



governmentattic.org

"Rummaging in the government's attic"

Description of document: **National Park Service (NPS) Agendas/Meeting minutes of the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, 2013-2014, 2019**

Requested date: **03-June-2020**

Release date: **26-May-2021**

Posted date: **13-February-2023**

Source of document: **Freedom of Information Act Request
National Park Service
12795 W. Alameda Parkway
P.O. Box 25287
Denver, CO 80225
Fax: Call for options 1-855-NPS-FOIA
[FOIA Online](#)**

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is a First Amendment free speech web site and is noncommercial and free to the public. The site and materials made available on the site, such as this file, are for reference only. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals have made every effort to make this information as complete and as accurate as possible, however, there may be mistakes and omissions, both typographical and in content. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused, or alleged to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the information provided on the governmentattic.org web site or in this file. The public records published on the site were obtained from government agencies using proper legal channels. Each document is identified as to the source. Any concerns about the contents of the site should be directed to the agency originating the document in question. GovernmentAttic.org is not responsible for the contents of documents published on the website.



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Interior Region 1- National Capital Area
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

IN REPLY REFER TO:

FOIA 2020-000908 (2020-001352)

May 26, 2021

Dear Requester:

Subject: Freedom of Information Act Requests Dated June 03, 2020
National Park Service (NPS) *re: Committee for the Preservation of the White House*

This letter is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request in which you requested: “Records sufficient to identify any donors to the recent redesigning the White House Rose Garden, as well as the amount donors gave and the date of their donations. Please provide all responsive records from January 1, 2019 to the date the search is conducted.”

The following response was prepared by the National Capital Area –Region 1 through consultation with President’s Park. The FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552, generally provides that the Government shall make documents available to the public for inspection and copying to the widest extent possible. However, certain classes of documents may be exempt. The FOIA does not require that new records be created in response to a request and only applies to records in existence at the time the request is received. Additionally, because the NPS creates and maintains law enforcement records, we are required by the Department of Justice to provide the following information, even though it may or may not apply to your specific request. Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(c). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that we are required to give all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

We have enclosed **84 pages** of responsive records which are being released to you in full as all but 2019 were part of our existing FOIA file and were released to other individuals in the past. Information on Exemption 7 can be found at [FOIA.gov - Freedom of Information Act: Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQ\)](https://www.foia.gov)

We do not bill requesters for FOIA processing fees when their fees are less than \$50.00, because the cost of collection would be greater than the fee collected. *See* [43 C.F.R. § 2.37\(g\)](#). ***Therefore, there is no billable fee for the processing of this request.***

Pursuant to 43 CFR § 2.57 you may appeal this response to the Department's FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer. If you choose to appeal, the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer must receive your FOIA appeal **no later than 90 workdays** from the date of this letter. Appeals arriving or delivered after 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, will be deemed received on the next workday.

Your appeal must be made in writing. You may submit your appeal and accompanying materials to the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer by mail, courier service, fax, or email. All communications concerning your appeal should be clearly marked with the words: "FREEDOM OF INFORMATION APPEAL." You must include an explanation of why you believe the National Park Service's response is in error. You must also include with your appeal copies of all correspondence between you and the National Park Service concerning your FOIA request, including your original FOIA request and National Park Service's response. Failure to include with your appeal all correspondence between you and National Park Service will result in the Department's rejection of your appeal, unless the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer determines (in the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer's sole discretion) that good cause exists to accept the defective appeal.

Please include your name and daytime telephone number (or the name and telephone number of an appropriate contact), email address and fax number (if available) in case the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer needs additional information or clarification of your appeal.

DOI FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Office Contact Information

Department of the Interior
Office of the Solicitor
1849 C Street, N.W.
MS-6556 MIB
Washington, D.C. 20240
Attn: FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Office
Telephone: 202-208-5339
Fax: 202-208-6677
Email: FOIA.Appeals@sol.doi.gov

The 2007 FOIA amendments created the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) to offer mediation services to resolve disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation. Using OGIS services does not affect your right to pursue litigation. You may contact OGIS in any of the following ways:

Office of Government Information Services
National Archives and Records Administration

8601 Adelphi Road - OGIS
College Park, MD 20740-6001

E-mail: ogis@nara.gov
Web: <https://ogis.archives.gov>
Telephone: 202-741-5770
Fax: 202-741-5769
Toll-free: 1-877-684-6448

Please note that using OGIS services does not affect the timing of filing an appeal with the Department's FOIA & Privacy Act Appeals Officer.

We appreciate your interest in the National Park Service. If you have any questions about this letter, please contact me at christopher_watts@nps.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "C. Watts", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Christopher Watts
Freedom of Information Act Officer
National Capital Area- Region 1

COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2013 AGENDA

- I. Opening
 - A. Welcome
 - B. Introduction of new members
 - C. Approval of minutes
- II. Acquisitions
- III. Room Projects
 - A. Blue Room
 - B. State Dining Room
 - C. Family Dining room
- IV. Other Items for Consideration
- V. Adjournment

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 12, 2013 MEETING
OF THE
COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

At 12:00 p.m. the committee was called to order by Chair Jon Jarvis in the Theater of the White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Present were: Chair Jon Jarvis, Members William Allman, Pamela Bass-Bookey, Anita Blanchard, Leslie Greene Bowman, Lonnie Bunch, Robert Clark, Wendy Cooper, Thelma Golden, Richard Jenrette, Richard Nylander, Laura Paulson, Rusty Powell, Linda Johnson Rice, Angella Reid, Michael Smith, and John Wilmerding and Executive Secretary John Stanwich.

Honorary Chair Mrs. Michelle Obama was unable to attend the committee meeting. Members not present were Wayne Clough.

Deputy Chief of Staff to Mrs. Obama Melissa Winter was present.

Staff members present were: Donna Hayashi Smith, Melissa Naulin, Lydia Tederick, and Jill DeWitt, all of the White House Curator's Office.

I. Opening

A. Welcome

Chair Jon Jarvis convened the meeting and welcomed members of the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, explaining that the committee needed to move through the agenda relatively quickly in order to vacate the theater at 1 o'clock for an upcoming reception and next use of the room. Mr. Jarvis remarked that it has been two years since the committee gathered to discuss the preservation of the White House and their extraordinary input is of very, very high value.

Mr. Jarvis commented that this is the 80th Anniversary of the National Park Service's involvement in the preservation of the White House at President's Park, and it is a component of its portfolio that the agency is very proud to be involved in. Mr. Jarvis said that the park just had a very wet and cold Christmas tree lighting, but ultimately successful.

B. Introductions

Mr. Jarvis moved next to welcome new and returning members as well as to have everyone present introduce themselves.

Mr. Jarvis reported that Honorary Chair Mrs. Obama and Secretary Clough are unable to join us today due to other commitments.

Mr. Jarvis said that three members have left, Mr. Lew Manilow; Ms. Beth White, who was appointed by the President to the National Capital Planning Commission; and Mr. Paul Schimmel, who in May of this year, became a partner at Hauser & Wirth.

Mr. Jarvis noted that we have some new members that are joining us, as well as some returning: Angella Reid, Director of the Executive Residence and Chief Usher; Anita Blanchard, Director of Obstetrics and Gynecology in the residency program at the University of Chicago Medical Center; Leslie Green Bowman, President and CEO of Thomas Jefferson Foundation, and Wendy Cooper, Curator Emerita of Furniture at the Naulinthur Museum, both of whom were welcomed back after having served previously; and Laura Paulson, Chairman of the Americas of Christie's.

Mr. Jarvis asked everyone in the room to introduce themselves.

Mr. Lonnie Bunch, Director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, noted that he was an old member.

Ms. Pamela Bass-Bookey, President, Greater Des Moines Public Art Foundation, Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. Michael Smith, founder and principal of Michael S. Smith, Inc., reported his design firm was located in New York and Los Angeles and that he is the decorator of the private quarters of the White House.

Ms. Thelma Golden, Director and Chief Curator of the Studio Museum of Art in New York.

Mr. Richard Jenrette, President, Classical American Homes Preservation Trust, believed he was the oldest member. He left Wall Street some years ago and founded a foundation with six house museums, not in the area of the White House.

Ms. Leslie Bowman, President and CEO, Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Inc.

Mr. Richard Nylander, Curator Emeritus of Historic New England in Boston, Mass.

Ms. Laura Paulson, Chairman of Christie's America, noted her area of expertise is post war and contemporary art.

Mr. Jon Jarvis, III, Director of the National Park Service.

Ms. Anita Blanchard teaches at University of Chicago, and during the summer participates with the City of Chicago Landmarks Commission.

Mr. Rusty Powell, Director of the National Gallery of Art.

Ms. Wendy Cooper, Curator Emerita of Furniture at the Naulinthur Museum.

Mr. Bob Clark, Chairman and CEO of Clayco, Inc. from Chicago, who is a design builder.

Ms. Linda Johnson-Rice, Chairman of Johnson Publishing Company from Chicago.

Mr. John Wilmerding, Sarofim Professor of American Art, Emeritus, Princeton University.

Ms. Angella Reid, Director of the Executive Residence and Chief Usher, the White House.

Mr. John Stanwich, National Park Service Liaison to the White House.

Mr. Bill Allman, Curator, the White House.

Ms. Lydia Tederick, Assistant Curator, Office of the Curator of the White House.

Ms. Donna Hayashi Smith, Collections Manager/ Registrar, Office of the Curator of the White House.

Ms. Melissa Naulin, Assistant Curator, Office of the Curator of the White House.

Ms. Jill DeWitt, Curatorial Assistant, Office of the Curator of the White House.

Ms. Melissa Naulin, Deputy Chief of Staff to the First Lady.

Mr. Jarvis provided an update on the White House Visitor Center, which he noted serves an incredible role for those of the American public who may not get a tour of the White House. Bill Allman and the staff have been working very hard in getting this completed. Mr. Jarvis said it is going to be an extraordinary visitor center for the public with many things that the public has not seen before in both the exhibitry and the curatorial artifacts, with the centerpiece being a large White House model. Mr. Jarvis relayed that the National Park Service has a strong emphasis on accessibility to this facility and also high grade of energy efficiency. There is not a hard opening date but they are shooting for the spring of 2014.

C. Approval of Minutes

Chair Jarvis asked if there were any corrections or comments on the minutes from the meeting of October 18, 2011. There were no corrections and a motion to approve the minutes as they stand was made, seconded and carried with no opposition.

Mr. Jarvis recognized John Stanwich, who is the Acting Executive Secretary. Former Executive Secretary Ann Bowman Smith has retired from the National Park Service in November. Mr. Jarvis wished to recognize her for her work with a Certificate of Recognition from this Committee. Mr. Nylander made a formal motion to do so and the motion passed with no opposition.

II. Acquisitions

Chair Jarvis introduced Bill Allman to describe and present the newest acquisitions.

Mr. Allman first noted that this is the first time for this Committee to meet in the White House Theater, which was created in 1942. Prior to that time from 1902 to 1942 it was called the Hat Box, and it was where you checked coats for formal functions at the White House. Mr. Allman showed a picture from 1948 that showed the way it looked, which was loose chairs, and no stadium or tiered seating. He also showed an image of the Theater during the Reagan administration in 1982, as well as one from when George W. Bush was practicing for the State of Union address in 2004. The last picture he showed was more family oriented for a Super Bowl watching party with President Obama and 3-D glasses in 2009.

Mr. Allman showed the Robert Rauschenberg picture that was approved at the last committee meeting. He also noted that they had acquired the portraits of President and Mrs. Bush painted by John Howard Sanden in 2012. Both were financed by the White House Historical Association as a contribution to the nation. Additionally, they have acquired four prints by Ben Shahn, a series of portraits of Frederick Douglass. Mr. Allman presented one for the Committee to look at and noted that the prints consists of two younger and two older portraits of Frederick Douglass. Mr. Allman explained that these were created by Ben Shahn in 1965 to help raise money for founding of an African American Museum in Washington, which was the groundwork for what is now the Smithsonian's Museum of African American Art. Mr. Allman noted that we don't often collect portraiture of non-presidents and first ladies, but it seemed ideal for this particular administration.

Mr. Allman also showed several other acquisitions on display for Committee members. One was a medicine chest that is believed to have belonged to President James Madison and taken by British troops from the White House just before burning it on August 24, 1814. It was returned to the United States in the Franklin Roosevelt administration, sent to the White House, and when the Roosevelts left, the chest left with their personal papers and possessions and went to the Roosevelt Library. The Library lent it back to Mrs. Kennedy in 1961, and it has been in the White House on loan since then. However, this past year the Library realized that the documents said they wanted it to go to the White House, and it should not have left with the Roosevelts' personal things. The Roosevelt Library has transferred title to the White House Collection.

Mr. Allman next showed a three-tiered confectionery stand acquired at auction this fall. It was made in France for President and Mrs. James K. Polk as part of a state dessert service companion to their dinner service. It was not itemized at the time the Polks lived in the White House, and it was only from later inventories that they it appears that confectionery stands were part of the service. Mr. Allman showed photos of a basket and a series of beautifully painted individual flower plates, both of which were parts of the service that the White House already owned. When the stand came up for auction, Mr. Allman said the Decorative Arts subcommittee endorsed pursuing its acquisition. He noted that this confectionery stand is the more intact version of what he believes to be the only two in this service. While Mr. Allman had seen the stand in pictures, he noted that it is smaller and more delicate than one might have imagined. Mr. Allman believes there were at least three types of serving pieces types in the dessert service.

Mr. Allman next showed items from President Millard Fillmore's silver service set. He explained that President Fillmore left office in 1853 with a carriage and horses that had been given to his wife, First Lady Abigail Fillmore. Not needing all this in the post-presidential life, they decided to sell it and buy a silver service that they felt would be a better monument to the citizens of New York, who had donated the carriage and horses. Mrs. Fillmore, unfortunately, died two weeks after leaving the White House. President Fillmore did buy of silver which are engraved 1853. Mr. Allman explained that there was a 12-piece set, and his office had bought a tall urn in 1973, the sugar bowl in 1992, and a kettle-on-stand stand this fall. They now own number 2, number 3 and number 7 out of the 12 pieces. He noted that he had found the item on eBay, and its acquisition was also endorsed by the Decorative Arts subcommittee.

Mr. Allman showed a chair acquired from a dealer in Providence, Rhode Island, with a label which says Executive Mansion, President William McKinley. He shared that it was not bought by President McKinley, but rather that those were labels put on as an inventory control. Mr. Allman noted that it would not have been put originally on the front of that chair but would have been up underneath the frame. He believed a previous owner thought what made the chair interesting was to put the White House documentation on the front. Mr. Allman shared that there were at least five of these chairs, and they have a pretty interesting history having been in the Presidential Offices from prior to 1889 through 1902. He showed a photo of the current Yellow Oval Room, then called the Library, with two of the chairs in front of the bookcase on the far wall. When it became President Gover Cleveland's office, he used the Resolute Desk with two chairs on one side and three chairs on the other. When the oval room went back to being part of the family quarters. President Harrison moved his office into what is now the Lincoln Bedroom with the Resolute desk. Mr. Allman showed a picture of the room with one of five chairs behind President William McKinley. Mr. Allman noted they were still in the room when President McKinley's staff posed for a portrait with his personal secretary seated in one of the chairs. He showed an image of the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1899 that ended the Spanish American War and pointed out a part of a chair next to a staff member and part of a chair in the far back corner. Mr. Allman explained that they were office furniture, which was not inventoried - only the Residence furniture was. Mr. Allman noted that he does not know too much about the acquisition of these chairs. He said in that Oval Room picture we could document all the chairs except for this set of five of these chairs.

Mr. Allman noted that sometimes we collect newspaper engravings of the 19th century because that was an early means to illustrate activities at the White House. He then showed an engraving of the Oval Room on the second floor with President Chester Arthur seated at the Resolute Desk, the desk that President Obama uses in the Oval Office now. He noted the armchair may have been just outside the image to the right. Sometimes these pictures are incredibly accurate. This is a wonderful depiction of that desk. Other times they are totally fanciful and they have rooms with people and decor that are not possible. But another print acquired that is actually quite accurate is one showing Andrew Johnson in 1868 at a state dinner for the first Chinese diplomatic mission to the United States. Pretty clear in this print is a Monroe candlestick that sometimes has a glass dish in the top of it in the period, but in this case it was just used as an ornamental piece. So someone was actually here seeing this, or they would not have gotten that close drawing that piece. It gives credence that other parts of the picture are authentic.

Mr. Allman showed a potential acquisition as a result of the arts activity that took place last spring. The foundation that represents the Motherwell Estate offered this particular piece. He noted it was small - only 15" x 18" - and not necessarily a piece that will work to make the Family Dining Room a venue for more abstract art. Mr. Allman submitted it to the Fine Arts Committee, and it did not get a unanimous response. Several people said fine. Mr. Powell, who had come back with a rather stronger opinion, was asked to address his point of view. Mr. Powell said he did not think it was a very good Motherwell piece and that Mr. Allman should go back to the foundation and ask for a better one. Mr. Powell did not know how it would fit in. He noted he has lots of Motherwell at the National Gallery and would be happy to lend one.

Ms. Paulson noted that 1958 was a very important year for Motherwell. He was painting his "Spanish Elegies", in which he is represented with much more force and definition and certainly his own voice. She noted it would be hard for us to even know this was a Motherwell and believed if you are going to represent Motherwell, it would be better to have a small 1958 "Spanish Elegy". Ms. Paulson said that that would be really what you think of as Motherwell in this particular period as opposed to something that is quite anonymous. She agreed with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Wilmerding asked if there was any question about it being on paperboard. Mr. Allman responded that we avoid using anything on paper anywhere but in a hallway and that we do not have too many paper things, adding that we purposely do not collect works on paper very often.

Ms. Paulson suggested that we add Motherwell's collages on paper, that there are amazing early collages from the late 40's and 50's. These things were really mixes of different mediums. She noted these are over 50 years old and have certainly stood the test of time, if the foundation cannot give you something, certainly identified with Motherwell.

II. Room Projects

A. Blue Room

Mr. Allman provided a very brief report on the refreshing of the Blue Room as endorsed by the Committee. He said this Committee created this look for the Blue Room in 1985 back in the Clinton administration - the wallpaper, sapphire blue drapery and carpet -and that it seems to be successful. The First Lady has mentioned the room is a favorite. We have discovered natural wear and tear to the draperies and wallpaper fading, even with ultraviolet protective materials on all the windows. With this Committee's endorsement, we ordered new paper. Mr. Allman said the original paper in 1985 was made by Brunschwig that was a print. This time they went to Adelphi, which is a traditional hand-blocked paper company that did the Lincoln bedroom paper to great success. He noted that we are really pleased with the new paper. Mr. Allman said the paper hanger was brilliant; after study, he said the up and bottom borders were intact and color-fast and he would preserve all of that. All he did was lay the new ground paper, cut and fit between the surviving borders. The end product it is not always that easy to see, but the room that had become almost white, again has a more golden tone to the walls. Mr. Allman noted the drapes were done all over again with new fabric and trims.

Mr. Allman called on Melissa Naulin to talk about the historic furniture in the room and what it cost for conservation and study. Ms. Naulin commented now that we have refreshed the walls and the draperies and such, there has not been time for a while to focus on the furnishings. She showed an image of the Bellangé seating furniture, which was purchased for the room by President James Monroe after the burning of the White House during the War of 1812 . He purchased 53 pieces. Ms. Naulin noted that the only piece that survived in the White house uninterrupted, a pier table, is now located in the Entrance Hall. Ms. Naulin said when Mrs. Kennedy entered the White House and was interested in any historic furnishings in the house, she was shown this pier table in storage; it served as sort of a jumping off point to try to solicit what else could be out there. Thanks to the publicity about the pier table, the White House received the first donation of an armchair to bring the total to four pieces. Ms. Naulin showed an image of the first piece to return in 1961, and noted that during the Kennedy administration, another armchair and two side chairs entered the collection, and in the 70's we acquired two armchairs and a sofa.

Ms. Naulin said that all the chairs were sent for regilding in the early seventies to Thorp in New York City and that for the most part a lot of them were stripped completely down to their wood. Thorp indicated that they were not finding original material. She said that this is the last time this furniture, besides the sofa, was sent to Thorp and that 1979 was the last time these pieces have been gilded. She noted they have received many fillings, but nothing comprehensive, and that the gilding is in a pretty poor state now and their conservators can no longer patch them. Ms. Naulin said that it really needs to be done comprehensively; They have been working with some gilding conservators in Baltimore to study the set and identify what original material might be left.

She showed a chair that had the most original material from the earliest date. Ms. Naulin said they sampled a small amount of gilding and decided to remove this chair from use in the Blue Room to make it into a study piece and try to regild it in the fashion that we think it would have

looked originally, which is different from the way it looks now. She mentioned they decided to do it in red, since it was not going back in the Blue Room, because red was the original color in the suite it arrived in.

Ms. Naulin said that as part of the study they unexpectedly got a phone call last spring that a fire screen that was believed to be part of this suite was coming up for sale. It was a screen that the office had known about since the early 1980's and had pursued with a private owner. The office had never been supplied pictures of it, so they had never seen it; but when his estate went to auction, there was a letter from former White house curator Clement Conger. The auction company contacted the White House and sent them pictures of the screen to confirm it was authentic. Ms. Naulin said that for today the screen was not taken out of its travel crate because it is extremely delicate and not in great condition; it is a wonderful study piece that they are learning a lot from. Microscopy was done which the conservator has studied, finding the same early gilding that matches the early gilding years on the armchair, confirming that it is indeed a part of the White House suite.

Ms. Naulin noted there were originally two fire screens in the suite, but we only have one. She showed a picture of the fire screens in the room, noting that they are set at angles to the fireplace. She commented that they were mystified as to why there are two fire screens when there was only one fireplace in the room, but they were placed sitting kind of catty corner to each other.

Ms. Naulin said that now we have a gilding analysis done there is fragment of the fire screen's blue cover that remains and some red threads preserved beneath a nail head. The office wonders if that could be from the first crimson upholstery. She commented that the National Gallery of Art has generously agreed to partner with them to help with research and analysis since it cannot be done in-house. The screen will travel to the National Gallery in hopes of identifying more information about its original appearance. She said the goal is to regild and reupholster enough of the suite so that they can be reinstalled it all at once in the Blue Room; it is a big project with a lot of elements to it.

B. State Dining Room

Mr. Allman brought up previous projects that needed further discussion. He showed an images of the State Dining Room from the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's each with different sets of drapes and a different carpet. He noted that there is a tradition to change the room. He showed an image of the current drapes and current upholstery fabric on the chairs. He also showed the rug for this room, noting that two were made, as is their practice. He said it has actually been laid even though the draperies and other things were not ready to go to make it a whole package. The leaves on the rug were taken out of the plaster work in the ceiling. Mr. Allman noted that the rug is not on display during the holiday season to keep it safe from food spills during receptions.

Mr. Allman commented that the dining room is not considered to be too user friendly, with the use of the Davenport Queen Anne -style chairs. He mentioned that what was designed for family or small get-togethers -two small square tables and imposing-looking chairs- was not ideal. He said Mr. Smith and Mrs. Obama had some discussions about how to make the room more interesting for their use and their guests and showed a proposed design, including the current rug.

Mr. Allman showed an image of draperies proposed for the room as well as chairs of the first version of what they thought might work for the room. He noted that armchairs would be at the table.

Mr. Allman showed an image of a chair that they were looking at, one which the White House owned in reproduction from the 1930's. However, they decided to make side chairs; once they took the arms off, the chair was plain and fat. Other than the feet, all the interest was in the now-removed arms. Mr. Allman presented option number two, which was a chair of which that President Monroe had purchased 24 of for the East Room in 1817, the same time he was buying the gilded furniture for the Blue Room. Mr. Allman noted that they own three of these chairs, two of which are in the Library. Mr. Smith arranged with Baker Furniture to make samples, which Mr. Allman presented. Mr. Allman showed an armchair and a side chair which were pretty accurate copies. Mr. Allman thought the side chair was a little slender and too tall and skinny. Allman proposed to scale the chairs down, but that means the chairs would not be the same height as the armchair, to have better portions back to seat. Mr. Smith believes this would make the chairs more elegant in form. Mr. Allman showed one of the chairs, when the arms were removed, looking a little unfinished. Mr. Allman shared a picture of what is being proposed instead. The chair stile had been reeded, not as whole but as two panels to give it a little more oomph. These chairs are remarkably lighter than their counterparts, which means that Executive Residence staff will be able to move them. Mr. Allman noted this means that the chairs are kind of back on the agenda, commenting that everyone said they like the idea of the chair, but then we switched chairs midstream, so now he wondered how the Committee feels about the existing table and having chairs like the second Monroe option he proposed.

Mr. Smith asked for confirmation of how many chairs would be made, as he thought it was 24. Mr. Allman confirmed that was his recollection as well.

Mr. Smith commented that the current larger chairs were made for use in the room, however the problem is no one ever uses them. They are too difficult to move. Mr. Smith said there were discussions initially about the original Monroe chair, and then with the First Lady afterwards for a usable set of chairs that would look a little bit better than the original chairs that are so strangely out of proportion. He said the proposed chair, of an early White House form, looks better. They might become usable for this family and future families because they're actually usable and can actually have people sit in them. Mr. Smith thought they looked at everything that they existed here before. He said the idea was to find something that had a reason for being here at least as a jumping-off point. Mr. Smith said he and Mrs. Obama sat in a number of historic chairs and decided it was a simple and comfortable chair that had once been in the rooms.

Ms. Cooper said she mentioned to Mr. Allman earlier that this is a good solution. She liked this but was very sensitive to the copy and noted the upholstery is not properly a squared box form. Mr. Smith said they would mimic the original and the samples were there to show the form.

Mr. Nylander thought the reduced height needed to happen but the proportion of the seat looked too wide. Mr. Smith responded that everything was done very quickly and there would be the boxed upholstery. He wanted to get the proper balance with the height. He said this is our second incarnation, and that we will see another incarnation of them.

Mr. Nylander said the reduction of the height in the side chair makes a lot of sense and the seat has to be proportioned to it. Ms. Cooper agreed and suggested taking the carving on the top of the arm and sort of just “vertical it up” to the top so there is a little bit of ornament on either side on the front face of the styles. Mr. Nylander agreed

Mr. Nylander commented that it would be interesting to see what that would look like in a sketch and that he did not mind it the way it was. Mr. Smith responded that he thought Mr. Allman has been here through enough families to realize that the room does not get used, because they are having to take away chairs.

Ms. Bowman confessed that to her the proposed chair does not look that different from the chairs being replaced.

Mr. Smith said the problem is the chairs did not look so great from the back and that was the issue, too flimsy and too small. Mr. Jenrette asked if he objected to armchairs, wondering if it was that hard to get in and out of armchairs.

Mr. Smith commented that they were concerned the room starts to act like a reading room. He thought they had literally gone through every historic chair in the collection and had Mrs. Obama sit in all of them. Mr. Smith thought this is also something that can be made relatively easy with not so much trouble, and they could add and expand the use of them. Mr. Allman agreed.

Mr. Smith thought the detail is a good idea because we have been with the plain on the front. Mr. Jenrette asked if you had to have an armchair because he did not like having throne-like chairs. Mr. Smith asked if he thought we should reduce the scale overall. Mr. Jenrette responded that the White House supposedly many years ago was offered chairs from Albany York. Mr. Smith asked where he could see them. Mr. Jenrette responded that they were in Edgewater.

Ms. Cooper asked if the chairs were being made in this country. Mr. Smith responded affirmatively. He noted that Baker had to find a retired carver to work on them because there is no carving in production.

Mr. Jarvis commented that Mr. Smith has enough input to go forward. Mr. Smith said he thought they were going to look at scaling both of them properly. He would look at the chairs Mr. Jenrette offered, but he noted that they struggled to get to this point, but certainly the subcommittee will see.

Mr. Clark asked if there was a plan to do more to the room. Mr. Smith responded that the room has a new carpet. The curtains are a new design, which the committee looked at it the last time and got approved, which are a silk material with some stripes, based on a document, probably French. And that is the only thing really involved in the room. Mr. Jenrette asked if they were old yellow curtains. Mr. Smith responded the original draperies were green, but they were tricky because the room was originally a paneled wood finished room. Mr. Smith said that the discussion could move on for now.

C. Family Dining Room

Mr. Allman showed a photo of the adjacent room to the State Dining Room, which at that time was still called the “Family Dining Room”. In 1948 it had white walls and red drapes and very red carpet. By the 1960's when a room was upstairs was converted into a private quarters family dining room. So he has put “Old” in parenthesis in the name of the State Floor room. Some of us that hold hands are not as comfortable with the new designation. Mrs. Kennedy had white walls and gold trim. Since the Nixon administration, we have had very yellow walls and very yellow drapes. There is a custom carpet done in the second Bush administration based on the elements in the room.

Mr. Allman noted in one of the previous meetings he went to with Mrs. Obama, it was commented that this room was not considered a public room because sometimes it looks nice, like the Green Room or Blue Room, and other times it becomes a staging area for state events. He said there could be times that, if it were made into a so-called “public room,” the doors could be open so the tours could look in the room. Mr. Allman said as a venue for modern art there is a place to bring the collection up a little bit newer than most of the things they have. When we put the gray wall color and new textiles in the room, it can take something more modern. He said they never have really had anything totally abstract. At the time they hung a work by Georgia O'Keeffe, the public did not understand a painting that was not 19th century. Mr. Allman showed Mr. Smith's early sketch for what could happen to the room if more 20th century design elements were used.

Mr. Allman said they went looking for some modern art. He showed a Robert Rauschenberg work that could be put in the room, noting this would be big enough to go over the sideboard where Mrs. Roosevelt is protected in plastic in the room photos. Mr. Allman showed other smaller works by Josef Albers. He mentioned there was suggestion at the time Anni Albers fabric designs to be used to make into a truly wonderful rug.

Mr. Smith showed a sample; he said that Nick Weber of the Albers Foundation was always saying you have to look at Anni Albers's weaving. He did and was completely captivated by them. And she clearly is such a great American success story. So it felt like we were going to do a carpet that deviated, that we should do something related to this idea, classical but still with jumping off with some relevance. Interestingly enough we just did this little sample, to see what would happen if we took an idea for concept. We have had some communications from the Albers Foundation to look to them financially. All of you that were at the last meeting were all very captivated doing a room because it has not been part of a museum in a sense. It would be a perfect location to have 20th Century design. I think we are currently of the idea of doing it and for some reason and red curtains because they seem very bold and simple and historic at least in color. And probably keeping the chairs and table.

Mr. Allman agreed and showed some items from the 20th Century from the White House Collection. He explained that the décor from President Theodore Roosevelt's renovation of the White House remained unchanged until Mrs. Kennedy arrived. Mr. Allman noted that they have a Stickley bookcase and a set of four sconces made for the Oval Office in 1930. Mr. Allman said that they have a fantastic tea service that was then transferred to the White House after the New York World's Fair in 1939. He then pointed out a 20th Century design that could be added to this room for display purposes, an Alma Thomas piece and called on Ms. Golden to explain.

Ms. Golden said she was recently at an art show in Miami Beach with a group doing a very contemporary art tour and came across a 1966 work by Alma Thomas, who lived her whole life in Washington. She taught art all the way through her career in Ernest. In the early 80's she was known for colorful style abstracts that came out of her study of painting when she retired at the American University. But there is this kind of really personal direct looking at the world around her that she then defined through this abstract style.

Ms. Golden said the example shown really knocked her out. It is 36" x 36" - a perfect square in sort of a wheel style. She noted the work starts with the yellow center and each ring a color in this wonderful field. The work is called "Resurrection". It had been in several collections with before the dealer it is with now. The moment she saw it she immediately thought this might be an option.

Ms. Rice commented that Alma Thomas was a wonderful artist.

Mr. Allman said his office pursued another Alma Thomas that came up for auction but felt uncomfortable to buy at the auction price it realized. Mr. Wilmerding asked for the asking price of Ms. Golden's proposal.

Ms. Golden responded that it was close to what the one went for that they were not able to pursue. She said that Thomas is a really incredible American figure from so many levels and that when we talk about American regionalism she clearly sits within the history of African American artists in so many ways. Ms. Golden mentioned that Thomas was the first fine arts graduate at Howard University. Ms. Golden thought the painting looked at before was also large. Thomas is known for work that is large. She said that the smaller works are sort of this type of perfect squares of various dimensions. That is also what made Ms. Golden say this one would be a good idea because of its scale and size, but composition that is exquisite.

Mr. Allman noted that if the Alma Thomas painting was between the two windows, then the two Albers paintings would not be visible to the public. But if they became involved in the rug design that perhaps would meet their to have an Albers work readily visible.

Mr. Wilmerding asked if a motion was needed to acquire the Alma Thomas.

Mr. Allman responded that the White House Acquisition Trust had already approved the purchase if we can wait until the 1st of January so that they can get into the new fiscal year. Mr.

Allman mentioned that they had paid for the Blue Room chair and the screen and the stand projects on the spot.

Mr. Wilmerding said that we can wait three weeks.

Mr. Jarvis asked for any objections and the motion carried.

Ms. Cooper noted that she loved the direction the dining room is going, but she was still not sure about the chairs. She asked if there was a possibility to commission some designs from a 20th Century artist. She thought the proposed chairs were out of sync with the rest of the room. She wondered if it was something they could think about in another year or two.

Mr. Smith responded that it has been very hard to find chairs that are functional for the room.

Mr. Nylander said that he thought going slowly and seeing what the art works look like with the rug and the chairs would be best.

Ms. Reid noted that the current chairs are more practical.

Mr. Smith said that sometimes people react to an object by saying, "That should have never been in the White House." He thought the expectations need to be sort of slowly rolled out. Mr. Smith mentioned that it is not to say if there was a great set of furniture it should all be Stickley.

Ms. Cooper said she was actually not thinking of finding a set, but rather commissioning from a contemporary artist. Ms. Reid noted that commissioning works would be very difficult if the room transitions.

Mr. Smith was concerned that if the committee went to every well-known furniture maker that has a contemporary voice, they might end up with something wacky, like Albert Paley.

Mr. Nylander recalled that when the committee was doing the collections policy that Rex Scouten said we really have to be careful of commissioning things because artists can use that to exaggerate their prices. There is also the risk that other artists might complain their work is not being shown.

Mr. Jarvis thanked Mr. Allman for the presentation and update and asked for any new business. There was none. Mr. Jarvis noted to all members that they were receiving a new publication from the White House Historical Association.

Mr. Jarvis said the picture reminds us it's not just a museum, but a living place, and noted that there were a number of committee assignments in the members' folders.

III. Adjournment

Chair Jarvis asked if there were any other comments and if not, the meeting was adjourned. The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
John Stanwich
Executive Secretary

COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

MEETING OF DECEMBER 11, 2014 AGENDA

- I. Opening
 - A. Welcome
 - B. Directions for minutes
 - C. Subcommittees
 - D. Director Jarvis – Visitor Center report
- II. Acquisitions or Objects Considered
- III. Room Projects
 - A. State Dining Room
 - B. Family Dining room
- IV. Stewart McLaurin –
new President of the White House Historical
Association - Report on goals and support
- V. Mrs. Obama – remarks and photos
- VI. Other Items for Consideration
 - A. East Room rugs
 - B. Cross Hall rug
 - C. Cross Hall furniture
 - D. Blue Room – upholstery for Bellangé suite
 - E. Reproductions for holiday use
 - Blue Room sofa, Red Room sofa,
 - Green Room armchairs
 - Cross Hall pier tables
- V. Adjournment

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 11, 2014 MEETING
OF THE
COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

At 11:10 a.m. the committee was called to order by Chair Jon Jarvis in the Theater of the White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Present were: Honorary Chair Michelle Obama, Chair Jon Jarvis, Members William Allman, Anita Blanchard, Leslie Greene Bowman, Lonnie Bunch, Robert Clark, Wendy Cooper, Thelma Golden, Richard Nylander, Laura Paulson, Rusty Powell, Angella Reid, Michael Smith, and John Wilmerding and Executive Secretary John Stanwich.

Members not present were Pamela Bass-Bookey, Wayne Clough, Richard Jenrette, and Linda Johnson-Rice.

Deputy Chief of Staff to Mrs. Obama Melissa Winter was present.

President of the White House Historical Association Stewart McLaurin was present.

Staff members present were: Deesha Dyer, Donna Hayashi Smith, Melissa Naulin, and Lydia Tederick, all of the White House Curator's Office.

I. Opening

A. Welcome

Chair Jon Jarvis convened the meeting and welcomed members of the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, noting that they come together periodically to take on the responsibilities of care and preservation of this extraordinary place, its history and its furnishings and its role in American society. Mr. Jarvis mentioned that Honorary Chair Mrs. Michelle Obama will be joining the group in a little bit to offer some remarks and for photo opportunities. He then noted that the National Park Service has been actively involved with the White House since 1933, and in 1961 Congress made it a unit of the National Park System, and that they are very proud to have a role with the White House.

B. Introductions

Mr. Jarvis asked that everyone present introduce themselves.

He reported that Pamela Bass-Bookey, Secretary Clough, Richard Jenrette, and Linda Johnson Rice are unable to join us today due to other commitments.

Mr. Jarvis asked everyone in the room to introduce themselves and asked Mr. Bill Allman to start.

Mr. Bill Allman, Curator, the White House.

Mr. Richard Nylander, Curator Emeritus of Historic New England in Boston, Mass. but resides in Portsmouth, NH.

Ms. Thelma Golden, Director and Chief Curator of the Studio Museum of Art in Harlem, New York.

Mr. Michael Smith, founder and principal of Michael S. Smith, Inc., located in New York and Los Angeles.

Mr. Lonnie Bunch, Director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, noted that he was an old member.

Ms. Leslie Greene Bowman, President and CEO, Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Inc., better known as Monticello.

Ms. Laura Paulson, Chairman of Christie's America.

Mr. Jon Jarvis, Director of the National Park Service.

Mr. Rusty Powell, Director of the National Gallery of Art.

Ms. Wendy Cooper, Curator Emerita of Furniture at the Winterthur Museum. Ms. Cooper noted that the minutes said "Naulinthur" and Mr. Jarvis responded that there were a few issues with the minutes from the 2013 meeting.

Mr. Bob Clark, Chairman and CEO of Clayco, Inc. from Chicago, who noted that his company received one of four drone permits issued yesterday by the FAA. Mr. Jarvis noted that drones are not allowed in National Parks, and Mr. Clark said that they are also not allowed to be flown over the White House either.

Ms. Anita Blanchard, professor at the University of Chicago.

Mr. John Wilmerding, Sarofim Professor of American Art, Emeritus, Princeton University.

Ms. Angella Reid, Director of the Executive Residence and Chief Usher, the White House.

Mr. John Stanwich, National Park Service Liaison to the White House and Executive Secretary.

Ms. Melissa Winter, Deputy Chief of Staff to the First Lady.

Mr. Stewart McLaurin, President of the White House Historical Association.

C. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Allman explained that the minutes from the 2013 meeting came through with Melissa Winter having said everything that Melissa Naulin said and that when he did a universal replace of Winter and Naulin, it grabbed Winter everywhere it found it, which was also in Winterthur. Mr. Jarvis said that minutes in members' packets are a draft and that any mistakes would be corrected. He asked members to submit comments by January 12, 2015. The corrections would be compiled and put out for a final review and vote.

Mr. Jarvis recognized John Stanwich, who is now Executive Secretary. He noted that Mr. Stanwich hosted a fantastic Lighting of the National Christmas tree a week or so ago with the First Family and Tom Hanks and an audience of thousands, and for the first time, having Google as a sponsor and the "Made with Code" initiative which allowed girls around the country to code the design elements of the state trees, which has been incredibly popular. Mr. Jarvis mentioned that Mr. Stanwich was replacing Ann Bowman Smith, who retired in November 2013 and was recognized with a certificate of appreciation at the previous meeting of the committee.

D. Subcommittees

Mr. Jarvis explained to the members that their packets contained information on the three subcommittees- fine arts, decorative arts, and design. He said that there would be an opportunity for new members to join subcommittees and for returning members to change subcommittees if they would like. Mr. Allman works carefully with all three subcommittees and explained that members may choose to serve on any subcommittee whether or not they are an expert on the topic. Mr. Jarvis asked Mr. Allman to explain how subcommittees are used to develop recommendations before they come to the full committee itself. Mr. Allman said that the Fine Arts and Decorative Arts subcommittees are generally called on when a possible acquisition comes up to provide expertise on whether or not it should be pursued. The design subcommittee focuses more on room projects. Mr. Allman noted that they welcome suggestions for acquisitions or collectors to talk to.

E. White House Visitor Center

Mr. Jarvis discussed the reopening of the White House Visitor Center in September 2014, noting that it was a partnership between the White House Historical Association and the National Park Service. He showed slides of the new exhibits and said that the center provides a nice opportunity for visitors who do not have the chance to visit the White House, since tours are limited in number and time. Mr. Stanwich invited all committee members to stop by to see the visitor center if they had a chance.

II. Acquisitions

Chair Jarvis introduced Bill Allman to describe and present the newest acquisitions.

Mr. Allman asked Lydia Tederick to present an Alma Thomas painting, which had been discussed and endorsed at the previous committee meeting. She explained that Laura Paulson visited the gallery where it was on display and confirmed that it was in terrific condition. The painting was accessioned in March 2014 as a gift of the White House Historical Association through the White House Acquisition Trust. Ms. Tederick explained that they had previously tried to purchase an Alma Thomas painting in 2012 but were not successful. Ms. Tederick noted that Alma Thomas was very active in the Washington, DC art scene and had many ties to the area. She also mentioned that Alma Thomas is the first African American woman artist to be represented in the White House collection. Mr. Allman highlighted the importance of the White House Acquisition Trust from the White House Historical Association, noting that an essential part of their cosponsorship is maintaining a trust devoted specifically to object acquisition, not just to endowment purposes of redesign or refurbishing. Mr. Wilmerding asked if there was another source of funds used to accession objects, but Mr. Allman replied that the trust was the primary one. Ms. Cooper asked if the painting was owned by the family before the White House acquired it, but Mr. Allman responded that it had multiple owners. He said they plan to display it in the old Family Dining Room.

Mr. Allman then discussed the next acquisition, a copy of an 1856 edition of *United States Magazine* with illustrations of White House rooms. Mr. Allman explained that the magazine is important because they are the earliest known images of at least five of the rooms of the White House, and they're incredibly accurate. He noted that they acquired the magazine from eBay.

Mr. Allman moved next to discuss a non-acquisition, a Thomas Hart Benton painting that had been discussed at length by the Fine Arts Subcommittee. The issue with the non-acquisition was that it was owned by a woman who gave 10 percent of the ownership to the National Gallery of Art and kept the remaining 90 percent. She would like to see it displayed in the White House, but the National Park Service cannot accept partial ownership for a White House object. The National Gallery of Art very graciously offered to divest itself of its 10 percent, but the owner has gone back and said that she wanted to donate it over a period of 10 years for tax purposes. However, that was not an ideal situation for the National Park Service nor the National Gallery of Art. The committee members discussed hypothetical scenarios that might enable them to accept the owner's terms, but Mr. Powell said that because the situation is complicated, it is better to follow specific rules. Mr. Jarvis asked Mr. Allman for the subcommittee's recommendation. Mr. Allman said that aside from the ownership issues, they were in favor of its acquisition. Mr. Powell noted that the National Gallery of Art sometimes uses a "when and if" provision to preapprove a donation when the donor is ready to donate the work in full, rather than partial. Mr. Jarvis asked the committee if this is something they would like to consider. Mr. Bowman moved to approve the "when and if" condition for this painting, and it was seconded by Mr. Wilmerding. The motion was carried, with Mr. Powell abstaining.

III. Room Projects

A. State Dining Room

Mr. Allman provided an update on the State Dining Room, which had been discussed at previous meetings. New rugs designed by Michael Smith, the First Lady, and the Office of the Curator have been in place since right after Christmas 2012. Mr. Allman said they alternate rugs to reduce wear. Mr. Smith asked how the rugs have been wearing, and Mr. Allman said that so far, they look great. Mr. Allman reminded members of the discussion of dining room chairs from the last meeting, and noted that Mr. Smith had arranged for Baker to make some reproductions. Mr. Allman explained that the initial chair design was too disproportional and presented the redesign. He proposed to go forward with the redesigned chairs upholstered in brown horsehair that had previously been approved and brighter colored tacks. Mr. Allman said that the fabric has been ordered and that they were in the process of ordering the tacks and the chairs. He then presented a sample of fabric for the drapery in the room. Mr. Smith noted that it was being woven in Pennsylvania, so an American company would be providing the fabric. Mr. Smith plans to do a mockup of the drapes once the fabric arrives. Mr. Allman explained that they do not have curtain rods available, so they plan to order rods based on ones placed in the house during the 1092 Theodore Roosevelt renovation. He displayed some sample trim, noting that they come in rayon and silk, but the silk was priced 50 percent higher. He did not think there was a noticeable difference between the two. Mr. Allman noted that that of the chairs being ordered, only a few will be armchairs. He said that Ms. Reid suggested there is no need for armchairs for tour purposes, since all of the chairs will be pushed against the table. Mr. Allman said that the plan was to use side chairs, but if the room is being used for meals, then armchairs can be brought in.

B. Family Dining Room

Mr. Allman reminded the committee that they had approved turning the Family Dining Room into a showcase for 20th century art at a previous meeting. He displayed early drawings of the room and showed different places for newly acquired art to be displayed. Mr. Allman said that they were proposing to replace the portrait of Edith Roosevelt with their Rauschenberg piece and to place the newly acquired Alma Thomas piece between the windows. Mr. Allman said that the walls would be an off-white color with red draperies inspired by Mrs. Kennedy's designs. He did note that the two Josef Albers works would likely not be on public view based on where they would be located in the room. Mr. Jarvis noted that it was okay with the Albers Foundation was okay with that because they offered to provide a rug based on an Anni Albers textile design. Mr. Allman noted that the rug was being made in Michigan and was almost finished. Mr. Allman said that they have been in contact with the Lauder Foundation via an East Wing employee for another 20th century work such as a Lichtenstein or Warhol. Ms. Paulson noted that she would be seeing Dorothy Lichtenstein the next day and would discuss a possible donation with her. Mr. Allman said that they propose to place the next modern work acquired over the fireplace.

The discussion stopped to allow photographs with First Lady Michelle Obama.

IV. Discussion with First Lady Michelle Obama

Mrs. Obama joined the discussion and thanked the committee for their wonderful work and efforts. Mr. Allman explained to Mrs. Obama the discussion that had taken place so far on the Family Dining Room. Mr. Allman then continued the discussion by noting that they do not have

a lot of 20th century decorative arts yet to add to the room, but they have two silver tea services that were commissioned for the American Pavilion at the 1939 World's Fair. Mr. Allman showed three out of originally seven pieces. The creamer has gone missing, but the rest remain. Mr. Allman showed images of an urn and a tray. He said the two great pieces are the kettle on a stand and the teapot that presumably are based on the sphere and the pointed pylon that were the symbols of the 1939 World's Fair. It was made by Graff, Washbourne & Dunn in New York, and it is sterling. Mr. Allman said that when they closed the World's Fair, they transferred things to the White House on the assumption that they were about the only ones who could use some of these fancy things. He noted there was also flatware and glassware, and that if members at the reception today took cheese, they would probably find the knife that says "White House" rather than "President's House" that comes from the World's Fair flatware. Mr. Allman pointed out that the Family Dining Room does still need to be a service room for big events in the State Dining Room or elsewhere; so on those days, the Family Dining Room would not be part of the public tour.

Mrs. Obama said that she was excited to be able to open the Family Dining Room to public tours because they have been working on it for quite some time. She was happy to be able to showcase more 20th century designs in art, furniture, and fabrics. She hoped that the committee was proud of their work. Mr. Jarvis recalled that the changes to the room were significant in terms of the art displayed and that the changes were bold. Mr. Smith noted the very strong and positive message of having acquired work by an African American woman artist, as well as having a Rauschenberg piece displayed, as Mr. Rauschenberg promised Mr. Obama that should he win the election, he would donate a piece to the White House. Mrs. Obama and Mr. Jarvis both thanked the White House Historical Association for their donations to acquire the art. Mr. Jarvis asked when the room would be open for tours, and Mr. Allman noted that January was a low visitation month, so they are proposing February to take advantage of Black History Month and to showcase the Alma Thomas painting. Mrs. Obama also mentioned the importance of the newly reopened White House Visitor Center and that it is a great place for children.

Mrs. Obama and Mr. Allman then gave members a preview of the Obama state china service. Mr. Smith had been working on the design, noting that the majority of the service would be a blue-green color with a gold service plate. There is also an alternate dinner plate. Mr. Smith said that the china was being made by Pickard in Illinois, so it was all American-made. He also explained that the blue-green goes well with other dishes and the gold service plates can be used with all the other services. Mr. Smith said the design was based on James and Dolley Madison's personal china service. Mrs. Obama thanked Mr. Smith for his work on the design of the china as well as the State Dining Room and Family Dining Room. She said that they had also worked with the White House chefs to make sure that this new china would be functional for modern day cooking and plating. Mrs. Obama was excited to share that they would be introducing a soup tureen to the service, mentioning that menus are limited by what dishes they had to serve food on. She said that this new service would give the chefs more flexibility. Mrs. Obama also noted that committee members were receiving a sneak peak of the china, as it was not likely to be ready until June. She asked the committee to refrain from discussing it until it was public knowledge. Mr. Allman reminded the committee that the Family Dining Room projects were not public knowledge as well. Mr. Jarvis asked if there was a special occasion in mind for the first use of the new china. Mrs. Obama said that it would likely be for a state dinner. Mr. Nylander

asked how many pieces were being ordered. Mr. Allman said there were eight different pieces per setting- service plates, two dinner plates, fish entrée plate, dessert plate, salad plate, and the soup tureen with lid. Altogether, he believed about 350 pieces would be ordered.

Mr. Jarvis asked Mrs. Obama if there was anything else she would like the committee to do over the next two years. Mrs. Obama said her primary goal in speaking to the committee today is to thank them for their passion and dedication to the work of the committee and that she is grateful for their support. She said that in terms of some next things to think about is how to make structuring and caring for the White House truly a nonpartisan thing that is properly funded at the levels that it needs to be funded, and that they are not subject to the economy or worrying about budget cuts so that things like painting and fixing the plumbing can happen. Mrs. Obama said she knows that right now that there are (b) (7)(E), (b) (7)(F) that have to happen in the house. Ms. Reid mentioned that the National Park Service is currently in the process of helping with that (b) (7)(E), (b) (7)(F) that they needed to work on. Mrs. Obama said that she would like to advocate for a big donor to help with many of the repairs needed because the White House needs to be maintained at a certain level for future administrations. (b) (7)(E), (b) (7)(F)

(b) (7)(E), (b) (7)(F) She said that any family or President that's going to operate going forward has got to be able to live in a home that functions as well, if not better, than any of the state-of-the- art skyscrapers that are being built. Mrs. Obama commented that (b) (7)(E), (b) (7)(F)

(b) (7)(E), (b) (7)(F) That should be here at the White House. Mrs. Obama thinks that that's what the average American thinks already exists, and so when things go wrong, they're horrified, but then they don't know what people here are really working with. She said the challenge is really getting the house, the offices, the whole building generally, working with the top technology that's there. She didn't know any company that wouldn't want to donate their services to do that, but she wondered how they do that with the current contracting requirements and the bidding processes. She noted a lot of those restrictions keep them from getting the best minds working on the house. Mrs. Obama said she thinks that's how we should be thinking about the house and how the family who lives there who is sacrificing so much, they should have everything. They should have everything that anyone has in their homes, any of the best of everything. That's what the President of the United States should have. She said it's hard to complain because they live in the White House and didn't want to seem ungrateful, but the truth is that we need to up the game here, and the differences are stark. Technology changes every two, three, four years, and they're still living in the 19th century in some ways. She said that would be something that's worth beginning to strategize about- how do we have those conversations? Who needs to be involved? How do we fund it? How much would that cost? Mr. Jarvis said that the building, the physical plant here, is the responsibility of the National Park Service, and the grounds as well, and they have been relying on federal appropriations, which haven't been all that generous for a variety of reasons. He said the National Park Service centennial is coming up and that they have some signature centennial projects, and there are people out there like David Rubenstein, who donated to the Washington Monument, and others that would like to get in on some of these projects. Mr. Clark said there could be personal donors and that he didn't think it would be too hard to raise however much money

would be needed. Mr. Jarvis agreed, noting that they had not yet been charged to raise money, but could mount an effort with the committee's support. Mr. Smith asked if the renovation in the 1950s when the first family moved to Blair House was done with federal money. Mr. Jarvis responded that yes, it was done with through Department of the Interior appropriations. Mr. Clark noted that he was a pretty seasoned fundraiser, and that it would be something he could get excited about. Mr. Smith thought it was something that many Americans would want to support via online donations. Ms. Golden said this is America's house and she thought there are people who would want to know that they are supporting its present and its future. Ms. Cooper asked if they should consider an endowment so they do not have to continue deferring maintenance projects. All members agreed. Mrs. Obama again thanked the committee for their work and the productive discussion and left the meeting.

Mr. Smith said when he started work on the Oval Office, he was approached by Cisco, Hewlett-Packard, and all these companies that wanted to up the technology and the telecommunications aspects present. He said it needs to come from a different, more orderly front, but based on the First Lady's comments, he thought everyone would like the White House to showcase not only art and décor but technology as well. Ms. Bowman suggested a technology master plan. Mr. Jarvis reminded the committee that First Lady is serving as the Honorary Chair of the centennial of the National Park system, and they have a number of signature projects and some major capital fundraising and some corporate sponsorships. He thought the White House projects could easily fit within that. Mr. Jarvis said he would talk to the National Park Foundation board and chair. He thinks in partnership with the White House Historical Association and the committee, that they could put something together. Ms. Reid asked if they were considering a master plan because she already had some things that needed to be redone. Mr. Jarvis said yes and that Congress would likely want to be involved too. Ms. Reid said they have a lot of upcoming projects related to energy saving. Mr. Jarvis said that they should talk about a comprehensive approach to this. He said the National Park Service has a whole set of guidelines and policies around donations that are pretty flexible.

V. White House Historical Association Report

Mr. Jarvis introduced Stewart McLaurin, president of the White House Historical Association. Mr. McLaurin said that the White House Historical Association was the private partner of the public-private partnership between them and the National Park Service since Mrs. Kennedy created it in 1961. He noted that in the 53 years of their existence, they have contributed over \$42 million in private money that has gone toward the restoration and conservation and preservation of the public rooms of the White House as well as the acquisition of furnishings, fine and decorative arts that go into the permanent White House collection such as the china, and other things that have been discussed. He noted that his predecessor had been on the job for over 20 years and he had just started in June. Mr. McLaurin said the Association is transforming how they do business, noting that their funding had come almost exclusively from retail operations. He said that they are known for the White House Christmas ornament, which is now in its 33rd version. Mr. McLaurin said that the 2014 ornament features Warren G. Harding, and next year's ornament would feature Calvin Coolidge. He said that the Coolidge ornament would feature a new piece of technology, and he was excited that opportunity. Mr. McLaurin was also pleased to announce that the Association had just hired its first development officer in an effort to diversify

their financial support. He mentioned that he was proud of the partnership that led to the renovation of the White House Visitor Center and their ongoing day-to-day operational work. He wanted to explain to the committee what other work the Association does besides sell Christmas ornaments.

Mr. McLaurin explained that they have an extraordinary education program which is currently focused on the five county metropolitan area but will soon be expanding nation-wide. He said that their publications department is responsible for beautiful books related to the history of the White House. Mr. McLaurin pointed out to committee members that they would be receiving a copy of their newest book, *Away from the White House*. He noted that the Association's magazine, which previously only came out twice a year, would come out three times in 2015 and become a quarterly production in 2016. Mr. McLaurin mentioned the successful symposia that the Association hosts, including the most recent one about the 200th anniversary of the burning of the White House. He also noted that they are in conversations with the State Department to connect with homes of other heads of state around the world to talk about best practices in terms of historic preservation and educational programs. Mr. McLaurin said that they would also like to host the 2018 meeting of the consortium of presidential sites in the United States, in partnership with the National Park Service and National Archives.

Mr. McLaurin discussed the Association's finances. Their primary funding comes from the sale of White House Christmas ornaments. He also discussed the two basic trusts that the Association operates- the conservation/preservation/renovation trust is currently at \$42 million dollars, and the acquisition trust is \$7.2 million dollars, and both are growing due to the success of the financial market. Mr. McLaurin noted that the Association's headquarters is located at the Decatur House and its two adjacent townhouses. They host special events there and have been able to derive some revenue from that venture. He mentioned that they also host public programming and invited the committee members to attend. Mr. McLaurin offered to place committee members on their public program invitation list as well as a subscription to their magazine. He finished his presentation by noting that the Association has existed for 53 years, and they would like to continue to grow and increase their impact, particularly among school-aged children who visit Washington, D.C. and throughout the country with education programs about White House history.

Mr. Clark asked how many staff work for the Association. Mr. McLaurin responded that their full-time staff is 38, which includes publications, special events, and education. He also mentioned their initiative to digitize their unique collection of over 50,000 White House photographs, which will be included in their revamped website in 2015. Mr. Bunch congratulated the Association for their accomplishments and future plans. He inquired about possible partnerships between the Association and the Smithsonian for future programs.

VI. New Business

Mr. Jarvis noted that the group had limited time remaining and asked Mr. Allman to finish the discussion on future projects. Mr. Allman noted that he would move through them quickly and would ask the committee for their input in the future.

A. East Room Rugs

Mr. Allman said that of the East Room rugs, made in 1995, the one in the middle has a tendency to buckle. The rug is rolled during tours and becomes a tripping hazard once it is unrolled after tours are over. They had room in the budget to remake them this year but went to using two smaller ones instead, since they do not have as much trouble. Mr. Allman asked the committee to consider whether or not the room should go back to having three rugs and if they should be the same reproductions. He reminded members that the committee had made those decisions in the early 1990s.

B. Cross Hall Rug

Mr. Allman said that the Cross Hall rug had been designed in 1998 and matches the staircase rug and entrance hall draperies. There are two rugs- the original and its emergency replacement. Mr. Allman said that the original manufacturer is prepared to make another one if the committee decides. He asked members to consider endorsing no changes.

C. Monroe Administration Furniture and Christmastime Changes

Mr. Allman noted that 2017 will be the 200th anniversary of the arrival of the Monroe suite of furniture, and they would like to reproduce the missing furniture. He asked the committee to consider whether or not to change the fabric of the furniture. He mentioned that the color should stay the same, but the fabric could change.

Mr. Allman said that at Christmastime, they change out the dolphin sofa in the Red Room and the Bellange sofa in the Blue Room with plainer historic furniture. He asked members to consider whether or not they should simply reproduce the original furniture and use those during Christmastime instead. Mr. Allman also asked members to consider whether or not they should reproduce a selection of tables to have on hand each year at Christmastime to use for food service. He told the committee that he would produce some documents for their perusal.

Mr. Smith said that to remake all of the suggested items seemed reasonable and practical. He asked about the durability of the East Room rug colors, and Mr. Allman responded that they could discuss a color change. Mr. Smith said that the current colors are not practical and suggested that they approach it in the same way as the State Dining Room rugs, which was an imitation of Aubusson carpets, with a multiple color brushing technique. He noted that the technique hides wear very well. Mr. Smith said the East Room rugs' design and color made them look worn rather quickly and thought that if the color was more forgiving, then wear would show less. He asked who manufactured the rugs, and Mr. Allman responded that Spinning Rock in North Carolina made the State Dining Room rugs, and the East Room rugs were from Fields, who now makes their rugs in Hong Kong. Mr. Allman asked if the matters should go next to the Design Subcommittee for review, and all members responded affirmatively. Mr. Jarvis asked Mr. Allman to convene a conference call when there was enough material for review or decisions to be made.

VII. Adjournment

Chair Jarvis asked if members had any new business to discuss. Ms. Paulson reminded the committee that she was going to speak with the Lichtenstein estate and that they would discuss a possible donation. Mr. Allman reminded her that all the public rooms have windows and that should be considered. Chair Jarvis asked for any other comments, and if not, the meeting was adjourned. The motion to adjourn was carried, seconded, and passed.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
John Stanwich
Executive Secretary

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE MAY 20, 2019 MEETING
OF THE
COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

At 10:00 a.m. the committee was called to order by Chair David Vela in the Family Theater of the White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members present were: Chair David Vela, Leslie Greene Bowman, Wendy Cooper, Kaywin Feldman, Tham Kannalikhram, Richard Nylander, Rusty Powell, John Wilmerding, Timothy Harleth, Lydia Tederick, and Executive Secretary John Stanwich.

Members not present were David Skorton.

Other parties in attendance:

Chief of Staff to Mrs. Trump Lindsay Reynolds was present.

President of the White House Historical Association Stewart McLaurin was present.

Office of the Curator staff members present were: Donna Hayashi Smith, Melissa Naulin, and Nicolette Pisha.

I. Opening

A. Welcome

Chair David Vela convened the meeting and welcomed members of the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, thanking them for taking time out of their busy days to get together and make some decisions and some recommendations about this extraordinary resource, the White House.

Mr. Vela explained that the National Park Service (NPS) has been the steward of the White House since 1933, almost ninety years, and it has been part of the National Park System since 1961. He mentioned that 1961 was a pivotal year, with the creation of the Curator position, and the White House Historical Association as an NPS cooperating association. He explained that the NPS has cooperating associations around the National Park System that help it develop educational materials specific to parks and in turn provide funding for educational programs in the parks.

DRAFT

Mr. Vela recounted that he was extremely honored to have recently met with First Lady Melania Trump here at the White House to talk about this committee's forthcoming meeting and its exceptional work. The first lady told him how much pride she has to live and work in this historic residence and how she appreciates the work that this committee has done to preserve and protect its legacy.

Mr. Vela concluded by saying that the White House was truly a place where every year millions of people from all over this nation and around the world visit. He emphasized that the mission of the National Park Service at the White House was accomplished by working closely and collaboratively with a number of other agencies including the Executive Residence led by Timothy Harleth.

B. Introductions

Mr. Vela asked that members each introduce themselves. Mr. Vela reported that David Skorton could not be in attendance today and sent his regrets. He then asked others in attendance to introduce themselves including the staff of the White House Curators Office.

C. Honorary Chair

Mr. Vela called on Richard Nylander, who had a motion for the committee's consideration. Mr. Nylander thanked the chairman. Mr. Nylander presented a motion that the Committee for the Preservation of The White House extend to the First Lady Melania Trump, an invitation to serve as the Honorary Chair of this committee. The motion was seconded by various members. Mr. Vela called for discussion and any objections. The motion was passed unanimously.

II. **Acquisitions**

A. East Room Rugs and Diplomatic Reception Room Rugs

Lydia Tederick reported that, in 1995, three rugs were made for the East Room by the Edward Fields Company. At that time, there was one large center rug flanked by two smaller rugs. The design process began in the early 1990s. An Adamesque design was chosen. There were design elements derived from the ceiling ornamentation in the room and colors included not only gold but red that was inspired by the room's red marble mantels. This design was approved by the Committee. A second set of rugs was produced in 1999, which enabled staff to swap them out periodically and preserve them for as long as possible.

In recent years, staff of the Executive Residence found they had more flexibility with different room setups by using just the two smaller rugs. After nearly 20 years of use, both sets were found to be worn in areas. The edges would no longer lay down, and they were stained from

continuous use. It was apparent that new rugs were needed. Edward Fields was now owned by a Chinese company, so in order to use an American source the Curators Office turned to the Scott Group in Grand Rapids, Michigan to replicate the current design and make two sets of the smaller rugs. The Scott Group was the only company left in the U.S. that still hand tufts their rugs. Ms. Tederick recounted that this project began before her predecessor, Bill Allman, retired in June of 2017. Production got underway late in 2017, and the first set arrived in time for the 2018 Governors' Dinner. A second set arrived a few weeks later. Later it was decided to have the Scott Group produce two more rugs to allow for the possibility for three rugs to be used in the East Room and to have a spare to be able to switch that rug out to help preserve it as well.

Ms. Tederick recounted that another rug project developed during the fall of 2017. The objective of this project was to replace the rug in the Diplomatic Reception Room fabricated and installed in late 2008 and made by the Mountain Rug Mills in North Carolina, a company that unfortunately was out of business today. The design process was very involved. It took over five years to finalize the design for this rug. Fabrication and design fees became rather expensive: she believed the cost for this one rug was over \$200,000, so only one rug was produced. It was in continuous use for nearly ten years and it, too, was showing wear. There was a distinct traffic pattern right down the center and especially noticed along the outside edges. So, with the approval of the ex officio members of the committee, a new rug was designed by Tham (Kannalikhham) and her team, manufactured, again, by the Scott Group. The design of the rug incorporates the eagle from the presidential coat of arms and some architectural elements from the room. The outside border changed slightly. The earlier renditions of rug for this room had incorporated state seals as part of the outside border, but at Mrs. Trump's suggestion instead of putting state emblems, why not state flowers? And so that was what was done.

Mr. Wilmerding said he thought that was a terrific idea. Ms. Tederick pointed out the flowers were arranged in the order that their states entered the union. This rug was a combination of cut and loop pile and made of wool with silk threads. Two rugs were made this time, again, enabling staff to swap them out periodically and preserve their longevity. The first rug arrived in time for the very first state visit held during this administration for the President of France in April 2018.

B. Dunbar Beck Drawings of the Steinway Grand Piano

Nicolette Pisha showed the committee some drawings by the artist Dunbar Beck. These drawings were related to the grand piano on the State Floor which was presented to President Franklin Roosevelt by Steinway & Sons as a gift to the White House. The piano was decorated with five gilded scenes of American music and dance by artist and muralist Dunbar Beck.

In 2018, three 1938 pencil drawings that Beck completed for the scenes were acquired. One of the drawings featured a cowboy lifting his voice to the stars above the vast prairies of the west. The drawing showed a male figure playing guitar and singing upward as he stands in front of a cacti. The next drawing was actually an unsigned sketch that featured a man dancing alone wearing no hat and both of his arms rotated around his waist as he danced. The last drawing showed workers in the cotton fields of the South singing after the day's work, and this featured a

DRAFT

seated African American man who faced forward singing and clapping while his companion danced. Interestingly, an ax was buried in the log which suggested chopping wood was their recent labor as opposed to picking cotton.

Beck actually attempted to donate these drawings to the White House in 1962 when he wrote to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy to provide information about the piano; however, the donation never came to fruition. Beck passed away in 1986, and all of the drawings were then a part of his estate. His estate came up at auction in 2017, and these three drawings were purchased by former curator Bill Allman, who then donated them to the White House collection.

C. William King Armchair

Melissa Naulin presented the first potential acquisition item for the Committee's consideration. The object being an armchair by William King of Georgetown [Washington, D.C.], originally purchased in 1818 during the James Monroe administration. Monroe was tasked with having to refurbish the entire White House following its burning in 1814 during the War of 1812. For the East Room, which had never been completed up to that point, local cabinetmaker William King was commissioned to make a suite of 24 armchairs and four sofas without being upholstered. Unfortunately the decoration of the East Room was not completed during the Monroe administration for lack funds, and the furniture remained without its show upholstery for 11 years. It was not until the Andrew Jackson administration that the decoration of the East Room was completed.

These chairs have an interesting history, all of them were used in the East Room until 1873. In one of the earliest known photographs of the East Room, ca. 1862 during the Abraham Lincoln administration, the chairs and sofas were shown in the East Room. It was a very well-known suite in White House history, and three chairs have been reacquired until now. The entire suite was removed from the room in 1873, believed to have been sold at public auction in 1882.

The chair for consideration would be the fourth to enter the collection and would give more flexibility in terms of either using all four together or using two pairs, which would be very useful. Ms. Tederick, Ms. Naulin and National Park Service furniture conservator John Courtney inspected the chair alongside other furniture conservators and curators of Colonial Williamsburg in December 2018.

Photographs shown to the Committee were taken in Leroy Graves' studio in Williamsburg, where he partially removed the upholstery for inspection, and this chair was found to be consistent in every way with the three chairs already in the collection. It was certain that this chair was indeed part of that East Room set.

The owner of the chair got two appraisals: the first was by Sumpter Priddy of Alexandria, Virginia, a well-known Southern decorative arts scholar; the second by Christopher Jones, also of Alexandria. Interestingly enough, they both came back with the exact same valuation, which was \$85,000, and that was the asking price which the owner offered the chair for sale to the White House. Based on past auction records of these chairs and the amount that other public

DRAFT

institutions have paid for them, it was believed to be a very fair price and the White House Historical Association was very supportive and offered to purchase this chair if approved by the Committee.

Mr. Vela called on John Wilmerding, who had a motion to accept the recommendation to acquire the William King armchair for the White House collection. Leslie Greene Bowman seconded the motion. Wendy Cooper recused herself from voting without an explanation. The motion was passed unanimously.

Ms. Cooper then asked a question about the finish of the chair. Because that chair looked very much lighter in color than the other chairs in the collection, she asked if it was the intention to deal with the finish to make it comparable and blend in with the other three chairs. Ms. Naulin responded the finish on three other chairs were made to look consistent and the photograph of the new chair showed the color to be lighter than it actually was, but by removing the existing finish there would be a good chance that the darker finish could be restored and made consistent with the other chairs in the collection.

Ms. Cooper asked if an original show cover was found for the chair. Ms. Naulin responded no, but stated a very small piece of red wool was found in the under upholstery materials. There was excitement that this might be original because there was no evidence that it could be anything other than from the King suite. There was existing documentation that the original show cover for the suite was blue and yellow. It was possible the red could have been a later show cover.

Mr. Stanwich asked if the piece of metal shown in the picture of the chair was bronze. Ms. Naulin replied there was little plaque that stated the chair was owned by Henry Clay, but the provenance of this chair has not been fully vetted. It was very likely purchased at auction in Washington, D.C., by the owner or more specific the ancestor of the owner's ex-husband. But that was not what the brass plaque attested to and without Conover Hunter having recognized it as part of the White House suite, the chair would have existed out there without anyone ever knowing it had this connection. Ms. Naulin planned to pursue its history, but so far has not come up with any good leads on an explanation of the Clay provenance.

Mr. Wilmerding asked if the plaque would remain on the chair or would it be photographed. Ms. Naulin responded there has been no formal discussion on the matter, but the plaque would probably be removed and definitely photographed before its removal. Ms. Cooper commented that it would be shame to separate the plaque from the chair, and suggested if it was removed it should be placed inside the back rail. Ms. Naulin confirmed the plaque would be definitely be retained and photographed in its current location on the front of the chair rail, but even if it was removed and stored separately from the chair, it was the practice of the Curator's Office to track all pieces of an object.

Mr. Nylander asked how many of the original 24 chairs have been located. Ms. Naulin stated there were two armchairs owned the Daughter of the American Revolution (DAR) Museum, one owned by James Monroe's Highland, one in the collection of the Lincoln Theater [Washington, D.C.], and one in the Baltimore Museum of Art. It was not sure how many chairs were in private hands, but believed there were definitely two and possibly a third in private collections. Of the

DRAFT

four sofas, the location of one was known and it was owned by the National Museum of American History. It was loaned to the White House for many years, and perhaps it can be borrowed again. The sofa was gorgeous and such a great piece.

D. Caroline Scott Harrison Watercolor Painting of Wild Roses

Lydia Tederick presented the second potential acquisition item for the Committee's consideration. There was a gift offer of a small watercolor painting of Wild Roses by Caroline Scott Harrison, Mrs. Benjamin Harrison from the Maryland State Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR). The framed painting measures 11x13 and a half inches. A photograph of the painting as a horizontal image was shown to the Committee, but Ms. Tederick indicated that it was currently matted and framed as a vertical painting, which seemed odd, and in the bottom of the mat was a little signature piece with Mrs. Harrison's signature.

The painting's history was found in the Maryland State Chapter's minutes from 1956 and suggested that the Benjamin Harrison Presidential Site gave the watercolor to a Mrs. Henry Robert in 1940. She was then president general of the National Society of the DAR. It was a thank you to her for her role in helping to procure a copy portrait of Mrs. Harrison for their site. While Mrs. Harrison was first lady, she served as the first president general of the DAR from 1890 until her death in 1892. Mrs. Robert later presented the watercolor to the Maryland State Chapter House in 1956.

Mrs. Harrison was a life-long art student. She had studios in her home in Indianapolis and here at the White House. She was very interested in china painting and held classes at the White House for Cabinet wives and others. Her flower studies were said to have been used as designs for paintings that she did on blank china forms. Although the painting was not actually seen in person yet, we understood it was in excellent condition.

The date was not known, and the owner would like to present it to the White House as a gift. Mrs. Harrison was currently represented in our collection by another watercolor entitled *Flowering Dogwood*, thought to have been painted during a time when she was first lady.

Ms. Tederick asked for advice as to whether it would be a worthy addition for the White House collection. Mr. Nylander inquired if the *Flowering Dogwood* watercolor was about the same size as this painting? Ms. Tederick responded it was a vertical piece and very similar in size, but maybe a little bit larger. Mr. Wilmerding stated he thought it was charming and a great period piece, and even if there was a certain amount of redundancy, it could surely be displayed somewhere. It was also his view that because of its historical association it should be accepted.

Ms. Cooper concurred and asked how and where, being watercolor and subject to light deterioration, would the painting be presented, and might be presented with the painting already in the collection. Ms. Tederick stated in the China Room, there was one spot along the north wall where the watercolor by Howard Chandler Christy of Grace Coolidge was displayed. This watercolor was thought to be a preliminary study that he did for the full-length portrait of her. The other watercolor by Mrs. Harrison has hung in this spot, and so fortunate to have two

DRAFT

painting that could be swapped out periodically, and that this would become a third work on paper that could be displayed in this one area in the China Room.

Ms. Bowman expressed her fascination with the painting, but when she first saw the photograph thought it was painted china. She suggested that if some enterprising intern or scholar would be available, not to burden the already indefatigable curatorial staff, they would research the many patterns that were commonly used for china painting, a lot of them were in the *Ladies Home Journal*. There was even the possibility of finding some of Mrs. Harrison's sources or identifying any surviving examples of painted ceramics with this pattern.

Ms. Tederick responded that such information does survive and the *White House History*, the periodical published by the White House Historical Association, published an article about Mrs. Harrison's china painting a few years ago. Mr. McLaurin offered to provide copies of that article to the Committee.

Mr. Vela called on John Wilmerding, who had a motion to accept the recommendation to acquire the Caroline Scott Harrison watercolor of Wild Roses for the White House collection. Richard Nylander seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

III. Project Reports

A. Fabric Refurbishment in the East Room, the Green Room and the Red Room

Donna Smith reported the Green Room and the Red Room were the only two public rooms that have upholstered wall coverings today. J. Edlin Interiors, a New York-based company, who has worked on the wall coverings and drapery installations for the White House for many years, at least a couple of decades now. Their soft-wall system utilized a snap method, which was a plastic track on the wall and fabric edges. The walls were lined with batting and muslin where the show fabric was snapped into place which allowed the fabric to be stretched that ensured a smooth, tight look. The beauty of this method was that sections of wall coverings can be restretched with changing environmental conditions during the summer and winter when the fabric can sag. It also allowed for sections to be replaced if they become soiled or torn.

The Green Room walls were covered in a silk moiré watermark which cannot be cleaned or wet or else the moiré would simply disappear. A photograph shown to the Committee was view of the Green Room that was last refurbished in 2007. On the south wall where the draperies were next to the secretary bookcase, there was a section in the middle of that wall that had been stained and was quite obvious. The Edlin soft wall system enabled the easy removal of the stained fabric and replaced with a fresh piece of moiré fabric. Fortunately that side of the room showed little fading and was behind the secretary bookcase and draperies, so there was no concern about the new fabric contrasting with the faded fabric in the room. It was surprising that one does not immediately see how much the fabric has faded, but it really had, and the trim was reused there as well.

DRAFT

A drawing from Jeffrey Edlin of J. Edlin Interiors was shown to the Committee. Edlin's plan was to trim the new piece to size in the room, remove the old, restretch it, and then snap it into place. When placing custom fabric orders for major room refurbishments, often one and half times the required yardage was ordered. This ensures fabric with the same dye lot was on hand to make repairs and/or replacements in a timely manner. This most recent repair occurred this past January.

Ms. Smith then discussed the Red Room, which was last refurbished in 2000, and many areas of the room had suffered from extreme fading for almost 20 years. The furniture was upholstered as needed for wear and tear, but the walls and draperies remained the same. The draperies were weathered and, in 2013, the draperies hems and edges were repaired and refreshed by the Edlins, which would provide a longer life span. Now almost six years later, the draperies have become worn again. A photograph of the room was shown to the Committee that contrasted the south side of the room's existing wall covering that suffered the most fading alongside a piece of new fabric to the left.

In March 2018, an order was placed with Scalamanré in New York to reweave the current fabrics and trim including the wood mold fringe and double tassel tiebacks for the draperies and valances. There was no change in design. Scalamanré had woven the fabrics and trim with the 2000 refurbishment from the many examples in their archives. J. Edlin Interiors, who had done the last refurbishment in 2000, was hired to make the draperies and remove and install the new wall coverings and trim. The only change was that the wide galloon at the chair rail trim and below the ceiling border trim would be handstitched in place instead of a glue application. In early January 2019, J. Edlin Interiors removed and installed the newly made wall coverings and draperies. This process lasted about one and half weeks. Plans for reupholstering of furniture in need of a refresh was being developed.

Ms. Smith then concluded with describing the plans for the East Room. A photograph of the room was shown to the Committee. The draperies created in 2003, were made of a custom designed silk of one single repeat by Old World Weavers. Through the years, the fabric and edges have become very soiled and worn. A new fabric design would be costly and take a significant amount of time to produce. It was a multiple month project just to create that design. In order to extend the life span of the panels in July and August of this year, the seven sets of panels would be sent to J. Edlin Interiors for refurbishment where the edges and hems would be readjusted and cleaned. This firm was able to remove, adjust, lengthen and/or shorten, and change hems around so that the panels would look almost brand new. Although concern has been expressed how successful this would be done with one repeat of the pattern for each panel, Edlin was confident they would provide work that was satisfactory. Hopefully this refresh would provide at least another five years of use. The 1902 cornices would be removed and reinforced for reattachment by the White House carpenter shop.

Mr. Vela asked what would the time frame be for the East Room project. Ms. Smith responded that Edlins were scheduled to receive the panels on July 22 or 23, and they would be ready for reinstallation on August 19.

DRAFT

Mr. Nylander asked if the East Room panels would be cut down by a certain amount so they would not be as full. Ms. Smith replied that Jeffrey Edlin has this way of working his magic, and has done that with a number of the draperies such as the one at the top of the steps as you go up to the State Floor where you cannot tell that those were once tattered and worn. He took from the top where no one who notice and added it on the bottom, and was able to work with the hems. Mr. Wilmerding asked if it was like invisible mending. Mr. Nylander remarked that it was like flipping the cushion of a chair with piecing the edges. Ms. Smith affirmed both questions.

B. Painting Conservation of the Portraits of William McKinley, Benjamin Franklin, and Theodore Roosevelt

Nicolette Pisha introduced the project stating that the Curator's Office has worked with Arthur Page at Page Conservation to conserve three portraits over the past year. He has also been working with Dean Khan to do the frame conservation for several of these works. Ms. Pisha presented photographs first showing the 1902 portrait of William McKinley by Harriet Murphy currently on view in the East Room. This painting was conserved in spring of 2018. It had a heavily darkened surface, yellowed varnish, prominent cracks, and a very large scratch. Arthur Page cleaned the surface of the painting and inpainted the cracks as well as the scratch. He also revarnished the entire piece and added a new backing board. This painting would be seen when the Committee goes upstairs to the East Room later this morning.

She then showed images of the 1767 portrait of Benjamin Franklin by David Martin, for the painting before conservation and then after conservation. Again, this was a piece where the frame also received conservation. It was conserved in the winter of 2019. It had a lot of old damages, lifting paint, mismatched overpaint, and a discolored varnish which was visible in the before conservation image. Mr. Page actually compared this painting to several other portraits of Franklin by David Martin that were done around the same time period in order to determine if some of the details that were coming out when they were removing the overpaint were actually original to the piece and what he found was on the area at the top of the chair, a vague shadow of a golden eagle sitting on top of the chair was visible, and by comparing that to some other portraits of Franklin by the artist, Arthur saw that eagle was most likely added sometime throughout the history of the painting. It was not actually original, and in consultation with Mr. Page, Ms. Tederick and Ms. Pisha agreed that they should inpaint the eagle to exist but not be incredibly prominent in the piece.

While Page's staff was doing their work, they removed all of the discolored varnish layers, completed approximately a hundred hours of inpainting on this piece, and then revarnished it. In terms of the frame, the surface was cleaned, the larger losses were filled with gesso and the smaller ones were inpainted and a gilt liner was constructed to allow a better fit for the painting overall. This portrait of Franklin was on view in the Green Room, but was actually on loan now to the National Portrait Gallery and would be there for several years.

Finally, the last image shown was of the 1903 painting of Theodore Roosevelt by John Singer Sargent which also was on view in the East Room, but the Roosevelt painting was currently undergoing conservation at Page. It has several frame-related canvas losses. The varnish has

DRAFT

been discolored. There was surface grime and then also areas of slight cupping in the paint. It was almost complete, and the surface would be cleaned. The varnish would be removed. The losses repaired and the inpainting of losses and abrasions would also be completed. In terms of the frame, it would also be conserved by Dean Khan, and would consolidate loose and lifting gilding and ornaments, gesso fill the larger losses, and inpaint the smaller losses. He was also going to increase the rabbet size to better accommodate the painting so that there would not be any more losses related to the frame itself. This should be completed within the next several weeks.

Ms. Cooper asked what would the funding source be for the painting conservation and fabric refurbishment. Ms. Pisha responded the White House Historical Association.

Mr. Nylander asked what painting was hanging in the Green Room in place of Franklin. Ms. Tederick replied that wonderful portrait of Edith Roosevelt by Chartran. When it was removed from the old Family Dining Room, there was no other spot to hang it, so this was an opportunity to put her out for display.

C. Zuber Scenic Wallpaper in the President's Dining Room

Ms. Tederick opened her remarks by reminding the Committee that this scenic wallpaper that was installed in the President's Dining Room in the family quarters in 1961. It was made by the French company Zuber. It was entitled *American War of Independence*. It was originally produced in 1852 as a variation of *Views of North America*. She reminded the Committee that a copy of *Views of North America* was in the Diplomatic Reception Room to this day. Prior to 1927, *Views of North America* served as the base and variations in the scene were produced by using stencils to simulate the relief printing. After 1927, the design was entirely relief printed using newly carved wood blocks for the foreground figures and the original *Views of North America* woodblocks for the background. In total, 2300 woodblocks were used to produce a full set of paper and about 360 colors.

The White House example was purchased from Stanley Pratt Antiques in London with funds given by Mrs. Vincent Astor. It was discovered that this wallpaper set was kind of a hodgepodge. It was a combination of both the pre-1927 paper and that produced after 1927. In addition to that, what arrived at the White House was not tall enough to reach the crown molding, so another donor came forward and provided sections of sky from yet another Zuber paper in order to complete the room. In 1976, at the request of Mrs. Betty Ford, the paper was removed from the room. She preferred painted walls, something lighter in color for that north facing room. In 1978, the paper was reinstalled at the room at the request of Mrs. Rosalynn Carter. In 1996, at Mrs. Hillary Clinton's request, an attempt was made again to remove the wallpaper from this room.

Robert Kelly of WRN Associates was brought in to do this work, and he immediately encountered problems because of the condition of the paper. To help him, Nancy Purinton, the National Park Service paper conservator at the time, was asked to assist, and they tried mechanical techniques, water, and steam. It was pretty apparent that the paper could not be

DRAFT

removed without causing severe damage, and the removal process was stopped. The walls were then covered with fabric. This was achieved by first protecting the wallpaper with a layer of synthetic fabric called “p-cap”. To that, perimeter wood battens were added. They were screwed and stapled through the wallpaper into the wall and then fabric was secured to the battens.

Then in 2012, there was a ruptured water pipe from the floor above that caused major saturation of the walls. Heat and airflow were used to quickly dry the walls, but there was still significant water staining. Looking at the photographs Ms. Tederick provided, the water staining was visible along the upper part of the wallpaper. Unfortunately, nothing more could be done with the wallpaper at that time. New fabric was immediately installed so the room could be put back into use. In 2017, there was an opportunity to determine if the wallpaper could be restored and, if so, how much time would be needed. Studio TKM Associates was contacted at the recommendation of two local paper conservators. They had experience with panoramic papers and were very familiar with this particular Zuber paper. During the course of a day when they came for an on-site visit, some of the fabric from key areas of the room was removed and this enabled them to study the wallpaper. A condition report was generated and made it clear that to fully restore the paper would be extremely expensive and the best results could only be achieved if the panels were sent to their studio in Massachusetts. The paper was most compromised in condition, in addition to water staining, it had been heavily overpainted during the various installations and conservation campaigns and had suffered mechanical damage from earlier deinstallations.

The decision was made to permanently remove the paper from the room and pack it for archival storage. If in the future, there was any interest in displaying a select scene from this paper, it would be sent to TKM for conservation and, from them, receive advice on how best to mount it for display. During a ten-day period in July 2018, the conservation team from this group, numbering as many as five conservators on some days, successfully removed the paper using a mechanical technique. A photograph was shown of the TKM removing the paper during that deinstallation process. The paper panels were stored in oversize archival folders and sent to the off-site storage facility.

Ms. Tederick then stated there was now an interesting dilemma: the Zuber Company still manufactures this paper today using the original woodblocks. *American War of Independence*, however, was only produced on occasion and, as luck would have it, they have recently printed several sets of this paper. Curious to see how much a new set of paper would cost, we provided the Zuber representative up in New York with information about the room to help them calculate how much would be required to install the paper in the dining room. They figured that one full set would be needed and several panels from another set. Normally, they do not break up their sets, but they would be willing to do that for the White House.

The cost for one set of paper would be \$78,000; this did not include the shipping cost. Funding would have to come from the White House Acquisition Trust, and Ms. Tederick prefaced this by saying that there were no immediate plans to install the wallpaper in this room. The new paper would have to be kept in storage for future installation, if purchased. She did inquire of the Zuber representative when they thought they might be reprinting this paper again, and the

DRAFT

representative was unable to provide an answer. It could be another ten years from now. If we would want to purchase a new paper, we would need to act quickly.

Ms. Tederick sought advice as to whether a new version of *American War of Independence* should be purchased that could be used in this dining room at some future time.

Ms. Bowman asked Ms. Tederick when the original paper was installed. Ms. Tederick replied in 1961 during the Kennedy administration by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. Ms. Cooper then asked the wall paper was reproduction, with Ms. Tederick responding that it was both pre-1927 with stencil figures on it and that was produced in 1927.

There was some brief discussion of the fabric currently on the wall in the President's Dining Room. Mr. Harleth raised the point that the room was located in the private quarters and that the project to deinstall the existing wallpaper was very time consuming. It was very intrusive and we were fortunate to be allowed the time and access rather than just take an opportunity to put up more fabric. The proper thing would be to remove and conserve the paper, and if we could find an opportunity to have that displayed for public viewing in the future. He recalled there was even the thought about eventually using the paper and if it was something that could be conserved and restored. The hope would be to have the wallpaper available for future first families as an option if they should want to restore the room back to 1961 appearance.

Mr. Wilmerding commented that the wallpaper was historical. If funding was available, it would be useful to have the paper for future use, and as Ms. Cooper stated the earlier versions were also reproductions of sort, and he was not bothered by that. But still for certain tastes, it was a wonderful set of images.

Ms. Bowman raised the point that there was another factor that supported the argument and may assist with fund raising. It would be the country's 250 anniversary in seven years, and anniversary events were already beginning for Lexington and Concord and the American Revolution. She stressed it was not the time for this paper to be unavailable whether it would be for the current or future inhabitants of the White House or now with the major anniversary of the country.

Ms. Cooper clarified that the removed paper was in storage and kept simply for an archives, and that it would be too expensive and just not practical to ever restore and reinstall. Ms. Tederick interjected that the scenes in better condition were identified, and that the National Museum of American History wanted to display part of it. Mr. Nylander raised the point that the 1920s paper used by Zuber was not as good a quality as the original paper when the pattern was first produced or what would be used now, so conserving pulp wood of the 1920s get expensive. Ms. Cooper added that Zuber would not be using pulp paper today. It would be rag paper or something that would stand up and not be brittle in 30 years. Ms. Tederick and Mr. Nylander stated this was a good question about the paper content, and Mr. Nylander added that knowing how Zuber prides itself on having original blocks he was certain they would be consciousness about the paper quality. Ms. Cooper stated she was in favor of purchasing new paper as long as it was rag paper.

DRAFT

Mr. Nylander then stated that the Diplomatic Reception Room paper had been repeatedly conserved. Ms. Tederick concurred and stated that American scenic paper was heavily overpainted in various areas. Mr. Nylander then proposed rather than tailoring this proposal to just the dining room, perhaps it would be worth purchasing additional paper for the Diplomatic Reception Room, which if restored again would end up as a repainted paper rather than anything original. A restoration would be very expensive and would not be worth it. Ms. Cooper responded then the question was would a set and a half be enough to do the Diplomatic Reception Room. Should that room also be measured and sets be ordered for both rooms? But if that was the thinking, then the Diplomatic Reception Room should also be measured. Ms. Tederick agreed.

Mr. Vela asked if someone would like make a motion on this matter. He called on Wendy Cooper, who had a motion that subject to funding and after proper measurements had been taken to purchase either one and half sets of two sets based on measurements and also on the paper quality for the two rooms. Both Leslie Greene Bowman and Rusty Powell seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Ms. Feldman, Mr. Powell, and Ms. Reynolds made their excuses and left the meeting at approximately ___ am. Chair Vela confirmed there was still a quorum of members present.

D. Bellangé Blue Room Furniture

Melissa Naulin introduced the ongoing Blue Room furniture project, which was the effort to refurbish the historic suite of gilded furniture in the Blue Room, originally purchased for the White House from a Parisian cabinetmaker Pierre-Antoine Bellangé in 1817. This project has been a priority for a number of years.

Approximately 15 years ago or so it was noted that the gilding was much worn. It had not been comprehensively addressed in about 40 years at that point, and something needed to be done in order to make the furniture look respectable.

The project also provided an opportunity to thoroughly study the chairs in order to try to understand what they looked like originally, how they were originally treated, and attempt to present the most historically accurate version of them to the public visiting here at the White House. After a number of scientific studies, analyses and consultations with experts in historic gilding and historic upholstery of this period, the desired treatment that was selected, again, based on the evidence that often came from the chairs themselves.

There was a decision that the look of the newly restored pieces in the suite was going to be so different from the existing appearance of the pieces, and mixing a few restored pieces with existing pieces would not work. All pieces presented in the room needed to match in appearance. The critical point was reached last fall when there were at least eight pieces of the suite restored and newly reupholstered; they were installed in the Blue Room in late September.

Photographs were presented that showed the newly restored suite placed in the Blue Room and a

DRAFT

few in-process pictures of the gilding process of work by the gilding conservator from Baltimore, William Lewin and Company, and two assistants. The photographs for the gilding showed first the recutting the gesso on the chairs, then applying the bole to the chairs and finally Bill Lewin applying the gold leaf to the chairs. This was all done with the traditional water gilding methods again, in the same way that would have been used in 1817.

A Parisian upholsterer and art historian, who was very familiar with the historic French upholstery, was consulted and he helped us select the pattern of the fabric that we had reproduced. It was a historic pattern that would have been available in 1817 and dates from 1811. It follows what was learned from written records of what was originally on the chair with the exception that it was known the original upholstery was red or crimson for that room, but the room has been blue since 1837, and so it was determined that we would not introduce another red room to the White House, but remain with blue color for the Blue Room.

The Committee was shown a few in process upholstery photographs. These included Xavier Bonnet, the Parisian consultant, and Frank Kalista, the Baltimore upholsterer, who executed the project and was still working on the project as well as a detail images of furniture that was currently in the room. There were a total of 21 pieces of furniture, of which 20 were upholstered. So far work has been completed on nine pieces. This would continue to be a multi-year project and has been generously underwritten by the White House Historical Association. Several members of Committee expressed their approval of the work.

Ms. Bowman asked Ms. Naulin to show the photographs to Scott the ethics officer, who was so amazed to learn that, legally, American furniture had to be used in the White House. She was certain he would appreciate the story.

Actually, it was the metals which really costed more than the furniture. The furniture was blamed, but it was actually other things. This certainly contributed to the high cost and for those who think that congressional inquiries of spending and such were new, Monroe's purchasing agents were being hauled in front of Congress multiple times to testify about their expenditures. But, historically, the purchase of these French furnishings did result in the passage in 1826 of a law by Congress stating that, in as far as practicable, all furnishings for the White House should be of domestic manufacture. Ms. Naulin stated historically that was not always followed, by any means, but that was definitely the inspiration for this beautiful furniture.

IV. Other Items for Consideration

A. Tennis Pavilion

Timothy Harleth provided an informational presentation on a project planned for the South Grounds of the White House adjacent to the National Park Service maintenance facility. He presented architectural drawings and renderings of what would be the tennis pavilion which was a new construction project to be undertaken adjacent to the tennis court and replacing a current

DRAFT

outbuilding that exists for first family use. The existing tennis court was something that dated back to the Ford administration and most recently underwent some work enabling that space to be used also as a basketball court for President Barrack Obama. This project would entail demolition of the current outbuilding, which was actually a part of the NPS maintenance facility that has its history back to the end of Truman renovation. Actually, it was originally a construction shed that was left over and was taken over by the grounds staff, at which Mr. Standwich suggested it be called “adaptive reuse”.

Mr. Harleth continued with stating that they moved the lawn mowers in there when the construction workers moved out and have been there ever since. The location of the space was where the maintenance facility was located on the southwest corner of the South Grounds. That area actually was comprised of four different components: the tennis court, the maintenance facility, the Children's Garden which was introduced under the Lyndon Johnson administration, and the incredible Kitchen Garden introduced by Mrs. Michelle Obama. The aim of this project was not just constructing new buildings; it was actually to revitalize what were really four distinct areas right now without a design and scope to connect these areas. The hope would be to use this project to revitalize the Children's Garden, bring that area back into the limelight that it deserved, connecting it with the first family's space at the basketball court/tennis court and also connecting the Kitchen Garden to that space as well.

Going back to the architectural rendering Mr. Harleth described the design of the area. This building would be a first family space adjacent to the tennis court. On the front/east elevation, the door corridor took design inspiration from the house itself. The aim would be to complete this work in two different phases: the first phase to work on the court itself and the construction of this new building and the second phase would be to build a new maintenance facility for the National Park Service team.

The first phase of the project would be to slide the new building into place with the least amount of disturbance to the surrounding landscape and the current maintenance building. The second phase would be to completely demolish the maintenance facility and build a new structure for the National Park Service grounds crew.

The tennis pavilion would include a main living space like a living room, a small kitchenette, a restroom, and storage. Mr. Harleth believed the tennis court, Children's Garden and maintenance building needed some care and had been neglected for some time.

The new building would come in centerline with the tennis court in the front and connect to the Children's Garden in the back. The maintenance building would be behind the pavilion and the view from the tennis court would be blocked by planting some additional trees.

Mr. Harleth stated the plan for the building was submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for review and received unanimous approval from the board members.

The architect was Steven Spandle, he graduated from Georgia Tech University and University of Notre Dame University as well as attended the Attingham Study Program. His background was

DRAFT

classical architecture. He worked for Fairfax & Sammons, and worked with Ms. Kannalikhham on some of North Carolina projects.

The project was planned for this summer and would be completed by sometime next year.

Ms. Cooper asked if a RFP (request for proposals) were sent to various architects. Mr. Harleth responded that the design went through several designs through Mr. Spandle, under the guidance of Mrs. Trump, who gave her vision of what was wanted for the building. However, a vetted RFP program process was used for the different general contractors and vendors associated with the project.

Some discussion followed that the design looked like an orangery or a folly. Ms. Kannalikhham stated the intent of the design was to celebrate details from the White House and ensure the design did not overpower the house. The height of the building was about 18 feet, the width was about 45 feet and the square footage was approximately 1200. The roof would be constructed of cooper with a standing seam. It would be constructed of a mix of stucco and limestone accents. The rear/west elevation would include windows. The main entrance was the front/east elevation, but it could also be approached from the Children's Garden toward the north elevation, where there was a doorway.

Mr. Harleth showed some photographs of the existing conditions to illustrate the current concerns. The hope was to provide a private space to which the first family members could escape.

Ms. Cooper asked if there were any historical precedents in the garden from earlier photographs, the late 19th century garden buildings or anything that would have set any kind of tone for this building.

Ms. Bowman asked where slave quarters were located in the White House and has there been any archaeology done. She also stated it was a very sensitive subject at this time. Mr. Stanwich responded that there has been archaeology performed on the grounds, but that area was disturbed substantially during the Truman renovation. He stated he would confirm that some archaeology had been done in that location, but stated that the grounds were not subject to Section 106 and specifically exempted as noted in section 107. While section 106 process was not required at this location, National Park Service cared deeply about the protection of historic landscapes. There were some records to inform the understanding of the archaeology in this general location and the National Park Service would definitely take this raised concerns under advisement.

Ms. Bowman also raised the point that like archaeology at Monticello there was also evidence of oral histories. Mr. Harleth, Ms. Tederick and Mr. Stanwich stated there was documentation that there were slave housing on the north side of the house in Lafayette Park during the original construction, enslaved people lived in the house's basement, but the original enclosed South Grounds did not extend to the location of the tennis pavilion.

DRAFT

Ms. Bowman proposed another way to look the site by asking what historical activities might have taken place at that location and could be substantive to the narrative of the history of the White House. Ms. Cooper then raised the question who would see Children's Garden and who of the public would likely go the garden and then into the pavilion, or was it strictly for the first family. Discussion then ensued on the Children's Garden and Kitchen Garden. The Children's Garden was an area that would not be opened during the spring or fall garden tours, so it was an area strictly held in reserve for the first family. The garden was a hardscape with hand and footprints of grandchildren of the first families.

Mr. Harleth offered a tour of the garden after the meeting. Ms. Bowman concluded that the design was beautiful and understood the need for the building, but regardless whether it was a legal requirement or not, she thought the White House should follow the best practices in the museum world and how it approached the layers of history of the site. She was hopeful archaeology has been done, but thinks there were some sensitivities to be considered.

The subject of the budget was raised even though it was not purview of the committee. Mr. Harleth stated the building would be funded through private donations under a new partnership with an organization called Trust for the National Mall, which has done great work with the National Park Service and recently had their master fundraising agreement amended to incorporate the White House and the President's Park. He hoped this would be the start of a very new partnership to look at the larger vision of the White House and not just the mansion or the State Floor, but also Lafayette Park, President's Park South, E Street, a new visitors experience and entry to the house. Speaking from his own personal experience, before assuming his current position, he had never been in the White House and the closest he ever got was standing on Pennsylvania Avenue. Looking the current condition right now, it was not representative of where we need to be. He was optimistic that this partnership established with the Trust for the National Mall over the next decades would get us where we need to be.

B. Rose Garden

Timothy Harleth put forward for discussion and consideration a project about the Rose Garden. He explained there were some issues with maintaining the current landscape. The first was the threat of boxwood blight which was becoming a lot more susceptible to this area in the United States. In addition to the boxwood blight, there were issues with the crabapple trees, the Catherine crabapples, which dated back to the Rachel "Bunny" Lambert Mellon design in the early 1960s with the John F. Kennedy administration. The disease of those crabapple trees actually required weekly pesticide spraying, and already had a number of trees have failed. There were ongoing issues with leafminer larvae growing as a result of poor drainage in the Rose Garden, and there were limitations on how often pesticides can be used, given the amount of events that were held in the Rose Garden.

Mr. Harleth proposed that this group form a new subcommittee to specifically look at landscaping and specifically look at the Rose Garden to determine if a renewal of that space can be recommended. A report would be drafted and presented using the services of an architectural landscaper with the advice of this group to present to the first lady a solution to some of these

DRAFT

issues. These issues again were poor drainage, insufficient irrigation system, and then if there should be new plantings and/or a new planting plan, what would that look like? It was also important that this achieved in manner that was respectful of the history of the Rose Garden.

It was his hope that in addition to the current members of the Committee, landscape advisors would be consulted to serve on this subcommittee. Beside National Park Service, possibly an expert in the field from perhaps Monticello, the National Arboretum, or the United States Botanical Garden could serve on the subcommittee and provide the best advice to move forward.

Ms. Bowman suggested including someone from Rachel "Bunny" Lambert Mellon's foundation, the Oak Spring Garden Foundation. It would be appropriate to ask the foundation for advice. Ms. Cooper thought that was an excellent idea, but emphasized with the environment changing there were new insect infestations as well as horticulturists have developed stronger strains for plants such as elm trees. Things would only get worse, especially the drainage issue. Mr. Nylander pointed out that the drainage issue was a civil engineer's matter, one had to tread carefully. The Rose Garden was frequently referenced in the news and events; and it was such an iconic space. Mr. Wilmerding stressed that changes to the garden would make the news. Ms. Cooper believed in many ways, it would still be the Rose Garden, unless roses were removed, which she did not believe would be considered.

Mr. Harleth raised the point that there actually may be the introduction of more roses, at least the current quantity would be retained, but he felt we could do better. He strongly believed some thought and effort was necessary because of the publicity and the iconic nature of that space to ensure everything was done correctly. Ms. Cooper pointed out this was more for posterity and not for the public's enjoyment of the space. Mr. Harleth responded that the space was definitely part of the West Wing tours and the space was seen during events in the garden such as press conferences. Mr. Vela stressed that the project was looking to identify sustainable practices. While the garden's ambiance and historic character would be maintained so that it would be enjoyed for future generations, it would be cared for and treated in a manner that was effective, so sustainability was another key objective for the committee.

Ms. Cooper responded that it should be recognized that there was nothing that was ever kind of carefree if one was trying to cut down on maintenance. Mr. Vela agreed and asked the question what were the current practices that need to be reconsidered in order to maintain what visitors expected for this historic landscape. Ms. Cooper added that if spun that way there should also be mention that things changed: plants changed, insects changed, environment changed, climate changed and everything changed.

Ms. Bowman pointed out that Mrs. Mellon updated the garden from its previous design, so the design evolved. Mr. Harleth stressed that if the right people were brought together for this project, since this was the country's house and this was the country's Rose Garden, to advise not only just replacement of the trees but some actual thought into what the replacement would be. Ms. Cooper reminded the committee that early this month the White House Historical Association presented a symposium, the White House Garden. Mr. McLaurin said that C-SPAN would be airing the entire proceedings and he would send that link to the group.

DRAFT

Ms. Bowman recommended that once the subcommittee was organized with advisors, the values be identified. Drawing from her experience at Monticello with a recent project that revived the agriculture, they started with the values and vision that were the approach to the historic spaces which helped formulate a through line of what things were not going to be considered and what was the role of it. It would be important to identify the underlying principles that would be honored. Mr. Vela added that this would also provide transparency and was always a good thing in Government.

Mr. Vela called on Leslie Greene Bowman, who had a motion to form a new subcommittee called landscape design, and tasked to specifically look at the Rose Garden to determine if a renewal of that space could be recommended. Mr. Wilmerding seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

C. East Room Floor Replacement

Timothy Harleth introduced the project that would take place in the East Room in August. Part of the work entailed the replacement of the floor, which would be a full replacement and not a refinish job.

The replacement would in kind with the existing Versailles pattern of American oak. The need for the replacement was driven by some structural issues from the previously installed floor. There were weaknesses in the subfloor that when walked upon, specifically if wearing heels, the heels could penetrate sections of the floor and the individual would be stuck. The Residence staff worked closely with Ms. Kannalikhham, and prepared a RFP (request for proposals) that was sent to several vendors to find a solution with this problem, it was determined that a subfloor would be created and constructed under the new flooring that would be installed. This has provided an opportunity to look at the existing floor finish and identify what was the best finish. There were color changes also for consideration. During the next month finish samples would be shipped to all members. The samples would include the existing finish condition and new color and finish samples. The hope was to get something with a more of a warmer feel to it.

Ms. Bowman and Mr. Nylander asked about the history of the current flooring. Mr. Harleth replied the flooring was not original and was replaced every 30 years or so. The most recent flooring was replaced during the George H. Bush administration (1989-1993) and prior to that in the 1970's. Ms. Bowman asked what would happen to the existing flooring. Ms. Tederick said it would not become souvenirs. Mr. Harleth stated sections would be saved as architectural samples and sent to curatorial storage. What was not kept would be properly destroyed. Ms. Bowman stated this was a concern at Monticello, especially with recognizable architectural elements that periodically needed to be replaced, and the staff was very careful with such matters.

D. Curatorial Storage Area

Donna Smith provided background on the curatorial storage area that was currently undergoing a major renovation as she presented some photographs to the Committee. What started out as a refresh of specific cabinets and shelving in the room became a complete renovation from floor to ceiling when the chief usher suggested the Curator's Office developed with ideas to improve this space, which had not been renovated since the early 1980's. There were still "No Smoking" signs, probably made by the calligraphy office, posted in the rooms from that time period when smoking was actually allowed in the White House. The chief usher's directive was that space was to be aesthetically and functionally pleasing so that he would feel comfortable leading the first lady and visitors into that space.

The support for the renovation was to improve space utilization, be aesthetically pleasing for visitors but functional for curatorial staff, and to have advanced technologies to improve overall collections management. AAM [American Alliance of Museums] via accreditation was scheduled to happen again in 2023, so this would be a very nice feather in our caps. It was also an opportunity to examine each object for condition and photograph them, and to have a space designed for a current state-of-the-art storage for a growing collection. Colleagues from the Holocaust Museum and the Colonial Williamsburg graciously invited our staff to tour their recently renovated storage spaces, which was very helpful to assess the needs for our project.

During the past three weeks, the room was emptied of approximately 1400 objects. Almost all of the objects received specialty packing with transit frames, and custom boxes and crates that were transported to our off-site storage facility for temporary and long-term storage until next spring. There were 256 framed works of paintings and prints; 287 pieces of glassware, many of them from the Abraham Lincoln service; numerous looking glasses and mirrors; ceramics; table lamps and other lighting fixtures; photographs; sculpture pieces such as the incredibly fragile Boehm birds; Crèche figures; and furniture including the bill-signing table, eagle podium, and spare Oval Office armchair just in case the ones currently in the office become soiled or damaged. Some of the objects, like the very ornate looking glasses, frames and Boehm birds, took up a great deal of footprint in the room, and they were never been transported to the off-site support facility because of their extreme fragility.

Mr. Wilmerding asked if there were general guidelines for what was stored in the location versus the large off-site storage facility. Ms. Smith responded with china and glassware services, a percentage was stored here and a percentage off-site in the event something happened either here or there. Most furniture not being used including property collection furniture was stored there. The facility was very crowded, but that was what was determined. Some objects were stored here just because of issues of concerns with packing and transporting objects safely.

The architectural firm, Architrave Architects, was hired to design the new space and worked with other vendors such as O'Brien Systems who assisted with improved space utilization ideas for new cabinets, compact shelving, open shelving, and painting racks. New flooring and lighting would be selected. It was also our plan to improve environmental monitoring with a wireless data logging system. Through the generosity of the White House Historical Association and support of the White House chief usher, the room would be completely emptied this week and

DRAFT

demolition would start soon to include asbestos abatement in the coming weeks. This wonderful opportunity has allowed and/or forced the cleaning out of the storage, the addressing of some problems, and the updating assessments for each object, as well as the performing the annual inventory at the same time.

When the project would be completed and the space reorganized, objects that are deemed necessary to be onsite would be returned. On the labels for each crate or storage were images of the objects. Ms. Pisha established a red star system, identifying which objects would be returned after the project. Cross Museum Services, based in D.C., was the firm hired that assisted the packing. They have been amazing, six workers came each day to assist. After a good quantity of objects were packed, the NPS truck were scheduled to pick up the objects. The Cross staff assisted with loading and unloading the trucks as well as assisting the off-site support staff with organizing the packed objects. The process has worked well and the off-site support facility staff, which was short staffed, appreciated the assistance. There were relatively few staff there and to have hundreds of objects to be moved in such a short time period was just as overwhelming there as was packing here on site.

Ms. Smith showed some photographs of the Cross Museum staff at work. Images included packing a candlestick with prisms and how to assess the best packing options, in this case each glass prism was individually wrapped and secured with artist's tape; the packed candlestick in the box; some action photographs that showed condition reporting the objects; tracking the objects; and labeling the boxes with a number. In addition transmittal receipts were prepared that listed every single object so that the off-site storage collection manager would double check and confirm what was received.

In another grouping of photographs were images of the existing visual storage cabinets that were retained and stored the Lincoln glassware and some ceramics. The six cabinets, including visual storage cabinets that were still in good condition, were incorporated by O'Brien Systems into a compact shelving unit design. At a future meeting the committee would be shown the finished room.

Various members praised the curatorial staff for their hard work, especially after learning how little planning time was provided and while on the staff performed their usual daily responsibilities. Questions were asked about the planning. A plan had already been developed by Kevin O'Brien for the new shelving, tubs and cabinets. There was also a plan to replace the painting screen, the existing ones were 30 years old. In the 1990's O'Brien designed a packing room area within the existing space and there was a customized packing table constructed that greatly assisted with observing the objects for the condition reports. Also in the space was a holding room with large and noisy air handler units that was part of the plan to be replaced and reduced their footprint. The air handler would now only be the size of a refrigerator. The newly available space provided additional painting racks. The painting screens selected would be the same type used by the National Gallery of Art. There were plans to add a wireless data logger system for the environmental monitoring and perhaps a card reader system for controlled access.

The original plan was to have one year for planning, but priorities were changed because of a project in the space above, which would impact this storage space and required the emptying of

DRAFT

the curatorial storage room sooner than anticipated. Mr. Harleth stated this was a once in a 30 year endeavor and thanked the Mr. MacLaurin and White House Historical Association for their financial support for this project.

E. Subcommittees

Chair Vela asked the members to turn their attention to this body's subcommittees. The members received a summary of the purposes and activities of the subcommittees in your pre-meeting materials. Sign-up sheets were circulated to the member, and they were asked to sign up for those subcommittees in which they have an interest. It was possible to serve on one or all of the subcommittees of their choosing, including the new landscape design subcommittee.

Mr. Vela also stated that he understood that over the years, the Committee has usually met on a semi-annual basis. Since the current meeting was in the spring, he proposed that should there be the need for another meeting this year that the Committee consider Monday, December 9, 2019, as a potential date to convene.

Mr. Nylander asked that the proposed date be sent out in an email as a follow-up. Mr. Wilmerding asked if there was any alternative dates to ensure there would be enough people could attend. Mr. Stanwich stated December 9 was the date flagged. Mr. Vela agreed it was necessary to have a quorum.

Ms. Bowman asked, given the small size of the committee was if it possible to combine the design and decorative arts committees since they overlap. Mr. Wilmerding stated there were two groups of concerns: one was the fine arts: the paintings, sculptures, et cetera; and the other was the decorative arts. As he recalled often the agendas and even materials for review were circulated to all members to commend on if they wanted so we worked as a committee as a whole. He believed it seem that was a better focus since the committee was a small group. Ms. Cooper added that often time the decorative arts was dealing with furniture, textiles and the designs and coordination in the room. Mr. Nylander stated the design was how the objects fit in the rooms. Ms. Bowman raised the point there was now the landscape design subcommittee.

Mr. Vela asked if Mr. Stanwich if a motion was necessary and he responded considering the legacy nature of those committees to would be prudent. He informed the committee that the charter definitely mentions subcommittees, but did not specifically name them. Mr. Vela asked for a motion, Leslie Greene Bowman motioned that the decorative arts and design subcommittees would be combined into one committee. John Wilmerding seconded the motion. It carried unanimously and the new subcommittee was named Decorative Arts and Design. **VERIFY NAME.**

The current subcommittees were now: Decorative Arts and Design, Fine Arts, and Landscape Design.

V. New Business

Chair Vela asked if members had any new business.

A. Italian Furniture in the Cross Hall

Wendy Cooper raised the issue, not as a new project but just as a question, because she remembered periodically that there were discussions about the Cross Hall and the furnishings in this corridor space between the State Dining Room and the East Room that were loaned from the Philadelphia Museum of Art (PMA). She recalled it was a suite of French furniture that visitors sat on, was in worn condition, and if the suite was returned each piece would need to be re-gilded first. Since this was a prominent space both to the public as well as when the president and/or the first lady come through into the East Room, et cetera, it was viewed and was visible, and she wondered what the thoughts were on that?

Ms. Tederick asked Ms. Naulin to discuss the Monroe tables. Ms. Naulin first recounted the history of the suite, which was a loan from 1972, when then White House curator Clem Conger thought the suite had a connection to President James Monroe. She strongly believed that the connection was pretty dubious to the point it was no longer accepted. She pointed out that the furniture was actually an Italian suite, and kind of a mix from two different sets. It certainly had a long presence in that corridor. Currently it was in a much degraded condition, needing both gilding and upholstery. Options were limited in terms of what can be done with it. Any work in the past has gone through PMA, but that was frustrating. The PMA had not shown much interest in it. There have been effort to get them to donate it or offers made to purchase it from them many years ago, the decision at the time was that because of the circumstances of how PMA acquired it, they do not want to pursue either option.

Ms. Naulin's personal perspective was that the furniture should be returned, and a plan developed on how to do that since the loan has been for many years now and the suite was much degraded. It would need to be determined with the PMA on what our responsibilities were in terms of what condition we would return it in. When the loan started the suite was not in a good state and it was re-gilded immediately after coming here at our expense. Anyway, there were many issues with that in terms of a substitute and different things.

On a related matter the Curator's Office has been pursuing, with NPS furniture conservator John Courtney, the conservation of a marble pier table, or console table, which was believed to date from the Monroe period.

It was either a set of originally two or four tables. It had been crated for many years, and it was not sure what exactly existed. It was uncertain if there was even a complete table. John Courtney uncrated it and examined the table. It turned out that only one side portion needed to be replicated in order to make the table complete. There was a possibility of using that table after was restored. There have also been discussions about potentially commissioning a reproduction to make two.

DRAFT

In the terms of seated furniture, again, there have been a few discussions about possibly using furniture that was originally provided in 1902 for the Blue Room. More recently the possibility has been raised of even introducing the King chairs back into that space now that there were four chairs. This was the current background of the discussion without any decisions being made. Ms. Naulin agreed with Ms. Cooper's point that it was something that was put off for a long time and it sorely needed to be addressed.

Mr. Wilmerding recommended that depending on future business, this topic might be an agenda item. He also suggested to get some focus on it, which also gives not only a timetable, but something to aim for and really to come to grips with it. Mr. Nylander proposed that this matter was a good project for the new subcommittee on design and decorative arts or decorative arts and design.

Ms. Cooper suggested that since visitors sat on the furniture in that corridor, perhaps there should be some consideration for the reproduction of two or four of the King sofas, mixed with the armchairs because they were sturdy construction. Ms. Naulin concurred stating the King suite were well-built pieces that did survive use in the White House from 1829 to 1873. She also believed that in terms of the form they were excellent, solid forms that could serve very well in that space.

Ms. Kannalikhham asked if any cost estimates had been obtained for the proposed reproductions for the Cross Hall furniture, both seated furniture and tables. Ms. Tederick stated no the Committee has not made any plans yet. Mr. Wilmerding asked if there any furniture in storage that could be considered as an alternative for purchasing reproductions.

B. Old Family Dining Room

Ms. Cooper inquired why the old Family Dining Room was taken off the agenda. Ms. Tederick replied that there were no plans formulated to present to the Committee or the subcommittee yet.

Mr. Wilmerding inquired if there was any change to room. Ms. Tederick replied that the modern art was still in place and it was still a showcase for modern design. Ms. Cooper and Mr. Wilmerding both asked if the room was still shown to visitors. Ms. Tederick said it was on occasion, but there were some U.S. Secret Service staff concerns, so the room was closed occasionally. Discussion then ensued that room was never meant to be on view at all times since the space was required to serve as a pantry from time to time, especially in December for holiday events.

V. Adjournment

Before concluding the meeting, Chair Velva asked the Committee's appreciation be extended to Mrs. Trump for hospitality allowing the Committee to meet at the White House and to Timothy

DRAFT

Harleth, Lydia Tederick and the curator's office staff for facilitating a tour. Members also extended their appreciation to the staff for their amazing hard work and achievements since the last Committee meeting.

Chair Velva asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Nylander motioned for the meeting to adjourn, Mr. Wilmerding seconded the motion, and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12 p.m. (Noon)

Respectfully Submitted
John Stanwich
Executive Secretary

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 9, 2019 MEETING

OF THE

COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

At 10:00 a.m. the committee was called to order by Chair David Vela in the Family Theater of the White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members present were: Chair David Vela, Wendy Cooper, Tham Kannalikhram, Thomas Luebke, Richard Nylander, John Wilmerding, Timothy Harleth, Lydia Tederick, and Executive Secretary John Stanwich.

Members not present were Leslie Greene Bowman, Lonnie Bunch, Kaywin Feldman, Rusty Powell, and First Lady Melania Trump.

Other parties in attendance:

Deputy Chief Usher of the Executive Residence Katie Hinson was present.

Office of the Curator staff members present were: Donna Hayashi Smith, Melissa Naulin, and Nicolette Pisha.

President of the White House Historical Association Stewart McLaurin was present.

President and CEO of the Trust for the National Mall Catherine Townsend and Executive Vice President Teresa Durkin were present.

Oehme, van Sweden staff present were: Principals Chief Executive Officer Lisa Delplace and Vice President Eric Groft, FASLA; Project Manager and Designer Lili Herrera; Designer Rachel Heslop; and Denton Williams.

I. Opening

A. Welcome

Chair David Vela convened the meeting and welcomed members of the Committee for the Preservation of the White House.

Mr. Vela explained that the National Park Service (NPS) has been the steward of the White House since 1933, some 86 years ago, and the White House has been part of the National Park System for 58 years since 1961. He mentioned that 1961 was a pivotal year, with the creation of the Office of the Curator and the White House Historical Association as an NPS cooperating association.

Mr. Vela announced that as a nation, we are preparing for some very critical milestone commemorations. Two examples are the 100th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution on August 26, 2020; and 250th of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 2026.

The National Park Service is involved in leading several events and programs related to these anniversaries for the 19th Amendment and the Declaration of Independence.

1. NPS Commemoration Guiding Principles

For the commemoration of the Declaration of Independence, NPS has created some infrastructure and six specific guiding principles to help lead programming, especially for the American Revolutionary War sites. The first is to focus on access, accessibility, and universal design principles that will be infused throughout NPS planning, execution, and evaluation of all products and deliverables. NPS will enhance its ability to not only embrace the nation but embrace the world as it comes to the United States and our national park units to learn about the Declaration of Independence.

The second principle will be to ensure NPS is complete in the origins and history of what took place 250 years ago, specifically to tell stories that have yet to be told. NPS has learned much from recent commemorations of the American Civil War, War of 1812, the Civil Rights milestone, and now the 19th Amendment. These best practices will be incorporated into the 250th anniversary.

Maximizing NPS's digital footprint will be the third principle. NPS wants to ensure that all communities, but especially younger communities and millennials, are engaged. NPS will maximize our programming for digital presence in Revolutionary War sites as we discuss the 250th anniversary.

A fourth principle is the ongoing desire to ensure the NPS workforce reflects the face of America, and it is incumbent upon NPS to ensure we reflect all the different cultures that were involved in the founding of our nation, as well as helping us to create a more perfect union. Our ability to provide information and programming reflecting these cultures is dependent upon our workforce reflecting that as well. NPS is committed to ensure this will happen.

Another principle is to examine and address our commitment to diversity inclusion, separate and aside from our workforce interest. We want to ensure the National Park Service is not only relevant to every American, but the 250th anniversary especially becomes relevant in the lives of our youth. For example, as part of the Civil War commemoration, NPS produced publications that focused on Hispanics in the Civil War, women in the Civil War, the slavery cause and catalyst of the Civil War, Asian Americans in the Civil War, and Native Americans in the Civil War—stories that NPS had not talked about previously. NPS sent these publications and posters to schools that reflected these student populations, especially the Native Americans. So maybe for the first time, as students studied the Civil War, they could find a story that they could relate to and maybe for the first time in their lives the Civil War would become relevant because they can make a connection with their ancestors. NPS wants to follow the same model with the 250th.

2. Partnerships

Mr. Vela wants to ensure that the NPS values and practices reflect our partnership culture, and we want to maximize the relationships we have with our stakeholders and partners, but also take that to another level. How can we leverage capacity? How can we leverage philanthropic efforts to generate products regarding the 250th?

Mr. Vela concluded that if the committee was interested, he would provide specific examples of these principles at future meetings. He would also like this committee to think about the role it could play, but more importantly the special place the White House could play in the 250th story. Recognizing that committee members represent different and very important value-added partner constituencies, NPS would welcome the opportunity to meet individually and/or collectively to get members' thoughts, perspectives on their thoughts, and how to leverage capacity with the National Park Service.

Ms. Cooper inquired if NPS has reached out to partners with museums like the Museum of the American Revolution in Philadelphia. Mr. Vela responded yes that he has met with those partners. He added that there is so much synergy out there when you think about what the States are doing and there is Congressional interest as well. NPS has created an internal advisory committee with a national coordinator.

Ms. Cooper also raised the point about providing the story from the perspective of those who were fighting us and mentioned that the Museum of the American Revolution had recently done a compelling exhibition of the story of an Irish soldier fighting for the British.

Mr. Vela stressed that the American Revolutionary War is a very important focus in the forming of our nation. Who helped form it? How is it still evolving? There are so many

major themes and sub-themes. One of his recent conversations with Timothy Harleth was the connection between Federal Hall in New York, with the inauguration of our first president, and the special place of the White House. What are the synergies? What are the opportunities? There are so many examples and NPS wants to have conversations with everyone as we talk about the move forward.

B. Introductions

Chair Vela introduced new committee member Mr. Thomas Luebke, who has served since 2005 as the Secretary of U.S. Commission of Fine Arts, the federal design review agency for the nation's capital.

Mr. Vela then asked that members and visitors present at the meeting to each introduce themselves. Mr. Vela reported that Leslie Green Bowman, Lonnie Bunch, Kaywin Feldman, Rusty Powell and First Lady Melania Trump were unable to attend because of previous commitments.

C. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Chair Vela asked for the approval of the minutes for the May 20, 2019 meeting, or if there were any corrections?

Mr. Nylander stated that on page 16 Cooper should be copper for the reference to a roofing material.

Ms. Cooper stated that on page 5 she recused herself from voting without an explanation. She asked if she should have given an explanation? She is close friends with Conover Hunt, who brought the chair to the attention of the White House.

Executive Secretary Stanwich thought it was not necessary, but if she did want to provide an explanation it would be fine.

Ms. Cooper requested a change be made on page 5, "Ms. Cooper asked if an original show cover was found for the chair." She had asked if any evidence of an original show cover was found on the chair like tiny little fragments.

Ms. Cooper also asked that on that same page 5, "Ms. Cooper commented that it would be a shame to separate the plaque from the chair." Chair cushion should be chair.

With no other corrections, Mr. Vela asked for a motion to approve the minutes as correct. Mr. Wilmerding made a motion and Ms. Cooper seconded the motion. The motion was

approved.

II. Acquisitions

A. William King Armchair

Ms. Tederick provided some follow-up information about the William King armchair that was approved for acquisition by the committee, thanks to the generosity of the White House Historical Association.

The chair was delivered to the off-site storage facility in late July and is currently in the conservation lab. Ms. Tederick displayed three photographs. The first was the chair when it was still in the conservation lab at Colonial Williamsburg. The other two images were recently taken at the off-site storage facility and showed the chair without the leather upholstery.

Ms. Tederick reported that NPS furniture conservator John Courtney was able to compare the finishes on all chairs and would propose a plan on how best to proceed with refinishing the King acquisition. Two William King armchairs that are normally on view in the Library but have been removed to protect them during the Christmas season, and a third chair in the collection currently stored at the storage facility.

Ms. Cooper pointed out that the boxed-out horse-hair stuffing upholstery form, called the “cake” on the back of the chair, is original. It is good documentation of what was done in terms of upholstery, boxing it out.

Ms. Naulin stated they were happy to see that the back panel on the new chair matched up with other King chairs in terms of the paneling, holes and everything inside it once the outer upholstery was removed.

Mr. Luebke inquired if the finish of the wood on the new chair changed dramatically? It looked different in all the photographs, or is it just the lighting? It looks like a golden finish.

Ms. Naulin responded that the finish has not been touched. She thought originally it would have been a darker finish, and what is shown currently is more of the finish being lightened or bleached from light exposure. She also indicated that the other chairs in the collection do not have original finish but will most likely be harmonized so the finish matches on all of them, and the chairs could potentially be used together.

Ms. Cooper asked if John Courtney is doing minuscule finish samples and looking at them microscopically to see, with the other chairs in the collection, what layers there are. Ms.

Naulin confirmed that there will be investigations.

B. Caroline Scott Harrison Watercolor Painting of Wild Roses

Ms. Tederick stated the committee approved the acquisition of a painting by First Lady Caroline Scott Harrison at the last meeting. The painting was offered to the White House as a gift by the Maryland State Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. After the last meeting the curator's office contacted their representative about this committee's interest in acquiring the painting for the White House collection, and while the society was excited about the approval, they found that they needed to modify their deaccessioning bylaws. That has not yet been completed.

C. Zuber Scenic Wallpaper in the President's Dining Room

Ms. Tederick reported at the last meeting, that the committee's advice was sought about whether to purchase a new printing of the Zuber scenic paper, The American War of Independence. The committee approved this purchase. After the meeting the curator's office began working with paper conservators at Studio TKM Associates, and paper installer, Robert Kelly, to finalize the amount of paper that would safely be required for installation in the second-floor dining room. Mr. Kelly recommended the purchase of two full sets of the wallpaper plus one extra scene to have on hand not only for the installation but for any future repairs that might need to be made. Zuber was happy to comply; they would be willing to break up a set, in order to give the extra scene. However, the cost for this purchase was higher than what the White House Historical Association anticipated. The board will determine whether they will be willing to fund this purchase.

Mr. Harleth mentioned the importance of getting one of the original panels conserved and finding an institution to be able to showcase the wallpaper. Perhaps, the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History, since they already have a White House section with presidential china on display. Since it is displayed in the dining room of the first family, it might be a good connection there. He also emphasized this was a request of the first lady so the public would have an opportunity to see something normally not that accessible.

Mr. Nylander inquired if there was a panel in the exhibition at the visitor center, or any thought that there ever would be? A panel is not currently displayed, but several members thought it would be a good place for exhibition.

D. Horace Townsend Tidd Design Sketches for Lincoln White House

Ms. Naulin reported about a potential new acquisition—three sketches by Horace Townsend Tidd with some supplementary family records that provide the history of Tidd.

Showing images of the sketches and documents, Ms. Naulin provided the background of the sketches. It was believed Tidd was working for William H. Carryl & Bro. of Philadelphia, which was a decorating house that Mrs. Mary Lincoln was very fond of patronizing when she was refurbishing the White House in the early 1860s. These are sketches that have been known to the curator's office for about ten years now, and former curator Bill Allman was able to do some research on them.

1. Description and Background of the Sketches

The first sketch showed a cornice that Bill Allman was able to document. It is a cornice that was installed in the East Room of the White House during the Abraham Lincoln administration. It is those cornices that were provided by Carryl and we believe that these were the design drawings for the work executed.

Photography during that period is limited and it was difficult to see all the details of the drapery design in surviving photographs. The design is very close and from what was seen in the photographs, perhaps the sides or bows that were originally part of the design did not get executed. Other features such as the shield tiebacks are clearly visible in the photographs.

The second design sketch very much looks like it was done for the White House in terms of the shields and the eagle. It looks like it was done for one of the oval rooms, probably the Blue Room. From examining historic photographs, the curator's office cannot see evidence that those designs were instituted. There is evidence that the cornices installed in the 1850s were still in place in the 1880s. Therefore, it is thought that this was a possible design proposal that was not executed, or it is possible that it may have been done for the second-floor oval room. The earliest known images for that room are not until the Andrew Johnson Administration, just after Abraham Lincoln, and those do not show this design in place.

Ms. Naulin summarized that there are a lot of questions, but that one sketch can be connected to the Lincoln White House. The smaller sketches show detailed drawings of drapery designs; they are not thought to be connected to the White House so far, but she has not been able to prove that.

One sketch is dated 1856. It looks like something that potentially could have been done for the Green Room or the Red Room, but again is not definite because the sketch does not quite match up with the architectural layout of those two rooms. There were attempts to try to identify a White House connection for the other drapery sketches, but so far, a connection

has not been found.

Ms. Naulin then showed some historic images to illustrate how they were able to identify that at least one of the three sketches was indeed instituted at the White House. This first image shown was published in 1866. It was an engraving and it was not done exactly right, but it shows the general concept of the curved cornice and the shield that is also shown in the sketch. Then a photograph dating from right after the Abraham Lincoln administration, during the Andrew Johnson administration was shown. Visible in the photograph was the swagging of the center draperies and the tassels which seem to align with the design. In another photograph, the scroll brackets were visible along the edges. Also shown in the room were the King chairs and a sofa.

Ms. Naulin stressed they felt confident that the design was for the White House and that it was largely instituted in terms of the draperies. They were just not completely sure of how it was instituted.

Ms. Naulin then provided some background provenance. Ten years ago, the family that owns these sketches (descendants of Horace Tidd) contacted the White House. At that time Bill Allman tried to see if they were able to donate them. The family was not in a position to do so; they have since consigned them with the Abraham Lincoln Book Shop out of Chicago, Illinois, that focuses on Lincoln associated objects. Daniel Weinberg is the owner, and he originally put a market value of \$25,000 on these sketches. They were offered to us a few years ago at \$18,000, and it was felt that we could not pursue them at that price. We were recently contacted again and made an offer of \$11,000. That is the proposed cost of these sketches now.

2. Discussion

Several committee members raised questions about ownership, the consignment, and the offer of \$11,000. It was expressed that the dollar amount was very reasonable for something of this importance.

Ms. Naulin recounted the history of the interaction with the family ten years ago. The family was requested to inform us if they planned to bring the sketches up for sale. The feeling is that if the sketches were to come up for sale at the reasonable \$11,000 price then we would pursue them rather than at the \$18,000 price.

As one comparison, Ms. Naulin informed the committee that many years ago sketches of furniture that were manufactured by A. H. Davenport for the White House were purchased at auction. There were about 40 drawings purchased for \$150,000.

Also, just in term of firsts as far it is known, there are no other known design sketches that survive for anything in the Lincoln White House. Certainly, the Lincoln connection gives

the sketches an interest in value that is beyond, say, if they had been produced for another administration.

Therefore, it was brought to the committee because it was at the point where there was a reasonable offer, and the curator's office wanted input on whether the committee also felt it was a reasonable acquisition that should be pursued. A request for funding would be made from the White House Historical Association, although that has not been guaranteed. Ms. Cooper agreed that the curator's office would like the sketches for the collection because they are important.

Ms. Naulin responded these sketches were wanted for ten years, but again, did not feel that the original offer was appropriate. The main sketch, the one that has the East Room drawing, is in very good condition. It measures three feet long, which you do not quite get the sense of from the photographs. The drawings are on rice paper, so they are delicate, but again, that one is in incredibly good condition and much better than the other two sketches.

The curator's office believes the large drawing is exhibitable. It is also significant because the drawing is about the East Room, one of the important rooms here in the White House.

It is also valuable to capture some of these design details because some information was not captured in the photograph of that time period. The period photography cannot provide all details such as the trim, the cording, and the roping. These sketches obviously are very well fleshed out designs that provide much additional information.

Mr. Wilmerding interjected that as America enjoys seeing all that, the price is perfectly reasonable, and the sketches are important. He suggested offering \$10,000, with a backup of going to \$11,000, if the owners balk.

Mr. Naulin replied that Mr. Weinberg did inform them that he thought the family, who had been trying to sell these sketches for several years now, would be open to a reasonable offer. She thought that possibly offering \$10,000 was a good compromise.

Mr. Wilmerding added that there are not that many other institutions that would want the sketches or need them, so the White House is the obvious repository. He recommended striking a deal that both sides like.

Ms. Cooper remarked we would not want to be stingy just because you need to look at who gets a cut. The family is getting the bulk, but also the seller is taking probably 15 or 20 percent or maybe even 25 percent; and they were kind enough to really come to you. She made a motion to purchase the sketches at \$11,000.

Ms. Harleth seconded the motion. He believed a funding source could be found because it is an important acquisition.

Mr. Luebke added that the visual evidence is incredible. He wished that there was receipts or a bill of sale and questioned if commercial records survived?

Ms. Naulin stated there is evidence of buying cornices from Carryl in this period that we think were for the East Room. What cannot seem to be located are the records for buying the actual draperies from Carryl.

But again, many objects were purchased from Carryl, including the whole Lincoln bedroom suite. There is documentation that Carryl was a known vendor to the White House and right now it seems like it is just a gap in the documentation, however, the photographic evidence is clear.

Several members commented that the evidence is compelling and raised the point that with more institutions uploading information about their collections online perhaps some new information can be learned. Perhaps either Tidd's records or accounts are in Philadelphia or Carryl's could be somewhere; they just are buried for the time being in the backlog and have not yet been placed online. It was acknowledged that there is still more research to be done.

With having the motion to purchase and a second in place, Mr. Vela asked for an all-in favor signify by saying aye. The motion carried with no oppositions.

II. Project Reports

A. East Room

Ms. Tederick recounted that at the last meeting there was discussion about the East Room floor replacement during the summer project window. Each committee member had received samples of flooring showing the different finishes that were being considered. Slides were shown of the completed work.

The project was completed in just about a one-month period. The room was emptied beginning July 22, and it was cleaned and prepared for reinstallation by August 17.

1. Drapery Fabric Refurbishment and Conservation of Light Standards

As part of this project, the seven gilded 1902 window cornices were temporarily removed and reinforced for attachment. They were sealed with plastic and were left in the room during the flooring project. Once the flooring was installed and the plastic was removed, museum technicians from Cross Museum Services carefully dusted the surfaces of the cornices and the four gilded 1952 mirrors. The valances were also vacuumed.

During this work the window drapery panels were sent to J. Edlin Interiors in New York for repair so that the drapery would be refreshed to give them a longer life span. The edges and hems were readjusted to hide worn fabric and then the panels were relined. Edlins staff reinstalled the drapery panels and undercurtains with new traverse rods beginning August 19.

As part of the de-installation of the room, the four 1902 light standards had to be disassembled and removed. Objects conservators Jane Norman and Catharine Valentour examined the standards and cleaned the metal surfaces.

2. Floor Replacement

Mr. Harleth provided additional background information about the floor replacement while showing slides. When the project started, it was realized that while the initial intent was to only add a new subfloor and replace the East Room floor, as the floor was removed, the sleepers were being removed as well. The company had to ad hoc, fabricate new sleepers onsite, and go right down to the concrete beneath the floor. They replicated the same installation pattern and a process that they saw from the Truman Renovation. They strung wires down the length of the room to level the floor because those sleepers were just a foot or two long.

Mr. Harleth acknowledged that the flooring selection the committee made on the revised color looked stunning. It was an incredible project and in addition to the fantastic work that Ms. Tederick and the curators did, it was a tremendous restoration of one of the most important rooms of the house.

Mr. Nylander inquired about the lifespan of the new floor and how many replacements since 1950. Mr. Harleth replied that there is a commitment from the vendor for at least 20 years, but the previous floors' lifespans were about 20 to 30 years. Given how strong this new floor is, the addition of the plywood subfloor and the thickness of the new East Room floor, it is possible that it will get probably 40 to 50 years. There were replacements in the 1970s, the late 1970s, and 2004.

Mr. Harleth also reported that the first lady requested an effort be extended to help educate the public on the incredible work the conservators and the Residence team did in restoring the East Room. For about a month after the installation, there was a temporary exhibit on display that showcased the importance of the East Room and explained the specifics about the restoration efforts undertaken in August.

The exhibit display was comprised of three large tables with white panels that can be removed and replaced with new information. The display was set up in the meeting space for the committee to review at their leisure.

B. Bellangé Blue Room Furniture

Ms. Naulin provided a brief update on the continuing project to restore the Bellangé Blue Room furniture suite. She showed some before and after photographs of the recently conserved fire screen, which was re-gilded and re-upholstered. This fire screen, for those who were not on the committee back in 2012, is something that was purchased then with the committee's support. It was the first piece believed to be from the Blue Room suite to come up for auction since the late 1970s.

The recent conservation work was completed in mid-November, but not introduced into the room until early January, after the holidays. This is the last unique form that will be placed in the room. The curator's office is excited about this addition to the room.

The remaining pieces of furniture for the room to be completed are armchairs and side chairs, which will serve as duplicates of the ones in the room when they need to be reupholstered or repaired. The final point in the restoration project will be to conserve the pier table, which is not in the Blue Room but is out in the Entrance Hall.

Ms. Naulin pointed out that there was some original under-upholstery on the fire screen. It was too delicate to remain on the fire screen while it was displayed in the room so that portion was removed, and a reproduction screen component was fabricated. The original material is preserved outside of the object.

Ms. Cooper inquired if the under-upholstery fabric on the fire screen was a rough linen? Ms. Naulin confirmed it is and does have tiny bits of blue threads on it from a later reupholstering, and some red threads. It also had some great textile history there that, again, will be preserved for those reasons as well.

C. Curatorial Storage Area

Ms. Hayashi Smith provided a report and slide presentation on the status of the curatorial storage renovation. Since the last meeting in May, the curatorial basement storage renovation is continuing. The space was completely emptied and the sixth and final truckload left on May 22, just after the last meeting. Demolition, asbestos abatement, and other necessary structural work began soon after, and thankfully there were no major setbacks. A rendering of the 100 percent design by Architrave Architects, Washington, D.C., was shown to the committee.

1. Design Plan

The renovation's architects and engineers made numerous visits and submitted the 100

percent design submission in late November. The overall design will be a semi-open plan with sections of the walls and what was the center packing room removed to provide easy access to the rest of the spaces.

The HVAC unit will be located at the north end of the room where a sliding panel/rack can hide the unit with a painting or object when guests visit. There will be an adjustable lighting system throughout, to enable the recreation of an outside location's "color temperature" in storage; eliminating the need for the object to leave storage while it is being considered.

The new layout was designed by O'Brien Systems, Philadelphia. The state-of-the-art sliding panels, painting racks, are six feet long on each side and will be installed in the north section of what is referred to as the packing room area. It will now be called the "showroom". Permanent panels will be installed on some of the walls to house fragile objects such as gilded looking glasses and wall clocks, objects that should not be moved on these sliding panels.

The east side of the room will be equipped with a compact storage system to house many more objects there. The west side of the room will be outfitted with space saving equipment—Delta visual storage cabinets, and Aurora Times-2, space-saving cabinet, with shelving on both sides.

The State Dining Room table leaves, eagle podium, and bill signing table are objects that are often needed during events and will finally each have their own specific storage locations. This will enable the Residence operations staff to easily enter the space from a different door, access what they need and safely depart. The painting racks recommended by the National Gallery are slightly different than the existing Crystallization's racks. They are safer to handle.

The existing HVAC that consumes a huge footprint in the packing room, will be replaced with a Data Aire unit, recommended by the James Posey Associates' mechanical and electrical engineers. It will have a footprint equivalent to a refrigerator, and will allow more space and a cleaner look, especially with the painting panel hiding it.

The Truman-era green and white floor tile was demolished to allow for asbestos abatement, and the selection of an updated, easy to maintain flooring material was made. During a recent visit to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum off-site storage, the curatorial staff admired a very attractive flooring material called terrazzo, which is a 100 percent VOC-free epoxy resin system [VOC: volatile organic compound]. It will be a grout-less, easy pour epoxy terrazzo, which can be poured in place, and would eliminate any of the grout lines. The surface will be smooth for carts and much easier to maintain. The tile system will also be treated with an additional sealant to protect against scuff marks.

The showroom area of the room will have a slightly different terrazzo design, to offset it

from the rest of the storage room. Samples were shown to the committee, everything is custom mixed so there are options for colors and designs.

2. Work Progress

Before and progress photographs of the room were shown. When last restored in the 1980s there was much open shelving that will be replaced, and the progress photograph showed the room emptied apart from the painting racks.

In this section was located the visual storage cabinets for our Christmas creche figures. Four of these storage cabinets will be returned and will be integrated into the compact shelving system.

The Truman-era light green wall tile is currently on the east and north walls. There is a plan to keep the tile as a documentation of that time period. The terrazzo flooring, which was shown earlier, is still in the preliminary planning stages. It is the intent to take parts of that light green color and integrate it so that it comes together.

Before and after photographs of the packing/prep room space were also shown. The packing room, soon to be the showroom, was completely gutted except for the HVAC unit. Fortunately, it was in place because temporary storage space was needed for the holidays. The images also showed the open section of the wall leading into the storage area, where the compact storage will be installed. The new unit will be placed near the location of the current unit but will be much smaller.

The packing table will remain in the room either in the current location, under a new LED track lighting system that will replace the current halogen, or relocated to the right-side wall, where the trashcan and the boxes are stored. More than one swing arm LED lights can be attached to the wall for the study and conservation of objects. This will provide conservators the option of either working there or against the wall, and lamps can be pulled around the workspace.

3. Surprising Discovery

Ms. Hayashi Smith then shared that there was an unexpected discovery. When the section of the wall was removed in the packing room, workers discovered a huge railroad map of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) underneath the drywall. Images of the map was shown to the committee.

It was not known exactly when the drywall was placed in the room. Interestingly the wall section has a layer of steel sandwiched in it, perhaps indicating that the room was once used as some type of shelter or a situation room of a sort. The map was prepared by the Army Map Service, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, Washington, D.C., copied in 1951 from

materials furnished by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

It is a Soviet map, one out of four million, compiled in 1945. The boundaries and the railroads were not all accurate and were corrected in 1947 by the United States. The curator's office wants to house and store the map at the off-site storage facility, it could possibly make a very interesting exhibit piece one day. It is a nice time capsule.

Ms. Hayashi Smith also added that the opposite wall section in the packing room has still yet to be removed, and perhaps there will be another discovery. It is not certain, perhaps there will be another map. But if there is a discovery, the committee will be informed.

It is the goal to have the construction phase completed and the equipment installed by the end of September 2020, slightly later than the initial spring completion date as previously reported. Cross Museum Services will return; the art handlers who helped pack the 1400 objects will assist with transporting and unpacking the objects designated to return from off-site storage.

4. Discussion

Mr. Luebke questioned the flooring. Unsure of the curatorial standards for storage spaces, it seemed that terrazzo, while a handsome choice is a very hard material; he questioned if something slightly more resilient could be considered since there are fragile objects? This might be something to consider in the event an object was accidentally dropped on the certain floor materials and if objects would bounce or would shatter.

Ms. Hayashi Smith replied that there was another flooring considered, but when the Rubbermaid carts rolled over it (some parts of the rubber wheels tear off) and scuffs the flooring. The curator's office is open to suggestions, perhaps even different flooring for the working area.

D. Exhibition and Conservation of First Lady Portraits

Ms. Tederick reported on an exhibition that is in progress. The White House has agreed to partner with the National Portrait Gallery and the National First Lady's Library in Canton, Ohio, on an exhibition of first lady portraits. This exhibition is scheduled to open at the Portrait Gallery on November 13 and will close on May 23, 2021. The exhibit will be just a little over six months. The Portrait Gallery is the only venue that is scheduled for this exhibition. The working title is: "Every Eye is Upon Me - America's First Ladies".

The White House has agreed to lend 15 portraits from the collection, nine of which are currently on public view. This is a great opportunity to not only show objects from the White House collection to a wider audience, but it was also an opportunity to temporarily

display paintings from the collection that are currently in storage and have not been seen on public view for a long time.

Ms. Tederick showed an image of the portrait of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt that “got the ball rolling.” It was painted by Douglas Chandor in 1949, and Portrait Gallery director Kim Sajet approached the curator’s office and inquired if we would ever consider lending that painting to them so that they could display it with a Chandor portrait that they have of President Franklin Roosevelt. We were very interested in this idea, but before we knew it, the whole exhibition was developed with the first lady portraits. Knowing that the White House is the number one collector of these portraits, we were asked to partner with them. The curator’s office is very excited about the prospect of this exhibition.

Ms. Pisha provided information about the preparations that are under way. Since there will be a significant number of paintings going offsite for several months, they will be getting some great conservation work done to them beforehand. She quickly reviewed some of the paintings that are going to have work done.

The portrait of Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower is currently at Page Conservation, Washington, D.C. Arthur Page will be performing all of the conservation work on these paintings. The portraits of Mrs. Bess Truman will be sent out to Page this summer. The portraits of Mrs. Lucy Hayes and Mrs. Caroline Harrison are currently not on view; these portraits are very large, and it is difficult to find space to display them. The portraits are at off-site storage and will be sent within the next several months to Page as well.

In addition to getting several of the paintings conserved, the frames will also be conserved. Page works very closely with Dean Khan, a frame conservator here in Washington, D.C. He will be coming on site to treat several of the paintings’ frames; two of which are Mrs. Lou Hoover and Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson. Works being sent to Khan’s studio include Mrs. Julia Tyler, Mrs. Lucy Hayes, Mrs. Caroline Harrison, Mrs. Edith Wilson, and Mrs. Bess Truman.

In addition, we are working with paper conservator Carol Ann Small who is also local here in the D.C. area. She will treat the engraving of Mrs. Mary McElroy [Chester A. Arthur’s sister, who served as hostess during his presidency], and Bill Butler of Archival Art Services will frame the piece. When all this work is completed, the portraits will be ready to go for the exhibition.

E. Tennis Pavilion

Mr. Harleth provided a brief update on the work that is happening down at the tennis pavilion and showcased some of the images of what was completed during the last few months. Much work has been done specifically with the Children’s Garden in relocating

that garden, essentially lifting it up and shifting it north and west about 15 feet.

The team from the Historic Preservation Training Center, National Park Service, who are incredible craftsmen and conservators, assisted with the project. In addition to relocating the historic paving, Perry Guillot, the landscape architect, coordinated the transplanting of several existing holly trees, to fit with the new site plan.

The tennis court itself is now a full-fledge construction site, and a laydown area for the start of the construction of the tennis pavilion. Last week demolition started with select areas of the maintenance facility as well as sections of the post tension slab tennis court.

Several members asked questions about the schedule, garden and pavilion. Mr. Harleth responded the garden and tennis pavilion will be completed by the end of May 2020. To meet the aggressive timeline the pavilion was constructed as a shell so that the exterior work and the interior work can happen simultaneously. The tennis court resurface will be a rubber court so that both basketball and tennis can be played on it, but the post tension slab will be retightened and preserved.

F. Children's Garden Plaques

Ms. Pisha provided a report about the plaques in the Children's Garden. President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson gifted the Children's Garden to the White House for Christmas 1968 with hand and footprints plaques of their then grandchildren. Since then, plaques for presidential grandchildren have been added to the garden during most administrations. Currently there are 20 plaques, including the dedication plaque. Example images of a few existing plaques and new work were shown to the committee.

Because of the tennis pavilion project, the Children's Garden location is shifting by about 15 feet. The move allowed for additional pavers to be added to the garden. The existing plaques were removed from the paver stones in September, the trees were shifted in October, and the stones were removed in November. New stones with ten plaques will be added for President Trump's grandchildren. The grandchildren range in age from several months to 12 years. We worked with the families to select a square shape for these new plaques and a script text.

The new plaques will be created by artisan Fiona Westphal, who is from New York, New York. She created wooden boxes for clay molds because it was determined that clay would be the best material to use with small children since it sets rather quickly. Ms. Westphal was fantastic with the kids; she even made an extra clay mold for them to play with before they made the real ones, so very few "re-dos" were necessary. Some of the molds for the children were made in the Rose Garden and the rest in New York.

After the molds were made, Ms. Westphal took them back to her studio in New York, and she hand stenciled all the children's names into the molds. After that, rubber was poured into the clay to create impressions. The rubber impressions will be used to create wax molds. The wax molds will to be sent to a fine art foundry in California to be cast in bronze. The finished plaques will then be installed in the garden along with the existing plaques when all other work is completed late next spring.

IV. Rose Garden

Chair Vela reminded the committee that at the last meeting Mr. Harleth proposed and obtained approval for a subcommittee to be formed to work with a landscape design firm to look at possible ways to address some horticultural, operational, and sustainability interest for the Rose Garden.

Mr. Harleth stated for consideration today with the agenda package is a draft landscape report. The intent would be for this committee, not today because this is only a draft, but sometime within the next week or two once a final report is submitted—to review and approve the contents of the report and release that publicly. To present the contents of the document will be the representatives from the firm of Oehme, van Sweden. Mr. Harleth introduced to the committee Mr. Eric Groft, who is one of the principals.

A. Project Description

Mr. Groft opened by thanking the committee for this opportunity. He went on to state Oehme, van Sweden (OvS) is a firm based here in Washington, D.C. The firm has completed several projects in and around Washington, their roots being in Georgetown and then expanding to the suburbs of Washington and then way beyond that. It has also undertaken several projects in the Monumental Core of Washington as well, but Mr. Groft expressed that this project is perhaps their highest honor to date and is thrilled to be here to work on this site within the historic context. The firm has uncovered a “design palimpsest” in perhaps the best-known garden in the world.

Provided to the committee is an OvS's report that builds on the NPS cultural landscape report that was started in 1994 and completed in 2001. Specifically, it addresses the 12,000 square feet, which is known as the Rose Garden. The new report is phase two of the cultural landscape report process that addresses analysis, treatment, and then eventually the management of the space. It is being developed and is in a draft form. The team has been working on this for about three months now, and Mr. Groft expressed his thanks to Timothy Harleth, the White House staff and the National Park Service.

OvS has worked very closely with them, and it has been a very informative process. OvS is very proud of where they are to date. Mr. Groft wanted to also thank the team, who have worked very intensely but particularly within the last week getting ready for today, his partner Lisa Delplace; project manager, Lili Herrera; Rachel Heslop; and Denton Williams who are with him today.

They have done a lot of work and have been to a lot of places. They first started with the archival work at the Smithsonian. They have also spent time at Oak Spring Garden, which is an amazing place. Very valuable information was found there. They also spent time at Monticello and Mount Vernon, all gathering the information that they need. Mr. Groft quoted Thomas Jefferson, who wrote that “No occupation is so delightful to me as the culture of the earth, and no culture comparable to that of the garden.” Mr. Groft then wondered if that is their responsibility as landscape architects and why they love what they do so much.

Mr. Groft announced that they have prepared a mission statement to help guide their process, it reads: “The mission of this report is to guide the renewal and enhancement of the White House Rose Garden, informed by physical, cultural, and historical precedents as well as the first families who have shaped the Rose Garden. The research and analysis contained within the report serve as a framework on which to curate an outdoor experience transcendent of each administration. The White House Rose Garden promotes design solutions that are steeped in scholarship and intellect, and reflective of meticulous attention to narrative intent and detail. The report advocates for a timeless garden befitting of the address and a garden for the people of the United States of America.”

Mr. Groft then announced OvS will now present their findings. He then introduced the OvS team starting with Rachel Heslop, who has been in charge with the history and “design palimpsest”, and then Lili Herrera, who will present the analysis portion. His partner, Lisa Delplace and Mr. Groft will then present the concepts.

B. History and Design

Ms. Heslop started with an overview that she would run through a few of the main highlights of how the Rose Garden came to be, where it is today, and then the full construction timeline in the report. The actual report contains a historic narrative and identifies consultants that assisted with the project. Mr. Groft pointed out that the study area really extends from the West Terrace Colonnade, the West Wing, the South Drive, and the South Portico; and that is the 12,000 square feet of the study area.

The timeline starts before the city of Washington was founded, and what the city looked like and who was living here. The city was founded in 1790 by President George Washington, chosen from one of three sites along the Potomac. From the very beginning, Thomas

Jefferson, Washington, along with the surveyors Pierre L'Enfant and Andrew Ellicott knew that there would be space within the city for a President's Park that would include the President's House and garden. Jefferson's sketch was shown, and that is the area that was designated for the President's House.

The house was built between 1792 and 1800. The first president to live in the house was John Adams, but he was only there for four months, so he did not have time to leave an impression on the house or the grounds.

Thomas Jefferson was the first president who made an impact on the grounds. The main things being the two terraces he built on either side of the main residence around 1805 that gives the north and south sides of the Residence their delineation. He also made a boundary wall around the main area of the President's House.

The beginning of the 19th century provides some good pictorial evidence, but it shows that there was not a much work taking place. By 1826, President John Quincy Adams had built a small arboretum, and there were kitchen gardens, but there was nothing onsite where the Rose Garden currently stands.

By the start of the second half of the 19th century, the first conservatories were built on top of the West Terrace and by the end of the century there was a series of about nearly ten greenhouses and conservatories on and around the space that the Rose Garden would be built upon.

Showing photographs, Ms. Heslop pointed out where the conservatories were in relation to the West Terrace colonnade. The garden space was the site of the glass enclosed Rose House. These greenhouses and conservatories were operational up until 1902 when President Theodore Roosevelt and First Lady Edith Roosevelt wanted to make room for offices outside of the Residence and built offices that we know form part of the West Wing, the first iteration of the West Wing, leaving space in between the Residence and the offices. Mrs. Roosevelt decided to build two ornamental gardens, one on each side of the house, east and west, known as the colonial gardens, which were constructed in 1903.

The West Garden was around for 10 or so years, as by 1913 First Lady Ellen Wilson redesigned the entire garden and built a slightly more linear garden along with a walk that was known as the President's Walk, so that the president could walk from the Residence to his office. In the early decades of the 20th century after the Wilson garden was installed, it did not change all that much, with only minor changes in planting. During the Truman renovation work, between 1948 and 1952, there were some changes. It was closed off from the building renovation site and in 1952 the garden was reinstalled along its previous lines, but with the addition of several more roses and azaleas. There was a plan listing which roses were used. It still survives in the NPS archives.

President Dwight Eisenhower had started to use the garden for slightly more official press events and needed some more space. He asked the National Park Service in 1957, and the landscape architect, James Howe, to help with just making the garden's lawn slightly wider and removing some of the beds, including the President's Walk, so that more people could be accommodated on the grounds.

President John Kennedy went one step further, and in 1961 asked family friend Rachel Lambert Mellon (Bunny Mellon) to help him build a new garden that would also act as a green theater, so he could hold events, and that would hold up to 1,000 people. But was set against the backdrop of beautiful planting reminiscent of early American gardens of Williamsburg, Mount Vernon, and Monticello, et cetera.

Ms. Heslop displayed some photographs to illustrate how the site was developed. There were greenhouses at the end of the 19th century; followed by Mrs. Edith Roosevelt's colonial garden; and then Mrs. Ellen Wilson's garden. At the western end, there was a trellis fence with a statue of Pan and behind the fence there was a laundry yard. At eastern end, there was a semi-circular bench. Then images of the Truman renovation, followed by head gardener Mr. Redmond inspecting his roses, and then how there were overcrowding issues during the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

The garden was finished in 1962 and President Kennedy welcomed the Prime Minister of Algeria for a State visit. The president showed off his new garden and made sure he would show the garden to anyone who was visiting. An aerial of the garden was shown to illustrate the new design from above.

Every president since President Kennedy, has used the garden for a variety of purposes—signings, turkey pardoning, press conferences, Easter Egg Rolls, and dinners. Even President Richard Nixon's daughter, Tricia, was married here in 1971. But it also served as a very private garden, and for the first family to enjoy. President Kennedy's son and then the President Jimmy Carter's family enjoyed the garden when the cameras were turned off.

Ms. Heslop then illustrated the design history, again, starting with the Rose House that was located on the site, and when it was torn down in 1902, and then Mrs. Roosevelt's colonial garden was created. It included ornamental, paisleyesque- patterned planting beds that were full of mainly native plants, such as goldenrods, but also contained roses. Ms. Heslop included within the report a list of the variety of roses with their associated president.

But then the change in 1913, with the creation of slightly more symmetrical regular beds for Mrs. Ellen Wilson by landscape architect George Burnap; he was also responsible for many of the city's landscapes such as the Tidal Basin and Meridian Hill Park. In 1952, there were slight alterations made with the addition of roselings and azaleas. Then in 1957, the expansion at the request of President Eisenhower, designed by James Howe with the NPS. The last major version of the garden was the Mellon installation in 1962 that is essentially

almost unchanged today; President Kennedy would certainly recognize it.

Ms. Heslop stated that the report includes the full narrative. Ms. Heslop handed off to her colleague Lili Herrera, who would discuss the existing conditions.

C. Analysis

Ms. Herrera stated that she would provide bullet points of the items that are detailed in more information within the report.

To begin with the site has several trees that were planted. In some of the photos one can see them when they were much smaller, and now have grown. There is a big pin oak and southern magnolias that have grown very large on the site. This provides shade in certain parts of the beds. Primarily the beds to the south get less sun than the beds to the north.

With regards to topography, the site currently drains north to south from .8 to 1.2 percent. Generally, for a lawn, it is preferable to have about a 2 percent grade, so there really is not very good runoff from the lawn. From the west to the east there is a .8 percent drainage. The high point is on the northwest side, and the low point on the northeast.

About the soil, working with Jim Urban and several penetrometer readings were made, over ten of them, which uses an implement to explore the substrate of the soil. It was discovered that the top section has a layer of clay that is contributing to root rot. Generally, this is because the source for the lawn is coming from a place with heavy clay, and that can easily be ameliorated. Then there is some sort of another stratum, which in looking at the site in the images of the construction of 1962, one can see how that soil was disturbed. Below that is a lighter colored soil, which is the parent material that was there.

Even though there are different soil horizons happening, there is still very good drainage on site, other than on the top two inches. This soil is very good for lawn and planting. As previously mentioned, the two inches on the surface and this is contributing to some compaction, which means the soil is compressed and creating areas of wear where there was a lot of foot traffic. Because of the pitch, the current drains in different areas are not functioning properly. The surface drainage is not working to capture the moisture.

The existing irrigation system is operating only on the lawn, the beds are hand watered, and it was installed in 2006. Working with the consultant that designed the system in 2006, he reviewed it and stated it was still in very good condition and could have additional zones added, if necessary.

About the hardscape, currently the area shows materials that have been added throughout its history, so there are over five different materiality happening. There is a lot of the stone,

particularly along the colonnade, that is showing signs of wear from moisture or just pieces shedding off from the stone.

Regarding the electrical, there is the same kind of problem as where over time things have accreted. A lot of wirings are not functioning properly; it is hard to tell what now at this point in time is. Because annuals have been planted also, there has been a lot of accumulation of mulch over the years, and so some of the infrastructure for the electrical is buried. There is also insufficient power to adequately serve the modern needs of the site. And, there are at least five different stakeholders, currently operating the lighting and the electrical needs of the area.

There are views out to the Washington Monument. Regarding the views, currently there is a need for the trees to be limbed up at least seven feet, so one can have clear site lines to the colonnade. This determines the kind of trees considered for that location. At the same time, it is desired to preserve the feeling of enclosure. So, it is working with those two elements. Lastly, they reviewed the circulation and, it is definitely a very active area with all the diverse events that take place there.

About the furnishing, the report shows a history of different furnishings that existed on the site, and it is OvS's hope to review those in more detail and perhaps restore them or look at what is available in the storage areas.

Utilizing a CAD file provided from the Office of the Chief Usher, a base was created from the information gathered from the assessment that tried to include all the different elements including drains, lights, and spot elevations. This will provide the base from which to develop a design.

The existing plantings were evaluated, and again, that shows the same sort of thread of things accumulating over time. The boxwood is showing some of the illnesses; it is currently under a treatment that was implemented once a week to keep it healthy. Because of the annual plantings and the trees, a lot of issues with the trees have been identified. The most current change in the crabapples was in August for the State Dinner. Because of digging around them, tree roots do not like to have people digging underneath them and that has created an issue with the current design.

There is also an existing Samantha hedge, which is an evergreen hedge that is present from the original 1962 design.

D. Concepts

Mr. Groft stated that he forgot to mention in the beginning, OvS worked with the subcommittee for gardens and grounds; he wanted to credit them and the list of sub-

consultants that helped them. This list includes: Jim Urban, who is well known in the soils and landscape architecture world; Thaisa Way, who is at Dumbarton Oaks right now; George Sexton and his crew on lighting; Wiley and Wilson the engineer consultant; and John Dancer, consultant for the furnishings.

Mr. Groft began by reviewing some of the goals they began for the design project, after completing all the analyses. These goals are: to solve the grading and drainage issues, simplify and unify the hardscape materials, improve the planting conditions—the actual soil medium that is functioning to support the plant material.

One observation that OvS had, and believe you had had as observers when walking in the Rose Garden is where are all the roses? The roses do not seem to be as prominent as one would expect. Another goal is to reinstate the roses as the dominant horticultural feature.

OvS wanted to create the perfect balance of annual, perennial, and shrub layer in the garden and limit the amount of disturbance that switching out the annuals has on both the shrubs and the trees. They wanted to update the garden with current sustainability practices that respect the history of the garden while easing the need for water, fertilizers, and herbicides. The gardening practices that were from the 1960s have changed, and different products are available. Lastly, they wanted to simplify the infrastructure and lighting and electrical. Because, right now it has just been added in an ad hoc manner over time and wires are on top of each other, so they wanted to come up with a method that simplifies that.

Moving along, first OvS started looking at defining characteristics of the existing conditions. Obviously, the central access established by the doors to the West Wing, the West Wing colonnade steps that Kennedy had influenced and rebuilt, the commemorative saucer magnolias that Bunny Mellon had brought from the Tidal Basin that anchored the four corners of the garden, the Jackson magnolias to the east, the east patio, and of course the main lawn are the defining characteristics.

OvS looked to several historic precedence and had all the “design palimpsest” drawings displayed around the room. Mr. Groft invited the committee to review the drawings after the presentation. He then continued that Howe had actually proposed an eight-foot-wide sidewalk, or border that really framed the lawn, and then established a walkway from the Palm Room to the south.

Again, this is the historical influence, they found many and there were just a couple represented in the images shown to the committee of early sketches that Bunny Mellon and Perry Wheeler [Mrs. Mellon’s landscape architect] had worked on for the original design, as requested by President Kennedy. They showed the various geometries that are displayed and found in early sketches. This led to alternative number one, which basically retains the most amount of the original Bunny Mellon design. Keeping the five crabapples but limiting the annuals to the front beds, which are really the display gardens; a groundcover that would

remain in place at the base of the ornamental flowering trees to simplify that process; and then, what OvS considered rose-compatible plants in the back beds. Each bed would have a collection of roses against the lawn, and then standard roses would be in the back.

On both alternatives, OvS would be taking up the lawn and regrading it, basically establishing a ridgeline along the central axis and then a 2 percent slope on either side with drainage on the sides. That is going to be the most invasive part of what they are proposing because, to get the grades right, they really must go from the colonnade to the South Portico to both colonnades, and then tie it into the driveway to the south. To grade all of this it really requires them to basically pick up the garden, regrade it, and put it back down.

They are also proposing that all the paving material, all the vertical surfaces be limestone, commensurate with materials elsewhere adjacent to the site. Because, as Ms. Herrera pointed out, there are five different materials there now. Retaining the walkway that Bunny Mellon put in, they could service the backside of the garden and the Hoover patio area under the Jackson Magnolia would remain in place. They would also be replacing the boxwoods with a more resistant to boxwood blight to edge the beds.

To the south, Mr. Groft also wanted to point out that they found some historic records that there had been for plantings at various points and times. They thought it might be a nice place to have a transitional area to display American native plants, done in an ornamental way, as a transition from the formal aspect of the Rose Garden to the areas of the garden to the south.

Showing images of the garden, Mr. Groft pointed out the high point of the garden. He then explained that at the steps along the west side of the garden, there would be a 2 percent slope on either side there with drainage on either side. Previewed to the committee was a watercolor rendering done in house by Jungsub Lee of OvS showing basically what the proposed garden would look like.

In alternative two, OvS is recalling the Howe plan from 1957 with the introduction of a limestone border that would run the entire way around to give some stability and reinforce the formality of the lawn itself. They could also have the utility trench underneath the pavement to condense all the utilities and electrical work. It would be four feet around on three sides with a six feet width on the fourth side.

OvS also thought it would be a nice opportunity to return this to an octagonal that had been there previously. And, on both schemes, have a formal bench located on axis here that recalls some of the early images that we showed benches.

Fundamental to this scheme is just bringing back three of the flowering trees on the north and the south flank. OvS had found some writings that Bunny Mellon had suggested that perhaps five trees were too many. Even though that number persisted to this day. When

they do grow, they shade, and they are not really that compatible with the roses. On this scheme, OvS is proposing only three of the flowering trees. Again, the annuals being on the lawn side, the groundcovers under the trees, and then rose-compatible perennials in the beds where the standard roses would be. So that aspect remains the same.

OvS also thought this would be an opportunity to perhaps expand the patio on the east with a random irregular pattern, which it has today, but include, instead of having that separate path there, make it a more cohesive design. Right now, basically the planting and the lawn is coplanar and that, in horticultural practices, raised beds, even if it is eight inches, produces a more sustainable environment. It does not quite show here, but we are proposing a curbstone. OvS has done this a lot in their more formal Georgetown gardens, but there would be a border stone there that raises this bed up on both schemes the two percent grade, and then this would be the four feet frame or border on either side.

Mr. Groft then turned to Lisa Delplace. Ms. Delplace stated if you go back to the plan, there is one thing she wanted to point out, which is the fact that we are removing the lawn underneath the magnolias is significant. Everything they are doing is very much thinking about long-term maintenance and longevity of the plants that are there. Currently there is lawn underneath the magnolias, which is very difficult for the magnolias because of the competition in roots. The fact that they are removing that, adding more paving, but also adding a native plant is going to perform better than the lawn that is underneath there.

She also mentioned having just a slight border on the rose beds. There is another reason why they want to do that; to prevent the water from flowing into those beds as it currently does now, so that it can be kept as a unique system. The lawn requirements for water and roses are completely different. The two systems should be isolated. The final point is to talk a little bit about is the reintroduction of the cloud boxwoods.

Mr. Groft stated whereas these beds have the clipped boxwoods, they were introducing boxwoods that on the far west and the far east that would be allowed to kind of perform naturally and not be so clipped. The stone border also gave a really nice place to build in actual surface drains that will help get rid of the surface water. In the rendering of alternative two is shown the display of native plants to the south.

Ms. Cooper inquired what native groundcover would be considered? Mr. Groft responded something that would take shade, probably a native carex, or sedge. He continued that one must be very sensitive about the tree roots there, so they would introduce bare root plants that would disturb the tree roots minimally. These are just some elements that we are considering. The edging—there are plenty examples of how ornamental it can be or how simple it can be. Then the idea of a stone border around the sides, they really loved the picture of this bench; they cannot tell if it is circular or octagonal, but OvS will work on it.

Then on alternative two, they were going to introduce planters—four to vertically articulate

that there is a garden here. One of the comments mentioned is that a lot of visitors to this area, pass along the south grounds' driveway, and the area is so overgrown you really do not get a sense of that there is a garden beyond the driveway. They thought placing one of these vertical urns at this location would be a nice way to mark the entrance into the garden space. These are American-made planters. One is actually called the Jefferson Box. They are not certain of its provenance, but you cannot go wrong with that name.

OvS is just proposing a plant palette in this location. The easy thing would be to put back the crabapple, but they thought this would be an opportunity to maybe make some other suggestions, which comes to mind something that is going to stay small enough like a crataegus, but also give some flowering and some varying capacity. Perhaps, even a small ornamental cherry, a flowering Japanese cherry tree that Washington, D.C. is known for, and, if one went with a true American native, perhaps a sweet bay magnolia.

Then, on the bottom are just some of the evergreens that would be placed back, but of the species that are easy to clip and are resistant to all the problems that a lot of the boxwoods are having right now.

OvS has done exhaustive research, and in the draft report is every rose that they found that has ever been planted in the Rose Garden, including a lot of first lady roses that are now available. So, almost curating those is a whole other aspect. But for this part of the report, it is really to get the kind of framework and the bones of the garden right so the actual selection of plant material will come a little bit later.

This shows what they think might be nice rose-compatible plants on the top; and then the annuals that get rotated frequently; and, of course, the spring bulbs.

Original watercolors for each alternative were then displayed for the committee to review.

E. Discussion

Mr. Luebke asked in alternative two, or maybe in all of them, what is the material of the path that goes from the Palm Room [West Terrace] down the drive? Mr. Groft replied it would be limestone.

Mr. Luebke then inquired that the one thing he preferred was the simplicity of the second alternative, but wondered, there does not need to be both the border and the walk. In other words, they could bring the lawn that much further to the east. Mr. Groft responded it is a high-use area, so they pushed and pulled there quite a bit. The bay is 12 feet. The walk is eight, and then there are four.

Mr. Luebke responded that he thought the border of the stone will probably help in the

use of the space. He certainly preferred the simplicity of that scheme. Mr. Groft added it seemed to really pop the lawn when we put that border in.

Mr. Luebke also added that it makes a natural way to engage—the visitor to engage with the roses in a kind of more intentional way. Both Mr. Groft and Ms. Delplace concurred, with Mr. Groft adding that without trampling and compacting the lawn, which they have plenty of images of that happening.

Mr. Harleth stated he very much appreciated the formality of that second option. He thanked the design team for taking feedback both from the National Park Service team here on the grounds and the Residence team, Dale Haney, and about the long-term care and maintenance that is required for the space. But also, of the fact that this is a garden that sits adjacent to the most powerful office in the world, and nothing can be done there very lightly. He added that he was very impressed with the work produced.

Mr. Wilmerding agreed and said he would use the word simplicity and the second proposal is clearer and nicer—this is wonderful and that first one is a bit busy. He congratulated Oehme, van Sweden and stated it is a beautiful and well thought through plan.

Mr. Vela asked John Stanwich if he had any thoughts from an operational maintenance perspective. Mr. Stanwich responded that he thought a lot of care has been given to sustainability and how the space is really used because form should follow function and a lot of what goes on out there definitely needs it. The other thing he recommended is that, like the restoration of the National Mall, that some form of recommendations, prescriptions for the use, and the protection of that space really would be very helpful for this project.

Ms. Cooper inquired if there is a desire to try to not use more perennials than annuals, so there would not be the constant removing of plants?

Ms. Delplace responded that they have given it a lot of thought. This is one of the things they want to do because annuals are important to the garden as well. So, by compartmentalizing annuals in the front, they can separate the annual rotations from the boxwoods. They intend to put in edging there, so that every time someone is putting an annual in, they are not re-disturbing the plant.

She added that OvS found a lot of suggestions in Bunny Mellon's writing about a compatible plant at where it would be a perennial that would almost be a neutral, like a silver or foliage plant. That would be a neutral, play neutral, between the kind of riotous annuals and then the standard roses with compatible perennials below.

OvS is really looking at the historic precedence that all of those things always were part

of this garden, but ways that, in terms of the plant health, they can help to ensure that there would not be the continually changing out the plants all the time because OvS is separating how the plants are actually used and what maintenance goes into them now.

Mr. Groft added that all the beds have annual rotations now. OvS will try to define exactly where that happens to limit the disturbance on the surrounding plant material so that you will get a little bit more bang for the buck in those front beds.

Mr. Harleth added that he thought the plan smartly balances the concerns raised, but also at the need that this must be a garden that looks great at all time. Various committee member concurred and agreed that a lot of work had been put into the design proposals.

Mr. Luebke commented about the Hoover patio under the magnolia, that he thought it makes sense to consolidate those things into a space. It is a very tight balancing act between making it bigger and more usable versus losing that kind of it is got to be like a really sort of secret, fresh, and shaded. Mr. Groft proposed perhaps a more intimate space. Mr. Luebke was not sure, but what was proposed looked slightly too big and perhaps the space should be tweaked, but that the concept is a great idea.

Mr. Harleth remarked that again no action is required today other than an effort to maybe read through the report, digest said report, and provide some further contemplation on the two alternatives. Over the next couple of weeks, the great folks from Oehme, van Sweden will finalize this report, and it will be sent to everyone on the committee for approval. At that point, we will obviously work with this team and the first lady to really determine what the path forward will be at that point.

Mr. Vela thanked the Oehme, van Sweden firm for a great presentation.

V. Other Items for Consideration/New Business

Chair Vela asked if there were other items for consideration for new business.

A. Kitchen Garden

Ms. Cooper inquired about the Kitchen Garden, adjacent to the Tennis Pavilion and the Children's Garden.

Mr. Harleth replied that the thought has always been that the Tennis Pavilion and Children's Garden projects will be the first phase of a multi-phase project. The second phase will include the construction of a new maintenance facility, for the National Park

Service, to better define that space and give a better working condition to the groundkeepers here onsite. After that project is completed it will allow us to be able to connect through a pathway the Children's Garden, the pavilion, and the Kitchen Garden so it will pull the Kitchen Garden back into that first family space.

B. Italian Furniture in the Cross Hall

Ms. Cooper asked if there have been anymore thoughts about the furniture in the Cross Hall. The current seating furniture is on loan from the Philadelphia Museum of Art (PMA).

Ms. Tederick responded that we have been giving that a lot of thought but were not ready to present anything today. She was hopeful that at the next meeting some options could be offered, and we could have a greater discussion about it.

VI. Adjournment

Before concluding the meeting, Mr. Wilmerding asked if there was a date for the next meeting. Executive Secretary Stanwich responded not at this time, but he would discuss some dates with Mr. Harleth and Ms. Tederick. Chair Vela proposed sometime in early spring be considered.

Mr. Vela then asked the Committee's appreciation to be extended to Mrs. Trump for hospitality allowing the Committee to meet at the White House and to Timothy Harleth, Lydia Tederick and the curator's office staff for facilitating a tour. Mr. Vela also thanked the committee.

Chair Vela requested a motion to adjourn. Mr. Wilmerding motioned for the meeting to adjourn, Mr. Harleth seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12 p.m. (Noon)

Respectfully Submitted
John Stanwich
Executive Secretary

COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

MEETING OF MAY 20, 2019
AGENDA

- I. Opening
 - A. Welcome
 - B. Introduction of new members
- II. Acquisitions
 - A. East Room rugs and Diplomatic Reception Room rug (Lydia Tederick)
 - B. Dunbar Beck drawings (Nikki Pisha)
 - C. William King chair – possible acquisition (Melissa Naulin)
 - D. Watercolor of wild roses by Caroline Harrison – possible acquisition (Lydia Tederick)
- III. Projects
 - A. Refurbishment of fabrics in East Room, Green Room, and Red Room (Donna Hayashi Smith)
 - B. Painting Conservation – Portraits of William McKinley, Benjamin Franklin & Theodore Roosevelt (Nikki Pisha)
 - C. Zuber wallpaper – removal from Rm 216 and possible acquisition of new scenic paper (Lydia Tederick)
 - D. Bellangé suite conservation (Melissa Naulin)
- IV. Other Items for Consideration
 - A. Family Dining Room proposal (Lydia Tederick/Tham Kannalikhham)
 - B. South Grounds and Garden House proposal; formation of advisory subcommittee to revitalize Rose Garden (Timothy Harleth)
 - C. East Room floor (Timothy Harleth)
 - D. Curatorial storage (Donna Hayashi Smith)
 - E. Subcommittees (Fine Arts, Decorative Arts and Design)
 - F. Member comments
- V. Adjournment
 - Invitation to stay for lunch and tour of completed projects

COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

MEETING OF DECEMBER 9, 2019 AGENDA

- I. Opening
 - A. Welcome and introduction of new member
 - B. The 250th commemoration
(Chair David Vela)
- II. Acquisitions
 - A. Status of new and pending acquisitions –
William King chair, watercolor of wild roses by
Caroline Harrison, and Zuber wallpaper
(Lydia Tederick)
 - B. Drapery drawings from Lincoln presidency
(Melissa Naulin)
- III. Projects
 - A. Refurbishment of East Room draperies and light
standards (Lydia Tederick)
 - B. Installation of East Room floor and temporary exhibit
(Timothy Harleth)
 - C. Bellangé suite conservation (Melissa Naulin)
 - D. Curatorial storage (Donna Hayashi Smith)
 - E. Exhibit of first lady portraits at National Portrait
Gallery (Lydia Tederick/Nikki Pisha)
 - F. Tennis Pavilion (Timothy Harleth/Ryan Busch)
 - G. Children's Garden plaques (Nikki Pisha)
- IV. Rose Garden
 - A. Report (Oehme, van Sweden)
- V. Other Items for Consideration
 - A. Member comments
- VI. Adjournment
 - Invitation to stay for lunch and tour of completed
projects