filter, c. 1937
C-30: Regulator House 5, 1944
C-31: Regulator House 1, 1944
C-32: Construction of 36-in rising main loop, 1946
C-33: Construction of 36-in rising main loop, 1946
C-34: Miscellaneous images of site, undated
C-35: View of Court 2, undated
C-36: McMillan Sand Filtration Site, late 20th c.
C-37: McMillan Sand Filtration Site, late 20th c.
C-38: Certificate of designation for McMillan Water Treatment Plant as an American Water Landmark.
C-1: Concrete construction of filter beds (June 4, 1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-2: Concrete construction of filter beds (July 2, 1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-3: Concrete wall of filter beds (June 4, 1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-4: Centers for vaulting of filter beds (June 4, 1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-5: Construction of filter beds, persons unknown (c. 1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-6: On-site concrete mixing plant for construction of McMillan filter plant (1902-1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-7: Form for column capital of groined arch structure (1902-1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-8: Form for entrance ramp to filter, looking northeast (1902-1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-9: Door to filter bed (1902-1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-10: Interior of filter bed (August 31, 1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-11: Looking east through Court 3 (1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-12: Interior view of north filtered-water reservoir (1902-1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-13: Interior view of north filtered-water reservoir (1902-1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-14: Panoramic view looking northeast over filter beds (c. 1904)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-15: Looking north along First Street (c. 1910)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-16: McMillan Memorial, east of First Street near intersection of Channing Street and First Street (c. 1911)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-17: McMillan Memorial (September 1, 1942), photo taken by Earl Francis Ketchum from 2411 First Street, N.W.
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-18: View looking west on Court 3 (c. 1928)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-19: Court 2, looking east from center (March 25, 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-20: Aerial view of McMillan Sand Filtration Site, looking northwest (June 2, 1930)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-21: Aerial view of McMillan Sand Filtration Site, looking west (June 2, 1930)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-22: View of sand washing machine (c. 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-23: View of sand washing machine as carried on dolly down filter entrance ramp (c. 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-24: Tractor with filter rake (c. 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-25: Tractor and filter rake pulverizing the filter sand surface and filter operation (c. 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-26: Transport of sand washing machine on dolly over metal channels (c. 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-27: Sand washing machine with helical screw conveyor, sand receiving hopper, and ejector throat holder (c. 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-28: Sand filter bed 14, showing contrast of dirty sand at surface and cleaner sand between (May 17, 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-29: Workmen scraping filter (c. 1937)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-30: Regulator House 5, looking northeast (March 25, 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-31: Regulator House 1, looking north (March 25, 1944)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-32: Construction of 36-in rising main loop, looking north on North Capitol Street from Court 2 (June 13, 1946)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-33: Construction of 36-in rising main loop, looking north on North Capitol Street from Court 2 (July 17, 1946)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-34: Miscellaneous images of sand filtration site (undated)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-35: View of Court 2, looking east from First Street, NW (undated)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-36: McMillan Sand Filtration Site, showing new hospital development to the north (late twentieth century)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct

C-37: McMillan Sand Filtration Site, showing new hospital development to the north (late twentieth century)
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
C-38: Certificate of designation for McMillan Water Treatment Plant as an American Water Landmark
Courtesy of the Archives of the Washington Aqueduct
APPENDIX D:
Photographs from the National Archives Records Administration

SOURCE
REPOSITORY: National Archives Records Administration, College Park, Maryland
DESCRIPTION: Photographs and plans related to the site were found in Record Groups 66 (Records of the Commission of Fine Arts) and 77 (Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers), within the Cartographic and Architecture Division, as well as in the Still Pictures Division. Aerial photographs were found in Record Group 18 (Records of the Army Air Force). Most materials related to the site have not yet been transferred to the National Archives from the Baltimore District of the Army Corps of Engineers (See Appendix C).

Note: The resources included in this appendix are selected based on relevance to the project and do not represent the entirety of the associated collection. Several resources related specifically to the reservoir, the land around the reservoir, the playground, and the filters located west of First Street have been reviewed but are not included in this report because they are outside the boundaries of the project area.

D-1: Aerial view of McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, 1921
D-2: Aerial view of McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, 1921
D-3: Aerial view of McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, 1921
D-4: McMillan Fountain, undated
D-5: McMillan Park on west side of First Street, showing bench, undated
D-6a: Blueprint showing transfer of land for Michigan Avenue, 1932
D-6b: Key to blueprint showing transfer of land for Michigan Avenue, 1932
D-1: View of McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, looking north, Bolling Field Photo, Negative 9907 A.S. (summer 1921)
RG 18AA, Box 153, No. 24
Courtesy of the National Archives Records Administration, Still Pictures Division
D-2: View of McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, looking north, Bolling Field Photo, Negative 9903 A.S. (summer 1921)
RG 18AA, Box 153, No. 21
Courtesy of the National Archives Records Administration, Still Pictures Division
D-3: North end of McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, looking northwest, Bolling Field Photo, Negative 9905 A.S. (summer 1921)

RG 18AA, Box 153, No. 22

Courtesy of the National Archives Records Administration, Still Pictures Division
D-4: McMillan Fountain (undated)
RG 66-G, Box 9
Courtesy of the National Archives Records Administration, Still Pictures Division

D-5: McMillan Park on west side of First Street, showing bench (undated)
RG 66-DC, Box 1
Courtesy of the National Archives Records Administration, Still Pictures Division
D-6a: Blueprint showing transfer of land for Michigan Avenue (1932)
RG 77-B
Courtesy of the National Archives Records Administration, Cartographic and Architectural Division
D-6b: Key to blueprint showing transfer of land for Michigan Avenue (1932)
RG 77-B
Courtesy of the National Archives Records Administration, Cartographic and Architectural Division
APPENDIX E:
Photographs from the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.

SOURCE
DESCRIPTION: Photographs and articles related to the site.

Note: The resources included in this appendix are selected based on relevance to the project and do not represent the entirety of the associated collection. Several resources related specifically to the reservoir, the land around the reservoir, the playground, and the filters located west of First Street have been reviewed but are not included in this report because they are outside the boundaries of the project area.

E-1: Movable ejector at work moving sand from filter, c. 1904
E-2: Stationary Washers, c. 1904
E-3: Movable ejector at work moving sand temporarily stored on top of filter, c. 1904
E-4: Looking northeast from McMillan Fountain across sand filtration site, c. 1909
E-5: McMillan Fountain, 1915
E-6: View of the McMillan Fountain, looking west from First Street, NW, 1934-1939
E-7: Service court, 1920-1925
E-8: Court 3, looking west from First Street, NW, 1949
E-9a: View of the base of the statue of the McMillan Fountain, stored at Fort Washington, 1993
E-9b: View of the base of the statue of the McMillan Fountain, stored at Fort Washington, 1993
E-1: Movable ejector at work moving sand from filter (c. 1904)
*Purification of the Washington Water Supply* (TD225.W3 A3 1909) (See Appendix A)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.

E-2: Stationary Washers (c. 1904)
*Purification of the Washington Water Supply* (TD225.W3 A3 1909) (See Appendix A)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.
E-3: Movable ejector at work moving sand temporarily stored on top of filter (c. 1904)
_Purification of the Washington Water Supply_ (TD225.W3 A3 1909) (See Appendix A)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.

E-4: Looking northeast from McMillan Fountain across sand filtration site (c. 1909)
_Purification of the Washington Water Supply_ (TD225.W3 A3 1909) (See Appendix A)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.
E-5: McMillan Fountain (1915)
Rambler Collection (0829-3)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.
E-6: Service court (1920-1925)
Fisher-Waltz Photograph Collection (FW 037)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.
E-7: View of the McMillan Fountain, looking west from First Street, NW (1934-1939)
(CHS 01251)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.
E-8: Court 3, looking west from First Street, NW (May 20, 1949)
Photo by John P. Wymer (WY1109.23)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.
E-9a: View of the base of the statue of the McMillan Fountain, stored at Fort Washington (1993)
Photograph by Jack D. Brewer (CHS 08834A)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.

E-9b: View of the base of the statue of the McMillan Fountain, stored at Fort Washington (1993)
Photograph by Jack D. Brewer (CHS 08834A)
Courtesy of the Historical Society of Washington, D.C.
APPENDIX F:
Photographs from the Washington Historical Image Collection

SOURCE
TITLE: Washington Historical Image Collection
DESCRIPTION: Includes photographs from the Evening Star newspaper, as well as donated material from several other sources.
REPOSITORY: Washingtoniana Division, Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library Washington, D.C.

Note: The resources included in this appendix are selected based on relevance to the project and do not represent the entirety of the associated collection. Several resources related specifically to the reservoir, the land around the reservoir, the playground, and the filters located west of First Street have been reviewed but are not included in this report because they are outside the boundaries of the project area.

F-1 Image of McMillan Fountain, 1918
F-2 McMillan Fountain, undated
F-3 View of McMillan Fountain in operation, undated
F-4 Aerial view of McMillan Sand Filtration Site, 1925
F-5 View of service court, c. 1938
F-6 Workmen cleaning sand in filtration beds, c. 1938
F-7a Closing of McMillan Park, 1941
F-7b Closing of McMillan Park Article, 1941
F-8 Moving of McMillan Fountain, c. 1941
F-1: Image of McMillan Fountain (1918)
Washington Evening Star
Courtesy of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library
F-2: McMillan Fountain (undated)
Courtesy of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library
F-3: View of McMillan Fountain in operation (undated)

Washington Evening Star, from June 17, 1949 article written after fountain had been moved off the site

Courtesy of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library
F-4: Aerial view of McMillan Sand Filtration Site (1925)
Swartzell Rheem and Hensey Collection
Courtesy of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library
F-5: View of service court (c. 1938)
Washington Evening Star from June 12, 1938 article
Courtesy of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library
F-6: Workmen cleaning sand in filtration beds (c.1938)
Washington Evening Star, from June 12, 1938 article
Courtesy of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library
F-7a: Closing of McMillan Park (1941)
Washington Evening Star from May 1, 1941 article
Courtesy of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library
Siren System to Guard District Water Supply

Sabotage sirens are being installed at all Washington water supply plants and a new 20-million-gallon reservoir will be constructed at the McMillan filter plant in line with the program of expanding and protecting the local water supply.

Deficiency appropriations by Congress already have provided for the fencing and patrolling of the Dalecarlia and McMillan distribution centers and the Washington conduit from Great Falls. Twenty-four-hour watches by civilian guards are now being maintained at these vital spots in the water supply. Hydro-electric facilities at the Georgetown distributing reservoir are now being converted so that in the event of a break in the single-line Great Falls conduit, water could be pumped throughout the city from the C. & O. Canal.

WILL USE CODE

The warning sirens—first of which is being installed at McMillan—are designed to call the guards to particular spots in the respective water works grounds. A code will be worked out that will signal the men to the location of any "trouble."

At the present there are 35 guards at McMillan working in three shifts. Other guards patrol the entire conduit, Dalecarlia, and the Georgetown Reservoir.

UNDERGROUND TANK

Present plans for the supplementary storage facilities at McMillan call for a huge underground tank beneath the present filter beds west of First-st nw. Altho requests for appropriations for the work are still before Congress in the 1942 budget, the Army Engineer Corps which controls the water supply here with the exception of the actual distribution of the filtered product, has already taken samples of the soil...
F-8: Moving of McMillan Fountain (c. 1941)
Washington Evening Star, from October 29, 1941 article
Courtesy of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Library
# APPENDIX G:
Historic Landmark Designation Decision

**SOURCE**

**TITLE:** Decision, Historic Preservation Review Board of the District of Columbia, McMillan Park Reservoir, Case No. 90-20, August 21, 1991

**DESCRIPTION:** The HPRB landmark decision for the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark, 1991, designating the property as an individual historic landmark in the DC Inventory of Historic Sites and recommending the property for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

**REPOSITORY:** Files, District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office
DECISION

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MCMILLAN PARK RESERVOIR

(Case No. 90-20)

The Historic Preservation Review Board, having held a hearing on May 15, 1991 on the application to designate McMillan Park Reservoir, located at First Street and Michigan Avenue, N. W. (Square 3125, Parcels 108/5, 108/6, 108/7, 108/8, Square 3128 A, Square 3128 H, excepting Bryant Street Pumping Station, Bryant Street Highway Department Garage, and Fire Alarm Headquarters of McMillen Drive), as an Historic Landmark with inclusion in the District of Columbia's Inventory of Historic Sites and to consider its eligibility for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places hereby designates McMillan Park Reservoir as an Historic Landmark with inclusion in the District of Columbia's Inventory of Historic Sites and recommends that the State Historic Preservation Officer nominate it to the National Register of Historic Places.

Background and General Characteristics.

The McMillan Reservoir occupies a 90 acre site at First Street and Michigan Avenue, N. W. (Square 3126, Lots 108/5, 108/6, 108/7, 108/8, Square 3128 A, Square 3128 H, excepting Bryant Street Pumping Station, Bryant Street Highway Department Garage, and Fire Alarm Headquarters on McMillen Drive). An architecturally cohesive plan, most of its buildings and structures date from 1901 to 1905, the only significant intrusion being the 1985 modern plant. The eastern portion was acquired by Congress at the turn of the century for $209,000. The area to the west of First Street was originally to have been a passive sedimentation reservoir, but lengthy Congressional debates in the 1890's determined the course of a slow sand filtration purification system.

The water for McMillan is supplied by the Potomac River at Great Falls, fourteen miles away, through the gravity fed aqueduct system designed by Montgomery Meigs in the 1850's. Before reaching the McMillan reservoir, the water passes through two sedimentation reservoirs at the Olmecarlia and Georgetown. After passing under Rock Creek at a depth of some 120 feet, the water flows under the East
Shaft Gatehouse at the McMillan reservoir. A pipe carries the water to the north end of the open reservoir basin. From there it was pumped twenty to thirty feet upwards to be distributed in the twenty-nine slow sand filtration beds where the water was cleansed. Regulator houses in the four courts contained sets of valves, manually operated, which controlled the flow of water through the underground beds and into the large clear water basin underground. Thence, the water went to the City owned Bryant Street pumping station adjacent to the reservoir site to the south. The huge sets of pumps in this large Beaux Arts style building (designed by Henry Brauns of Baltimore at the turn of the century) distributed the water to all parts of the city.

With its 29 slow sand filtration compartments of one acre each, and underground clear water reservoir constructed of unreinforced concrete, its four courts of sand bins, regulator houses and sand washers, the plant served the City until just five years ago as originally designed. It was probably the largest slow sand filtration system still operating in the country. Almost all of the original buildings are still in use on the Federal site between First Street and Fourth Street, N. W. The old filtration beds, sand bins, washers, and regulator houses remain a testimonial to the civil infrastructure of the city in both an engineering and architectural sense.

The reservoir site was included in the McMillan Plan as a key linkage between two natural networks of green open space extending from Rock Creek to Anacostia through the developing suburbs north of the Federal City. In 1906 it was designated as a memorial to Senator McMillan who had died suddenly four years earlier before the plan which bears his name could be implemented. As with the McMillan Plan itself, design of the reservoir park was a collaborative effort of men who had been participants in or had been associated with the design of the Great White City at the Chicago Columbian exposition of 1933. The team included Allen Hazen, engineer; Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., landscape architect; Charles Platt, architect; and Herbert Adams, sculptor. Olmsted designed a picturesque setting for the reservoir with a circuitous drive and walks with views over the water. The various engineering structures were landscaped in a more formal manner, complementing their industrial character. A monumental fountain was erected in memory of McMillan.
Reasons.

The McMillan Park Reservoir meets the criteria or possesses the quality of significance present in other properties included in the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites for the following reasons:

1. The McMillan Park Reservoir is a major element of the water system of the District of Columbia, an urban American engineering resource of great historic, cultural, landscape, planning, engineering and architectural significance. (Criterion 2)

2. It was the first water treatment facility in the City of Washington, and its operation resulted in the elimination of typhoid epidemics and reduced incidence of other diseases. (Criterion 2)

3. Construction of its slow sand water filtration system represented a triumph of the pure water advocates over those who advocated chemical treatment of water. (Criterion 2)

4. It supplied water to the U.S. Capitol as early as 1833, and to fire hydrants on Pennsylvania Avenue in 1837. (Criterion 3)

5. It is a major element of the McMillan Park System which envisioned a linkage of green open spaces from Rock Creek to Anacostia through the developing suburbs north of the Federal City. (Criterion 2)

6. It is the result of the collaboration of major figures in the City Beautiful movement who later contributed to the aesthetic and architectural development of Washington. (Criteria 2, 3, 4)

7. It is a memorial to Senator James McMillan who spearheaded development and implementation of the monumental McMillan Park Plan, completing and refining the 1794 Plan of the Federal City in the context of the 1893 City Beautiful aesthetic. (Criterion 1)

Further it possesses sufficient integrity to convey, represent or contain the values and qualities for which it is judged significant; and sufficient time has passed since it achieved significance or was constructed to permit professional evaluation of it in its historical context.
In addition, the Board believes that the McMillan Park Reservoir possesses the following characteristics which qualify it for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places:

1. The McMillan Park Reservoir is a major element of the water system of the National Capital, an urban American engineering resource of great historic, cultural, landscape, planning, engineering and architectural significance. (Criteria A, B, C)

2. It is a memorial to Senator James McMillan and a major element of the monumental McMillan Park Plan which transformed the urban fabric of the Nation's Capital in the early twentieth century. (Criteria B, C)

3. It is the result of a collaboration of major figures in the City Beautiful movement who later contributed to the aesthetic and architectural development of Washington. (Criterion C)

21 AUGUST 1991
DATE

James T. Speight
CHAIRMAN
HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
**APPENDIX H:**

*Quitclaim Deed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SOURCE</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE:</strong></td>
<td>Quitclaim Deed, September 25, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION:</strong></td>
<td>Deed for the transfer of 24.69 acres of the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant from the United States government to the District of Columbia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPOSITORY:</strong></td>
<td>Files, District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUITCLAIM DEED

STATE OF GEORGIA
COUNTY OF FULTON

THIS INDENTURE, made this 25th day of September, 1987, between the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, acting by and through the Administrator of General Services, under and pursuant to the powers and authority contained in the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, approved June 30, 1949 (P.L. 81-152), as amended (40 U.S.C. 484), and regulations and orders promulgated thereunder, Grantor, and the District of Columbia, Grantee.

WITNESSETH:

That the Grantor, for and in consideration of the sum of NINE MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND AND NO/100 DOLLARS ($9,300,000.00) cash in hand paid, and receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, has remised, released, and forever quitclaimed and by these presents does remise, release and forever quitclaim unto the Grantee, its successors and assigns, all right, title, interest, claim and demand which the said Grantor has or may have had in and to that certain tract or parcel of land lying and being situate in the District of Columbia, and being more particularly described as follows: Part of Parcel 108/8.
A certain parcel of land situate in Washington, District of Columbia, NW, being all of Tract Number 133 and a portion of Tract Numbers 134 and 135 known as the "McMillan Filter Plant" parcel of the Washington Aqueduct McMillan Reservoir and Filter Plant, owned by the United States of America, here-in-after referred to by the Tract Number, and more particularly bounded and described around the filter plant boundary line as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner common to Tract Number 133, at a point of intersection of the southerly line of Michigan Avenue with the westerly line of North Capitol Street, said point being further located South 48° 54' 36" West 86.24 feet, more or less, from the intersection of the centerline of Michigan Avenue with the centerline of North Capitol Street; thence, leaving the southerly line of Michigan Avenue, and with the westerly line of North Capitol Street and the line of Tract Number 133;

Due South; passing a corner common to Tract Number 133 and Tract Number 135 and formerly the north line of Frankfort Street at 284.49 feet; passing a corner common to Tract Number 135 and Tract Number 134 and formerly the south line of Frankfort Street at 374.49 feet; passing a corner common to Tract Number 134 and Tract Number 135 and formerly the north line of Emporia Street at 674.49 feet; passing another corner common to Tract Number 135 and Tract Number 134 and formerly the south line of Emporia Street at 764.49 feet; passing another corner common to Tract Number 134 and Tract Number 135 and formerly the north line of Douglas Street at 1064.49 feet; passing another corner common to Tract Number 135 and Tract Number 134 and formerly the south line of Douglas Street at 1154.49 feet, in all 1454.49 feet to a corner common to Tract Number 134, at a point of intersection of the westerly line of North Capitol Street.
with the north line of Channing Street, thence, leaving the westerly line of North Capitol Street, and with the north line of Channing Street and the line of Tract Number 134;

Due West 774.33 feet to another corner common to Tract Number 134, at a point of intersection of the north line of Channing Street, with the east line of First Street; thence, leaving the north line of Channing Street, and with the east line of First Street, continuing with the line of Tract Number 134;

Due North; passing a corner common to Tract Number 134 and Tract Number 135 and formerly the south line of Douglas Street at 300.00 feet; passing another corner common to Tract Number 135 and Tract Number 134 and formerly the north line of Douglas Street at 390.00 feet; passing another corner common to Tract Number 134 and Tract Number 135 and formerly the south line of Emporia Street at 690.00 feet; passing another corner common to Tract Number 135 and Tract Number 134 and formerly the north line of Emporia Street at 780.00 feet; passing another corner common to Tract Number 134 and Tract Number 135 and formerly the south line of Frankfort Street at 1080.00 feet; passing another corner common to Tract Number 135 and Tract Number 134 and formerly the north line of Frankfort Street at 1170.00 feet, in all 1323.01 feet to the northwest corner common to Tract Number 133, at a point of intersection of the east line of First Street, with the southerly line of Michigan Avenue; thence, leaving the east line of First Street, and with the southerly line of Michigan Avenue and the line of Tract Number 133;

North 80° 21' 47" East 785.41 feet to the place of beginning, containing 24.69 acres, more or less and except 4.80 acres of previously dedicated public rights-of-way.
The bearings and distances used herein are based on the Maryland Coordinate Grid System, 1927 N.A. Datum, as well as reflecting subdivision survey data depicted on sheet no. 8 of a map entitled "Washington Aqueduct Property Map McMillan Property", prepared by U.S. Engineer Office, Washington, D.C., Revised by C.P.H., October 1937.

It is the intent of the foregoing description to include all of the same land as that acquired by the United States of America by the following deeds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract No.</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Deed Dated</th>
<th>Liber</th>
<th>Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Joseph Paul &amp; Wife</td>
<td>18 Mar 1901</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, a portion of the same land as that acquired by the United States of America by the following instrument:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract No.</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Deed Dated</th>
<th>Liber</th>
<th>Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Joseph Paul &amp; Wife</td>
<td>29 Apr 1901</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>District of Columbia Streets Turned Over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT TO all existing easements or rights-of-way for public roads and highways, public utilities, railroads and pipelines as of May 8, 1987.

The Government of the District of Columbia hereby acknowledges and agrees that upon acceptance of conveyance of the property that no construction or disturbances of any kind will be allowed to take place prior to January 1988. Therefore, allowing the Washington Aqueduct Division to continue the maintenance and use of the property for the purpose of a water filter facility, to be used as needed, on a non-reimbursable basis.
The following are covenants running with the land at law as well as in equity, and are binding upon and inure to the benefit of the successors and assigns of the District of Columbia, and all present and future persons or entities owning or having an interest in said portion of the McMillan Reservoir, District of Columbia, or part thereof.

NON-DISCRIMINATION

The purchaser covenants for itself, its successors, and assigns and every successor in interest to the property hereby conveyed, or any part thereof, that the said purchaser and such heirs, successors and assigns shall not discriminate upon the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex in the use, occupancy, sale, or lease of the property, or in their employment practices conducted thereon. This covenant shall not apply, however, to the lease or rental of a room or rooms within a family dwelling unit; nor shall it apply with respect to religion to premises used primarily for religious purposes. The United States of America shall be deemed a beneficiary of this covenant without regard to whether it remains the owner of any land or interest therein in the locality of the property hereby conveyed and shall have sole right to enforce this covenant in any court of competent jurisdiction.

EXCESS PROFITS

This covenant shall run with the land for a period of 3 years from the date of conveyance. With respect to the property described in this deed, it shall at any time within a 3-year period...
from the date of transfer of title by the Grantor, the Grantee, or its successors or assigns, shall sell or enter into agreements to sell the property, either in a single transaction or in a series of transactions, it is covenanted and agreed that all proceeds received or to be received in excess of the Grantee's or a subsequent seller's actual allowable costs will be remitted to the Grantor. In the event of a sale of less than the entire property, actual allowable costs will be apportioned to the property based on a fair and reasonable determination by the Grantor.

(c) For purposes of this covenant, the Grantee's or a subsequent seller's allowable costs shall include the following:

(1) The purchase price of the real property;

(2) The direct costs actually incurred and paid for improvements which serve only the property, including road construction, storm and sanitary sewer construction, other public facilities or utility construction, building rehabilitation and demolition, landscaping, grading, and other site or public improvements;

(3) The direct costs actually incurred and paid for design and engineering services with respect to the improvements described in (a)(2) of this section; and

(4) The finance charges actually incurred and paid in conjunction with loans obtained to meet any of the allowable costs enumerated above.
(b) None of the allowable costs described in paragraph (a) of this section will be deductible if defrayed by Federal grants or if used as matching funds to secure Federal grants.

(c) In order to verify compliance with the terms and conditions of this covenant, the Grantee, or its successors or assigns, shall submit an annual report for each of the subsequent 3 years to the Grantor on the anniversary date of this deed. Each report will identify the property involved in this transaction and will contain such of the following items of information as are applicable at the time of submission:

1. A description of each portion of the property that has been resold;
2. The sale price of each such resold portion;
3. The identity of each purchaser;
4. The proposed land use; and
5. An enumeration of any allowable costs incurred and paid that would offset any realized profit.

If no resale has been made, the report shall so state.

(d) The Grantor may monitor the property and inspect records related thereto to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of this covenant and may take any actions which it deems reasonable and prudent to recover any excess profits realized through the resale of the property.

FAA CLAUSE

Based on coordination between the General Services Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) as recommended in House Report No. 95-1053, entitled "FAA
Park Service, 1983), by an engineering or architectural historian approved by the District of Columbia HPO and who meets, at minimum, the professional qualifications standards described in the "Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation."

The report will identify and evaluate historic resources in the Parcel in relation to the whole of McMillan Reservoir. The report will also describe and discuss the potential significance of any prehistoric and pre-reservoir historic resources, and those associated with the development of McMillan Reservoir as a municipal reservoir for the District of Columbia. If necessary to present a complete picture of the significance of the resources, the report will discuss them in relation to the whole of McMillan Reservoir.

If no part of the Parcel is found to be eligible, then the Grantee is relieved of further preservation responsibilities. If any part of the Parcel is found to be eligible, prior to the initiation of any work at the Parcel, the DC HPO will be consulted during the development of any and all plans and specifications for the renovation, rehabilitation, demolition, or new construction planned for the Parcel, and any and all final plans and specifications for work will be submitted to the District of Columbia HPO for review and approval prior to implementation. If the District of Columbia HPO does not agree with the preliminary or final plans and specifications for work at the Parcel, and the disagreement cannot be resolved, the
District of Columbia shall immediately request the comments of the Council in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.

Any and all rehabilitation and renovation work at the parcel will be undertaken in accordance with "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings" (standards).

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the same, together with all and singular the appurtenances thereunto belonging or in anywise appertaining, and all the estate, right, title, interest or claim whatsoever of the said Grantor, either in law or in equity.

The property hereby conveyed is presently under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, is available for disposal and its disposal has been heretofore authorized by the Administrator of General Services acting pursuant to the above referred to laws, regulations and orders.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA has caused these presents to be executed in its name and on its behalf the day and year first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Acting by and through
Administrator of General Services

WITNESSES:

BY:

PATRICIA E. BAILEY
Acting Director
Office of Real Estate Sales
General Services Administration
Region IV, Atlanta, Georgia

- 10 -
STATE OF GEORGIA 
COUNTY OF FULTON 

This day, before the undersigned, personally appeared PATRICIA E. BAILEY to me well known and known to be the person described in and who executed the foregoing instrument of conveyance on behalf of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and acknowledged that she, being thereto duly authorized as Acting Director, Office of Real Estate Sales, General Services Administration, Region 4, Atlanta, Georgia, executed the same for the purposes therein mentioned as the free act and deed of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and the Administrator of General Services.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed my official seal of office in Atlanta, Georgia, this the 25th day of September, 1987.

ELAINE H. MITCHELL
Notary Public, Georgia
My commission expires 1/11/91
D.C. STATUTE 45-602 REQUIREMENT FOR PERSONAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I, ELAINE H. MITCHELL, a Notary Public in and for the State of Georgia, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT PATRICIA E. BAILEY, party to a certain Deed bearing date on the 25th day of September, 1987, and hereinafter annexed personally appeared before me in said County of Fulton. THE SAID PATRICIA E. BAILEY, being personally well known to me as the person who executed the said Deed and acknowledged the same to be her act and deed on behalf of the United States of America.

Given under my hand and seal this 2nd day of October A.D., 1987.

Elaine H. Mitchell
NOTARY PUBLIC
My Commission expires 1/11/91
Determination of 'No Hazard' for Structures Near Airports, it has been determined that the only public airport within six nautical air miles of this property is the Washington National Airport. FAA has been apprised of the proposed disposal of the property, and that the Government's conveyance document (this document) will contain a provision that the Grantee, its successors and assigns and every successor in interest to the property herein described, or any part thereof, must prohibit any construction or alteration on the property unless a determination of no hazard to air navigation is issued by FAA in accordance with 14 CFR Part 77. "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace," or under the authority of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

An Historic Resources Report for the 19.89 acre parcel of McMillan Reservoir (hereafter "Parcel") that includes an inventory of resources considered to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places will be undertaken by the District of Columbia. This report will be prepared in consultation with, and submitted to, the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Officer (HPO) for review and comment prior to the initiation of any work at the Parcel. The District of Columbia HPO and the Council shall have 30 working days to review the report.

The Historic Resources Report will be prepared in accordance with the "Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation" (National...
APPENDIX I:
Evaluation of Relative Level of Significance and Integrity for Each Resource Type

The following table presents the evaluation of the Relative Level of Significance (RLS) and Integrity for each resource type that is identified at the McMillan Site and described in Chapter 1 of this report in the following order:

**BUILT RESOURCES**
- Service Courts
- Service Court Walls
- Regulator Houses
- Sand Storage Bins
- Stationary Sand Washers
- Filter Beds
- Filter Bed Portals
- Filter Bed Ramps
- Filter Bed Sand
- Manholes and Manhole Covers
- Perimeter Pedestrian Path
- Corner Stairs
- Service Ramps and Stairs
- Tunnel

**LANDSCAPE RESOURCES**
- Perimeter Plantings
- Service Court Plantings

**SITE RESOURCES**
- Site Boundaries
- Site Plan and Spatial Organization
- Topography
- Internal Views
- External Views

As presented in Chapters 2 and 3 of this report, the RLS and integrity were evaluated using the following methods.
METHODS

RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

Relative Level of Significance (RLS) of individual resources has been developed as a preservation-planning tool to assess the relative importance of resource types, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The RLS ranks each resource based on its contribution to the historic significance of the landmark as a whole.

The first step in evaluating the RLS of the resources within the McMillan Site is an understanding of the significance of the McMillan Site within the context of the entire McMillan Park Reservoir Landmark. Based on the evaluation of the McMillan Site provided in Chapter 1, the following principles were accepted:

- The McMillan Site is understood as a distinct component of the McMillan Park Reservoir Landmark and the relative level of significance of the individual resources within the McMillan Site should be evaluated for the resource’s role in conveying this distinction;
- The McMillan Site is significant for the same reasons that the Landmark was judged to be significant; thus the relative level of significance of the individual resources within the McMillan Site should be evaluated based on the same criteria.

Using these principles, each of the resource types identified in the Resource Inventory in Chapter 3 was evaluated for its contribution to the significance of the McMillan Site based on the following criteria:

- **CRITERION A**: Association with the History of Water Purification
- **CRITERION B**: Association with Senator James McMillan
- **CRITERION C**: Distinctive Design and Construction as a Public Works Facility and Public Park

The following considerations were then made to determine the RLS of each resource type under each of the above criterion:

- **CRITERION A**:
  - How does/did the resource convey the operations of a slow sand filtration plant?
  - How does/did the resource convey the role of a slow sand filtration plant within the water purification system of the City of Washington?
  - How does/did the resource convey the original operational scale of this slow sand filtration plant?
  - How does/did the resource convey the story of the Site’s construction as a distinct component of the first water treatment facility for the City of Washington?
  - How does/did the resource convey the importance of water purification to the City of Washington?

- **CRITERION B**:
  - How does/did the resource convey the Site’s association as a distinct component of the first water treatment facility within the larger District of Columbia park system that is associated with the leadership of Senator James McMillan?
  - How does/did the resource convey the experience of the Site as a distinct component of McMillan Park and as a memorial to Senator James McMillan.

- **CRITERION C**:
  - How does/did the resource convey the original construction methods of this slow sand filtration plant?
How does/did the resource contribute to the Site’s distinctive architectural character and aesthetic and its role as a distinct component of the first water treatment facility for the City of Washington?

How does/did the resource convey Olmsted’s design intentions for the Site’s original landscape plan as a distinct component of McMillan Park?

Using these considerations, each resource was then ranked on a scale of 0 to 3 for its contribution to the significance of the McMillan Site under each of the evaluation criterion, with 3 corresponding to the greatest level of contribution. Based on the sum of the rankings for each criterion, the resource type was then assigned an RLS as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>SUM OF RANKINGS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>The resource is of the highest level of contribution to the historic significance of the McMillan Site and is essential to understanding the most significant aspects of the McMillan's Site's history and historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>The resource is moderately important to conveying the significant aspects of the McMillan’s Site’s history and historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>The resource is minimally important to conveying the significant aspects of the McMillan’s Site’s history and historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CONTRIBUTING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The resource does not contribute to the historic significance or historic character of the McMillan Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HISTORIC INTEGRITY**

The integrity of each resource type was evaluated based on a comparison of historic documentation (plans, drawings, photographs, and narrative descriptions) with on-site investigations of existing conditions. Because this integrity evaluation was completed for the purposes of developing recommendations for the proposal that will be part of a PUD Stage 1 Submission, the integrity was evaluated for each resource type listed in the Resource Inventory (see Chapter X) rather than for individual resources. Therefore, the integrity does not necessarily reflect details of the physical condition of each resource; rather, the integrity evaluation conveys whether each resource type is extant and appears to be consistent with the original location and design that is reflected in historic documentation. Structural integrity was not evaluated as part of this study. Based on this evaluation, each resource type was assigned one of the following levels of integrity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>All resources within the resource type are extant, in their original locations, and appear to be visually consistent with the historic character of the resource as seen in historic documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>All resources within the resource type are extant and in their original locations, but the general physical condition of the resource type does not fully convey the original character of the resource type as seen in historic documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not all resources within the resource type are extant and/or the general physical condition of the resource type has diminished its overall integrity so that its historic character is not fully legible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Integrity</td>
<td>The resource is no longer extant and retains no material integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUILT RESOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Courts</td>
<td>Two paved service courts span the width of the Site in an east-west direction. The courts are depressed five feet below the grade of the adjacent plains and are bordered to the north and south by concrete parapet walls that are integrated into the structure of the subterranean filter beds. The courts are accessed by stairs and ramps that lead from the streets and from the tops of the filter beds. The service courts are occupied by a majority of the built resources on the site and accommodated most of the human activity within the operation of the facility.</td>
<td>• A: The paved surfaces of the service courts contribute to the understanding the operations of the sand filtration plant by distinguishing areas of human activity within the facility.</td>
<td>Both service courts are extant and in their original locations. The paved surfaces are overgrown with weeds and show previous concrete patches and repairs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Court Walls</td>
<td>Concrete walls bound the north and south sides of both service courts. These walls are the parapet walls of the subterranean filter bed structures and also function as retaining walls to the fill that was placed on the roofs of the filter beds. The walls have a simple, unadorned concrete cornice but feature no other architectural detailing. Ramps and stairs penetrate the wall at several locations in both service courts to provide access from the courts to the tops of the filter beds. Three areas of concrete in-fill are located where original ramps were previously demolished.</td>
<td>• A: The walls contribute to the understanding of the operations of the filtration plant by distinguishing areas of human activity within the facility.</td>
<td>The service court walls are extant and in their original locations. The concrete is in various states of deterioration, including cracking and spalling of the concrete.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE TYPE</td>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td>INTEGRITY</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>RLS</td>
<td>INTEGRITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Regulator Houses  | The Site features four regulator houses, with two located in each service court. These one-story masonry buildings are constructed of red brick coursed in Flemish bond and feature terra cotta tile roofs. The houses are detailed with arched entrances and window openings featuring wood doors and windows. The structures of the regulator houses extend below grade with concrete pits and original mechanical systems. These systems were originally used to regulate the speed of pumps and to maintain the desired water level within the adjacent filter beds. | • A: The number and spacing of the regulator houses is key to conveying the scale of the facility, and the relationship between its above-ground and below-ground elements is key to understanding the role of these structures within the operation of the facility.  
• B: The Regulator Houses were a focal point of a pedestrian’s view of the site and key to the experience of McMillan Park.  
• C: The design of the regulator houses is key to conveying the site’s historic character, and the detailing, construction methods, and materials of these buildings conveys the intention to integrate this facility into the architectural fabric of the surrounding city. | All four brick structures are extant and in their original locations. Some original wood elements are extant and show various signs of deterioration. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9     | Key | High     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sand Bins     | The site features twenty cylindrical concrete sand bins that were originally used to store clean sand. Clean sand was transported from the adjacent sand washers and stored before being replaced into the filter beds. There is one sand bin for each filter bed. The bins are constructed of reinforced concrete, and the base of each bin is pierced by an arched opening through which clean sand was collected. The foundations of the sand bins extend approximately ten feet below grade. Each bin features original appurtenances that aided in the collection and ejection of clean sand. Each sand bin also has a ladder leading to the top of the structure. | • A: The number and spacing of the sand bins is key to conveying the scale of the facility and has a direct correlation with the number of filter beds. The sand bins are also key to understanding the process of washing sand as part of the operation of the facility.  
• B: The sand bins were a key part of the public experience of McMillan Park as a focal point of the view from the pedestrian path.  
• C: The sand bins are one of the site’s most identifiable resources and are key to defining the unique utilitarian character of the site and structural rhythm of the service courts. | All original sand bins are extant and in their original locations. Some of the ladders and other appurtenances have been removed or have deteriorated. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | Key | High |
| Sand Washers  | The site features twelve stationary sand washers located in the two service courts. The sand washers are generally aligned with the sand bins and regulator houses with the exception of the westernmost washer in the north court. These concrete structures have a unique shape that is generally defined by an upside-down pyramid set within an open concrete box frame. The extant sand washers were installed in 1910, at which time the original sand washers were removed. | • A: The sand washers convey an important aspect of the operation of the facility and the importance of clean sand to the water purification process.  
• B: The sand washers are not as visible from the pedestrian path as other resources within the service courts but played a secondary role in the public experience of McMillan Park.  
• C: The sand washers are an important part of the site’s utilitarian character. | All of the 1910 sand washers are extant and in their original locations. Some of their appurtenances have been removed or have deteriorated. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | Supporting | High |
The site features twenty un-reinforced concrete filter beds, each of which is approximately one acre in area. All of the filter beds are concealed beneath a layer of fill and appear from above-grade as flat plains of grass. Each filter bed is independent of the other filter beds and has its own entrance that opens into the service courts. The floors of the filter beds are inverted, groined arches that carry piers with a slight batter near the bottom. The roof consists of elliptical groined arches that are pierced with manholes. The walls of the beds are built in sections not exceeding 30 feet in length, the joints being tongued and grooved. The filter beds have substantial parapet walls along the perimeter that act as retaining walls along the north and south sides of the service courts. For the facility to operate properly, substantial re-grading of the site was completed to allow the filter beds to be level, resulting in a maximum depth of cut of 35 feet and a maximum height of fill of 30 feet. The filter beds are enclosed and independent structures and can only be experienced one at a time.

Several of the filter beds that were constructed on fill settled substantially within the first few years of the facility's operation. This rapid settlement led to chronic structural issues that have resulted in partial collapse of sections of filter bed roofs. According to a 2001 structural assessment, approximately eight of the twenty filter beds exhibit severe structural deterioration. Other filter beds show varying degrees of cracking and material deterioration but were said to be stable at the time of the assessment. Several types of previous structural reinforcements are visible within some of the filter beds.
Filter Bed Portals

The site features twenty portals that lead to each of the twenty subterranean filter beds. The portals are integrated into the parapet walls of the filter beds that line the north and south sides of the service courts. The portals are constructed of brick and parged in concrete, featuring a dentilulated concrete cornice. Each portal has an arched opening fitted with a double-leaf wood door with iron hardware.

- A: The number and spacing of the sand bins is key to conveying the scale of the facility and play an important role as the above-grade representation of the quantity and locations of each of the subterranean filter beds.
- B: The portals are not as visible from the pedestrian path as other resources within the service courts but played a secondary role in the public experience of McMillan Park.
- C: The portals exhibit architectural details that indicate that they were intended to be a key part of the overall aesthetic of the site.

All of the original filter bed portals are extant and in their original locations. Many of the original wood doors are extant and intact, with other doors missing or showing various degrees of deterioration.

Filter Bed Ramps

The site features twenty ramps that lead from each of the portals to the subterranean filter beds. These ramps were typical for this type of facility for facilitating the movement of sand in and out of the filter beds. However, at McMillan, a different system of moving sand was developed, and the ramps were constructed primarily as an alternate access point in the case that the sand-handling apparatus failed to perform. The ramps were designed at an incline that accommodates horses, which would have been used to bring wagons into the filter beds to move the sand.

- A: The ramps were a secondary part of the operations of the facility by showing the need to provide an alternate means of access to the filter beds.
- B: These ramps did not contribute to the public experience of McMillan Park.
- C: These ramps do not play a major role in conveying the aesthetic of the site but are part of the unique construction of the subterranean filter beds and their various parts.

All filter bed ramps are extant and in their original locations, with some signs of material and structural deterioration.
Filter Bed Sand

The site features a deep layer of sand at the floor of each of the filter beds. An early description of the construction and operation of the sand filtration plant stated that “the sand is, in a way, the most important part of the filters.” The sand in the filter beds was furnished from a bank at Laurel, Maryland on the main line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and went through an extensive preparation process to meet specifications for cleanliness, removing all traces of clay and other undesired particles. The average depth of sand in the filter beds was kept at approximately 38 inches. The resources that are located in the service courts of the facility were used for the sole purpose of cleaning and storing this sand throughout the operation of the filtration plant.

- A: The sand is a key aspect of understanding the operation of the facility and conveying the history of the national debate between slow sand filtration advocates and those in favor of using coagulants.
- B: The sand was not part of the public experience of McMillan Park.
- C: The sand is an important characteristic of the filter beds, covering the floor vaults of the filter beds since the plant started its operation in 1905.

Manholes

The site features approximately 2,100 manholes spaced evenly across the three sections of open space. These manholes lead to the subterranean filter beds and were used for two purposes: (1) to drop clean sand back into the filter beds; and (2) to provide natural light and fresh air to workers in the filter beds. During operation of the facility, between three and four acres of manholes would be open at any given time during cleaning of the sand in the filter beds below. The concrete manholes are an integral part of the subterranean filter bed structures and are marked above grade by iron covers, most of which are severely deteriorated or no longer extant.

- A: The manholes are important to understanding the operation of the facility and the process of replacing sand within the filter beds.
- B: The expanses of manholes were a secondary aspect of the public experience of McMillan Park and were the primary reason why pedestrians were intended to be confined to the perimeter path.
- C: Although secondary to the more prominent built resources, the expanses of evenly spaced manholes are important part of the utilitarian character of the Site.

All of the original manhole structures are intact, except those in the area of the collapsed filter bed in the southwest section of the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Perimeter Pedestrian Path | The Site features a narrow pedestrian path around the perimeter of the top of the filter beds. Once the Site was dedicated as McMillan Park and Olmsted was retained to design its landscape, Olmsted activated the perimeter of this section of the complex with this pedestrian path, providing a place where visitors could stroll and admire the views across the plains of open space. The east, west, and south legs of the path run in straight lines parallel to the adjacent streets. The north leg is curvilinear to reflect the more picturesque qualities that once defined the character of the land on the other side of Michigan Avenue. Olmsted focused on the enhancement of the pedestrian path in his planting plan, which further emphasized the perimeter of the site. | • A: The pedestrian path was constructed subsequently to the filtration plant and do not contribute to the understanding of the history of water purification.  
• C: The pedestrian path was the primary feature of the perimeter park on the Site and is key to conveying how the Site was incorporated into the idea for McMillan Park.  
• C: The pedestrian path and the intention of confining pedestrians to the perimeter is key to understanding Olmsted's landscape design for the Site. | Supporting | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6     | Low   |           |
| Corner Stairs        | The Site originally featured four sets of stairs at each of its four corners. These stairs were designed by Olmsted to be the primary access points for the public use of the site, directly connecting to the perimeter pedestrian path. The stairs at the southwest and southeast corners led up from the public sidewalk to the pedestrian path at the top of the filter beds, approximately 16 feet above First Street. The stairs at the northeast and northwest corners led down from the public sidewalk to the pedestrian path at the tops of the filter beds, which was approximately 12 feet below Michigan Avenue. These stairs were intended solely for the purpose of providing access to the perimeter pedestrian park and were not part of the operation of the slow sand filtration plant. | • A. These stairs were designed subsequently to the filtration plant and do not contribute to the understanding of the history of water purification.  
• B: The corner stairs were the primary points of access for users of the perimeter park and were a key aspect of the public experience of the Site.  
• C: The corner stairs were a key component of Olmsted’s landscape design and the intention to provide a public entrance separate from the service entrances that already existed. | Supporting | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6     | Low   |           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Ramps and Stairs</td>
<td>The site features several utilitarian concrete ramps and concrete stairs along the service courts. These ramps and stairs provide access from the courts to the tops of the filter beds (19), from the courts to the adjacent streets (3), and from the courts to the perimeter path (4). Two sets of concrete stairs lead from First Street to the tops of the filter beds adjacent to the north service court. These stairs and ramps were used as part of the operation of the facility as workers moved throughout the site, and many of these stairs and ramps are integral to the structure of the service court walls.</td>
<td>• A: These ramps and stairs convey how workers moved around the site during operation of the facility but are not key to understanding the water purification process. • B: Although these ramps and stairs were used by workers and separate from the stairs provided for the public, they were a minor part of the public experience of McMillan Park. • C: The service ramps and stairs play a minor role in conveying the architectural character of the site but provide an understanding of the intention to provide numerous points of access to the service courts to allow workers to negotiate the topography of the site.</td>
<td>Three original concrete ramps leading from the service courts to the tops of the filter beds were previously demolished and their locations in the service court wall were in-filled. The remaining ramps and stairs are mostly intact, with varying degrees of concrete deterioration and possible structural deterioration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel</td>
<td>A single tunnel connects the northern service court of the McMillan Site to the service court of the section of the filtration plant west of First Street. The design of the tunnel is consistent with the architectural detailing of the filter bed portals, with a denticulated cornice and flat-arched opening. Although there are most likely pipes and other subterranean connections between the west and east sides of the filtration plant, this tunnel is the only visible connection.</td>
<td>• A: The tunnel is important to the understanding that the two sides of the filtration plant were part of one facility. • B: The tunnel was a secondary part of the public experience of McMillan Park. • C: The tunnel is not a prominent feature but was designed to mimic the architecture of the filter bed portals and to be integrated into the overall aesthetic of the site.</td>
<td>The tunnel is intact but is overgrown with vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE TYPE</td>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td>INTEGRITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Service Court       | The site historically featured plantings within and bordering the service courts. Olmsted specified two east-west rows of evenly spaced cork trees to be planted within each of the service courts, ivy along the tops of the sand bins, and small groupings of shrubs to be planted along the upper part of the parapet wall marking the locations of each of the ramps, stairs, and portals. For the parapet plantings, Olmsted chose species that were to be low to the ground and planted closely together. Olmsted also specified a few instances of taller tree species, but it appears from historic photographs that these species were not planted. | • A: The service court plantings do not contribute to the understanding of the history of water purification.  
• B: The service court plantings were a secondary part of the visitor’s experience of McMillan Park but are important to conveying Olmsted’s intention to soften the utilitarian character of the site as part of its transformation into a public park.  
• C: The service court plantings are important to understanding Olmsted’s intention to make the “park features of McMillan Park are clearly secondary to its water-works features” while still providing a designed landscape for the site. | The service courts are overgrown, and Olmsted’s original planting plan for the service courts is no longer legible and the majority of plants are lost. | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4     | Supporting  | n/a       |
| Perimeter Plantings | The site historically featured rows of plantings that flanked the perimeter pedestrian path in tightly spaced rows. Olmsted specified the cockspur thorn (Hawthorne trees) and small thorny hedges for these perimeter plantings to create a passive barrier and confine pedestrians to the path. | • A: The perimeter plantings do not contribute to the understanding of the history of water purification.  
• B: The perimeter plantings confined public visitors to the perimeter path and were a key aspect of a visitor’s experience of the park.  
• C: Olmsted’s enhancement of the site’s perimeter to create a perimeter pedestrian park was a key aspect of his overall landscape design. | Although remnants of these trees still exist in the form of scattered stumps, this resource is no longer materially intact. | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6     | Supporting  | n/a       |
## SITE RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Site Boundaries       | The boundaries of the Site are defined by: First Street to the west, North Capitol Street to the east, Channing Street to the south, and Michigan Avenue to the north. These streets existed before the facility's construction, and the arrangement of the filter beds was dictated by the trapezoidal footprint created by these boundaries. Although bounded by city streets, the Site spans approximately five blocks north-to-south and does not continue the city street grid within its footprint. | • A. The boundaries convey the context in which the location for the filtration plant was chosen.  
• B: The boundaries of the Site were an important part of the historic experience of McMillan Park by making the Site distinct and special place within the Bloomingdale neighborhood.  
• C: The boundaries of the Site create a distinct footprint that dictated the design and arrangement of the filter beds. | The McMillan Site retains its original boundaries. | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | Supporting | High |
| Spatial Organization  | In aerial views, the Site has a tripartite organization created by two paved service courts that run east-to-west and divide the Site into three horizontal sections of open space. From the ground level, this tripartite organization is expressed through the linear arrangement of built resources within the service courts that rise above the horizontal plane of the adjacent open spaces. Olmsted's landscape plan reinforced this tripartite organization by focusing new plantings around the Site's perimeter and within the service courts. The spatial organization of built resources and open space on the McMillan Site is distinct from that of adjacent areas, with dense urban residential development to the south and east, the city reservoir to the west, and the complex of large hospital buildings to the north. | • A: The spatial organization of the built resources and open space conveys their operational relationships as components of the sand filtration process.  
• B: The organization of the built resources and open space on the Site is legible from the ground and was a key aspect of the public experience of McMillan Park.  
• C: The Site's spatial organization distinguishes it from adjacent and was used by Olmsted as the framework for the Site's landscape plan. | The McMillan Site retains its original spatial organization of built resources and open spaces. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | Key | High |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>RLS</th>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>The Site’s original topography was changed by a major cut and fill operation during the original construction of the facility to create a level grade for the concrete filter beds. Once the filter beds were constructed, approximately two feet of additional fill was placed on their roofs, allowing the flat surface of the filter beds to read as a topographical feature rather than a built structure. The re-grading was confined within the boundaries of the Site, resulting in a flat plateau that is raised approximately 16 feet from Channing Street to the south and depressed approximately 12 feet from Michigan Avenue to the north. There is also a drop in grade at each of the two service courts, which are depressed by approximately 5 feet into the plateau. Further, at the location of each of the filter bed portals, mounds in the plateau correspond with the subterranean path of the ramps that lead from the service courts.</td>
<td>• A: The topography is significant to conveying the importance of providing a level surface for the operation of the filter beds. • B: The topography was a key component to the experience of McMillan Park, lifting park visitors above the surrounding land, creating a level perimeter path on which to stroll, and providing clear views within and from the Site. • C: The Site’s artificial topography distinguishes it from the adjacent areas and conveys the design of the subterranean filter beds.</td>
<td>The McMillan site retains its artificial topography.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Views</td>
<td>When the facility was first constructed, expansive view sheds existed within the Site, from one side of the filtration plant to the other. Olmsted’s landscape design specifically mentions these view sheds and his intention not to “cut off...the interesting and remarkable effect of the filter bed plain.” To feature these views as part of the park experience, Olmsted designed a “double row of small growing trees...beneath the foliage of which the view could pass and between which a border path could be provided whence the plain could be overlooked.”</td>
<td>• A: The internal views do not convey the significance of the Site’s role in the history of water purification. • B: The internal views were intended as a key aspect of the experience of McMillan Park. • C: The internal views are key to understanding the design of the Site’s built and landscape resources and were featured in Olmsted’s landscape plan.</td>
<td>The internal views are intact.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE TYPE</td>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td>INTEGRITY</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>RLS</td>
<td>INTEGRITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| External Views| The location for the slow sand filtration plant was chosen because of its adjacency to the Washington City Reservoir and because of its central location in the city. Because of this centrality, the Site is surrounded by several landmarks, which are visible outside its boundaries, including the Washington Monument, Howard University, the United States Soldiers’ Home (USSH), Glenwood Cemetery, Trinity University, and the adjacent McMillan Reservoir. Some of these views are made possible because of the artificial flat topography of the site. The original northward view to USSH (now AFRH-W) from the Site has been partially obscured by the development of the hospital complex to the north. | • A: These external views convey the context in which the location for the filtration plant was chosen.  
• B: These external views were an important part of the public experience of McMillan Park as pedestrians strolled along the perimeter path.  
• C: These external views do not contribute to the understanding of the Site’s unique design and construction. | Many of the historic external views to major landmarks are still intact. The construction of the hospital complex to the north has impacted the view to AFRH-W, but the tower of the Ford Building at AFRH-W is still visible in an axial view from the pedestrian path. | 1  | 2  | 0  | 3     | Minor | Moderate |
APPENDIX J:
TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES

The following table presents treatment guidelines for each resource type identified in the Resource Inventory in Chapter 1 of this report in the following order:

**BUILT RESOURCES**
- Service Courts
- Service Court Walls
- Regulator Houses
- Sand Storage Bins
- Stationary Sand Washers
- Filter Beds
- Filter Bed Portals
- Filter Bed Ramps
- Filter Bed Sand
- Manholes and Manhole Covers
- Perimeter Pedestrian Path
- Corner Stairs
- Service Ramps and Stairs
- Tunnel

**LANDSCAPE RESOURCES**
- Perimeter Plantings
- Service Court Plantings

**SITE RESOURCES**
- Site Boundaries
- Site Plan and Spatial Organization
- Topography
- Internal Views
- External Views

As presented in Chapter 4 of this report, the treatment approach guidelines were created using the following methods.
METHODS

A range of treatment approaches is provided for each individual resource type that is listed in the Resource Inventory in Chapter 1 of this report. The Quitclaim Deed that transferred ownership of the McMillan Site from the United States to the District of Columbia addresses the protection of the site. The deed states that any work proposed to take place on the McMillan Park Reservoir Historic Landmark must be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation of the McMillan Site may include a variety of treatment approaches for its individual resources. Therefore, the range of treatment approaches proposed in this report for each resource type is based on the four treatment approaches provided in the Standards: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. These approaches are defined as follows:

- **PRESERVATION:** The act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement, new construction, or exterior additions.

- **REHABILITATION:** The act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

- **RESTORATION:** The act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

- **RECONSTRUCTION:** The act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>PRESERVATION</th>
<th>RESTORATION</th>
<th>RECONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>REHABILITATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Courts</td>
<td>● Both service courts would be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation. ● Previously demolished ramps would not be reconstructed. ● Repairs should be limited to those necessary to replace areas of missing paving or to prevent further deterioration of existing paving. ● All existing drainage and other appurtenances should be retained.</td>
<td>● Both service courts would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration. ● Drainage or other appurtenances not original to the facility should be removed.</td>
<td>● N/A (The resource is extant.)</td>
<td>● The service courts would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation. ● Both service courts would be retained in place. ● The service courts would remain paved, but the paving could be repaired, altered, or replaced as necessary to accommodate new uses, such as vehicular and pedestrian circulation. ● Secondary resources such as drains and other mechanical elements could be removed selectively. ● To ensure the retention of the integrity of the architectural character and rhythm of the service courts, new construction of within the service courts should be avoided. ● The service courts could be widened if it is determined that moving of the portals is possible. If the service courts are widened, the portals must be retained and moved in accordance with the guidelines outlined for that resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE TYPE</td>
<td>PRESERVATION</td>
<td>RESTORATION</td>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>REHABILITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Service Court Walls    | • The existing service court walls would be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• Repairs necessary for stabilization or long-term preservation of the concrete would be completed as appropriate. | • The existing service court walls would be restored in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
• The areas of concrete infill would be removed, and the original ramps would be reconstructed in those locations. | • N/A (The resource is extant.) | • The service court walls would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• Sufficient spans of wall should be retained to convey the original boundaries of the service courts.  
• Retention of wall should be focused on those sections in the best condition and those sections associated with other retained resources, such as stairs and ramps. |
| Regulator Houses       | • Each of the four regulator houses would be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• All existing interior and exterior, above-ground and below-ground architectural and mechanical features would be retained for interpretation.  
• Where doors and windows are missing or deteriorated beyond repair, they would be replicated to allow the building to be protected from the elements.  
• Limited mechanical and electrical upgrades could be installed in a sensitive manner to make the building inhabitable and ensure its preservation.  
• No additions or major alterations to the interiors or exteriors of the structures would be appropriate. | • All four regulator houses would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
• The existing interior mechanical systems would be preserved in place, and missing appurtenances would be replicated using archived drawings. | • N/A (The resource is extant.) | • The regulator houses would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• Each of the four regulator houses should be retained in place.  
• At least one of the regulator houses should be preserved or restored.  
• A conditions assessment should be conducted to select which regulator house(s) would be most appropriate for restoration or preservation.  
• For the regulator houses not slated for restoration or preservation, the exterior architectural features should be retained and repaired as necessary. The interiors of the buildings can be rehabilitated to accommodate new uses. If possible, the subterranean mechanical equipment should be kept in place as an artifact but does not have to be visible.  
• There should be no additions or major exterior alterations to the regulator houses. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sand Bins** | • All twenty sand bins would be preserved in place, including their appurtenances, in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• Missing ladders or other appurtenances would not be replaced.  
• No additions or major alterations to the sand bins would be appropriate. |
| **Preservation** | • All twenty sand bins would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
• All missing or severely deteriorated appurtenances, ladders, and other features would be replicated using archived drawings and historic photographs.  
• A study would be conducted to determine if certain features (rooms constructed within some of the sand bins, windows, etc.) are original to the facility. If they are determined to be non-original, they would be removed. |
| **Restoration** | • N/A (The resource is extant.) |
| **Rehabilitation** | • The sand bins would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• All twenty sand bins would be retained in place.  
• A conditions assessment would be conducted to determine which sand bins could accommodate minor alterations (removal of mechanical equipment, removal of the internal storage structure, removal of concrete floors and drains, new openings, etc.) to allow for new uses.  
• Sand bins could be adapted for a new use or incorporated into a new streetscape or landscape design.  
• If a sand bin must be moved to accommodate development, it should remain within a service court and generally within the east-west alignment of the other sand bins. Moving of sand bins should only be attempted as necessary. |
| **Stationary Sand Washers** | • All twelve sand washers would be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• Missing appurtenances would not be replaced. |
| **Preservation** | • All twelve sand washers would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
• All missing or severely deteriorated appurtenances would be replicated using archived drawings and historic photographs. |
| **Restoration** | • N/A (The resource is extant.) |
| **Rehabilitation** | • The sand washers would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• All twelve sand washers would be retained.  
• A conditions assessment would be conducted to determine which sand washers could be moved and/or accommodate alterations for cultural installations or to be used as landscape features, such as planters.  
• At least one sand washer must be preserved or restored in place. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESERVATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Filter Beds   | • All twenty filter beds would be preserved in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• Collapsed sections of filter beds would be treated as ruins, and debris from the collapsed filter beds should not be removed.  
• Previous structural reinforcements would be left in place.  
• A structural assessment would be conducted to determine what further structural intervention is needed. All new structural repairs and reinforcements would be limited to what is necessary to stabilize the structure and would be clearly legible.  
• No new infrastructure or construction would be located within the filter beds.  
• Enclosure of areas of collapse may be necessary to protect the adjacent structure from further damage. Collapsed sections should not be reconstructed, and measures to enclose these sections should be clearly legible.  
|               | • All twenty filter beds would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
• Any contemporary structural reinforcement or incompatible repairs should be removed, and new repairs and reinforcements should be more visually and physically compatible.  
• Collapsed sections of the filter beds would be reconstructed using specifications in archived drawings and information from adjacent structure.  
|               | • N/A (The resource is extant.)  
• The filter beds would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• As many filter beds would be retained as possible.  
• A new structural assessment would be completed to determine the conditions of the cells and to determine the varying degrees to which the structures can be preserved and used.  
• At least one of the retained filter beds would be preserved in its entirety below grade to facilitate the interpretation of the original function of the resource. Preserved filter beds should be accompanied by their portals, filter bed ramps, and manholes to facilitate full interpretation of the resource.  
• A use should be planned for the area above the preserved filter bed that minimizes the amount of structural reinforcement necessary to the concrete structure.  
• All structural reinforcement of the preserved filter bed should be done in a sensitive manner that does not prevent full interpretation of the resource.  
• In addition to the one preserved filter bed, sections of other filter beds could be retained in various forms and incorporated into the landscape and architectural design of a new development. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Preservation** | All twenty portals would be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
All extant portal doors and associated hardware showing minor deterioration would be repaired to be operable.  
Missing doors would not be replaced.  
Some concrete patching to protect the underlying structure may be appropriate. |
| **Restoration** | All twenty portals would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
All missing or deteriorated doors and associated hardware would be replaced in kind. |
| **Reconstruction** | N/A (The resource is extant.) |
| **Rehabilitation** | The portals would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
All twenty portals would be retained.  
At least one portal must be retained with its ramp and filter bed to facilitate interpretation of the relationships of these resources.  
If the width of the service courts must be increased to accommodate a new use, the relocation of the portals may be possible. A conditions study must be conducted to determine whether the portals could be moved without affecting their material or structural integrity. If it is determined that they can be moved, the portals would need to remain aligned east-to-west and retain their original spacing so as not to diminish their ability to represent the quantity and general locations of the filter beds. At least one row of portals must be retained in place.  
Existing portal doors should be retained and repaired.  
Portal doors could be relocated to other portals that are currently missing doors and would not necessarily have to be operable.  
The portals could be incorporated into new landscape or architectural designs. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESERVATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Filter Bed Ramps | - All twenty filter bed ramps would be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
- Repairs would be limited to those required for long-term preservation of the resource.  
- Any structural reinforcement would be legible. | - All twenty filter bed ramps would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration. | - N/A (The resource is extant.) | - The filter bed ramps would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
- The ramps associated with retained filter beds would be retained and repaired as necessary.  
- Other ramps could be retained and incorporated into landscape and/or architectural design of the new development. |
| Filter Bed Sand | - All existing sand should be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
- Trash or other foreign debris should be removed. | - All existing sand would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
- The original depth of sand, as described in historic documentation, would be restored.  
- Specifications for the replacement sand would be informed by an assessment of the existing sand, as well as by the specifications outlined in historic documentation. | - N/A (The resource is extant.) | - The filter bed sand would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
- The sand within a preserved intact filter bed should be retained, cleaned of debris, and leveled.  
- New sand should be added to approximate the original average depth of sand.  
- Replacement sand should be compatible in color and general appearance with the original sand but does not have to replicate the original specifications.  
- If the sand makes access to the rehabilitated filter bed difficult, sections of the sand could be removed, exposing a cross section. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manholes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESERVATION</td>
<td>• All extant manhole structures should be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All extant and intact manhole covers should be preserved in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manhole covers that are beyond repair should be removed to ensure safety on the site. To secure uncovered openings, a transparent cover could be provided to indicate that the original cover is no longer extant and to allow interpretation of the manhole structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTORATION</td>
<td>• All manhole structures would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing manhole covers would be restored, and missing or severely deteriorated covers would be replicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The manholes that are associated with collapsed filter beds should be reconstructed as part of the restoration of the filter bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>• N/A (The resource is extant.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REHABILITATION</td>
<td>• The manholes would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As many manhole structures as possible should be retained in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As many manhole covers should be retained as possible. If retention of the manhole covers in place is a safety hazard, a new use for the retained manhole covers would be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All manholes associated with preserved filter beds should be retained to maintain the relationship between the components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retained manhole structures could be treated in various ways to make them a prominent feature of the development. Lighting, transparent covers, various materials and designs for infill, and other treatments should be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perimeter Pedestrian Path</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESERVATION</td>
<td>• Remnants of the perimeter pedestrian path would be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTORATION</td>
<td>• The original perimeter path would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Missing or severely deteriorated sections of the path would be reconstructed using specifications from archived drawings and information adjacent remnants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>• N/A (The resource is extant.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REHABILITATION</td>
<td>• The perimeter pedestrian path would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The perimeter pedestrian path would be retained and repaired in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Missing portions of pedestrian path would not necessarily need to be reconstructed, but portions of both the linear and curvilinear sections should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The perimeter pedestrian path could be integrated into a new pedestrian circulation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE TYPE</td>
<td>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESERVATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Corner Stairs | • The existing corner stair would be preserved in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• The slight depressions in the topography would be preserved in place to indicate the original locations of the corner stairs.  
• The single remaining corner stair would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
• An assessment of the existing concrete material would be conducted to inform the selection of a patch material.  
• Any repairs would match the existing material in composition, texture, color, and treatment.  
• The three missing corner stairs would be reconstructed in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Reconstruction.  
• Historic photographs and Olmsted’s original plans would be used to help replicate the size, profiles, materials, treatments, and locations.  
• An archeological investigation would be conducted to determine if any remnants of the stairs remain and could be used to further inform the reconstruction.  
• The new stairs would be identified as a contemporary reconstruction.  
• The corner stairs would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• The existing corner stair would be retained and repaired in place.  
• An assessment of the existing concrete material would be conducted to inform the selection of a patch material.  
• Any repairs would match the existing material in composition, texture, color, and treatment.  |
| Service ramps and stairs | • All existing stairs and ramps should be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• Repairs necessary for stabilization or long-term preservation of the concrete would be completed as appropriate.  
• All existing stairs and ramps would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration.  
• The three missing ramps would be reconstructed using archived drawings and historic photographs.  
• Areas of previous patching and repair that are not compatible with the original material would be removed and repaired appropriately.  
• The ramps and stairs would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• A sufficient quantity of ramps and stairs would be retained in place to represent the range of types of ramps and stairs that were originally extant.  
• Stairs and ramps adjacent to retained sections of the service court walls should be the focus of retention of this resource.  
• Where ramps and stairs are retained, the associated topographical relationship should also be retained to provide context for the stairs and ramps.  |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation</strong></td>
<td>The existing tunnel would be preserved in place in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation. Overgrown vegetation would be removed to ensure preservation of the concrete. Any existing barrier installed to provide security between the two sites should be retained in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restoration</strong></td>
<td>The existing tunnel would be restored in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Restoration. Overgrown plantings and any non-original barriers that have been installed would be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstruction</strong></td>
<td>N/A (The resource is extant.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rehabilitation</strong></td>
<td>The tunnel would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The existing tunnel would be retained in place. Overgrown plantings would be removed, and the structure would be repaired as necessary. If a security barrier separating the McMillan Site from the active filtration plant on the west side of First Street is required, the barrier would need to be of a character that preserves the sense of an open connection between the two sides of the filtration plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE TYPE</td>
<td>PERIMETER PLANTINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESERVATION</td>
<td>N/A (resource is not extant.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTORATION</td>
<td>N/A (resource is not extant.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>The species, spacing, and treatments of the original plantings would be replicated using Olmsted’s original landscape plan, planting plans, and historic photographs in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Reconstruction. Any plant remnants should be used to further inform the reconstruction. If an original plant species is no longer available, the replacement planting should replicate the form, function, and general appearance of the original species, and native species should be preferred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SITE RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Site Boundaries** | • The original site boundaries would be preserved in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• Circulation would be limited to existing paved areas (pedestrian path and service courts).  
• N/A (The resource is extant and intact.)  
• The site boundaries would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• The original site boundaries would be retained.  
• New circulation could be accommodated outside the existing service courts and pedestrian path but would not be integrated into the surrounding street grid. |
| **Spatial Organization** | • The configuration of open space and service courts would be preserved in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• N/A (The resource is extant and intact.)  
• N/A (The resource is extant and intact.)  
• The spatial organization would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• Any new construction would be contained within the current open spaces to retain the three-part configuration of the original plan.  
• The service courts would remain paved to preserve the distinct horizontal divisions on the site.  
• New circulation on the site would be secondary to the service courts in scale and would be distinguished by material. |
| **Topography** | • The existing topography would be preserved, including the southern berm, the northern depression, the grade changes at the service courts, and the mounds at each of the filter cell portals, in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• N/A (The resource is extant and intact.)  
• N/A (The resource is extant and intact.)  
• The topography would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• The grade of the service courts would be preserved.  
• The design of the new development would convey the unique topography of the site by maintaining the sense of a flat plateau and/or retaining sufficient sections of the topography to convey the significant topographical relationships on the site. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>TREATMENT APPROACH GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESERVATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Internal Views** | • Internal views would be preserved in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• No vertical development would obscure the existing internal view sheds across the site. | • N/A (The resource is extant and intact.) | • N/A (The resource is extant and intact.) | • The internal views would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• New circulation and open space would be configured so as to provide visual connections between the service courts.  
• Built resources within the service courts would be used as focal points for visual connections throughout the site.  
• Visual connections along service courts (east-to-west) would remain unobstructed. |
| **External Views** | • External views would be preserved in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Preservation.  
• The existing topography would be retained to preserve southward views.  
• All vertical development would be arranged to ensure that significant external views remain unobstructed. | • N/A (Restoration would require work outside the boundaries of the site and is not applicable.) | • N/A (The resource is extant.) | • The external views would be rehabilitated in accordance with the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.  
• Axial views from the perimeter path would remain unobstructed and would be framed by landscape features and/or vertical development to emphasize their significance. |
APPENDIX K:
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS FOR THE TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

The following text is taken directly from http://www.nps.gov/hps/tps.


FOUR TREATMENT APPROACHES

There are Standards for four distinct, but interrelated, approaches to the treatment of historic properties--preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction.

- **Preservation** focuses on the maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property's form as it has evolved over time. (Protection and Stabilization have now been consolidated under this treatment.)
- **Rehabilitation** acknowledges the need to alter or add to a historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the property's historic character.
- **Restoration** depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods.
- **Reconstruction** re-creates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes.

CHOOSING AN APPROPRIATE TREATMENT

Choosing an appropriate treatment for a historic building or landscape, whether preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction is critical. This choice always depends on a variety of factors, including its historical significance, physical condition, proposed use, and intended interpretation.

The questions that follow pertain specifically to **historic buildings**, but the process of decision making would be similar for other property types:

- **Relative importance in history.** Is the building a nationally significant resource--a rare survivor or the work of a master architect or craftsman? Did an important event take place in it? National Historic Landmarks, designated for their "exceptional significance in American history," or many buildings individually listed in the National Register often warrant **Preservation or Restoration**. Buildings that contribute to the significance of a historic district but are not individually listed in the National Register more frequently undergo **Rehabilitation** for a compatible new use.
- **Physical condition.** What is the existing condition--or degree of material integrity--of the building prior to work? Has the original form survived largely intact or has it been altered over time? Are the alterations an important part of the building's history? **Preservation** may be appropriate if distinctive
materials, features, and spaces are essentially intact and convey the building’s historical significance. If the building requires more extensive repair and replacement, or if alterations or additions are necessary for a new use, then Rehabilitation is probably the most appropriate treatment. These key questions play major roles in determining what treatment is selected.

- **Proposed use.** An essential, practical question to ask is: Will the building be used as it was historically or will it be given a new use? Many historic buildings can be adapted for new uses without seriously damaging their historic character; special-use properties such as grain silos, forts, ice houses, or windmills may be extremely difficult to adapt to new uses without major intervention and a resulting loss of historic character and even integrity.

- **Mandated code requirements.** Regardless of the treatment, code requirements will need to be taken into consideration. But if hastily or poorly designed, code-required work may jeopardize a building’s materials as well as its historic character. Thus, if a building needs to be seismically upgraded, modifications to the historic appearance should be minimal. Abatement of lead paint and asbestos within historic buildings requires particular care if important historic finishes are not to be adversely affected. Finally, alterations and new construction needed to meet accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 should be designed to minimize material loss and visual change to a historic building.

### STANDARDS FOR PRESERVATION

**Preservation is defined** as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
PRESERVATION AS A TREATMENT. When the property's distinctive materials, features, and spaces are essentially intact and thus convey the historic significance without extensive repair or replacement; when depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate; and when a continuing or new use does not require additions or extensive alterations, Preservation may be considered as a treatment.

STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION

REHABILITATION IS DEFINED AS the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

REHABILITATION AS A TREATMENT. When repair and replacement of deteriorated features are necessary; when alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use; and when its depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate, Rehabilitation may be considered as a treatment.

STANDARDS FOR RESTORATION

RESTORATION IS DEFINED AS the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.
1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use which reflects the property's restoration period.
2. Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
4. Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.
7. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.
8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
9. Archeological resources affected by a project will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
10. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

RESTORATION AS A TREATMENT. When the property's design, architectural, or historical significance during a particular period of time outweighs the potential loss of extant materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods; when there is substantial physical and documentary evidence for the work; and when contemporary alterations and additions are not planned, Restoration may be considered as a treatment. Prior to undertaking work, a particular period of time, i.e., the restoration period, should be selected and justified, and a documentation plan for Restoration developed.

STANDARDS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

RECONSTRUCTION IS DEFINED AS the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

1. Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property.
2. Reconstruction of a landscape, building, structure, or object in its historic location will be preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to identify and evaluate those features and artifacts which are essential to an accurate reconstruction. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
3. Reconstruction will include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features, and spatial relationships.
4. Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the
availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.

5. A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.
6. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

RECONSTRUCTION AS A TREATMENT. When a contemporary depiction is required to understand and interpret a property's historic value (including the re-creation of missing components in a historic district or site); when no other property with the same associative value has survived; and when sufficient historical documentation exists to ensure an accurate reproduction, Reconstruction may be considered as a treatment.