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No occupation is so delightful to me as the culture of the earth, & no culture comparable to that of the garden.

Thomas Jefferson, 1811
‘...a garden that [will] endure and whose atmosphere, with the subtlety of its ever changing patterns, [will] suggest the ever changing pattern of history itself.’

Bunny Mellon 1983
Comments from First Lady Melania Trump
MISSION STATEMENT

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 this Report serve as a framework on which to curate an outdoor experience transcendent of each administration.

_Landscape Report: 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.

This Report advocates for a timeless garden, befitting of its address and the people of The United States of America.
Chapter One: Introduction

Management Summary

Located within the grounds of the White House, the Rose Garden is one of the most recognizable landscapes in the United States, if not the world. Since President Kennedy commissioned the most recent incarnation of the garden in 1961, every subsequent president has used the Garden as a backdrop for speeches, events, and announcements. The Rose Garden encapsulates the many functions that the White House provides on a daily basis: as the home and residence of the president, as the center of the Executive Branch of the United States Government, as a living museum of American history, and as a setting and focus for official functions. Presidents past and present have all recognized and understood the power and significance of the Rose Garden.

Today, the Rose Garden appears closely akin to the Rachel “Bunny” Lambert Mellon design, constructed in the spring of 1962. The Garden was the crowning achievement of her gardening pursuits, creating an outdoor room for the President’s private and public use. Changes in planting have taken place in the intervening years, with a broader restoration project taking place in 1981, but President Kennedy would certainly recognize the overall garden design if he were to see it today. Combining elements of form, plan, space, structure and style of the landscape, the Rose Garden maintains a high level of integrity for this historic period.

The Rose Garden has had many names over the twentieth century. First Lady Ellen Wilson planted a rose garden in 1913, and it is occasionally referred to as such in print over the following decades, but its official name at that time remains obscure. In the second half of the century, ‘Rose Garden’ starts to appear more frequently, but the term was used simultaneously and interchangeably with ‘West Garden,’ particularly on government documents. For continuity’s sake, this Report will refer to the Rose Garden throughout, unless specified otherwise.

Since 1962, time has taken its toll on the Rose Garden and its planting. Consequently an updated vision for long-term development and management is now necessary. Due to the unique significance of the site, any changes that will inform a new design must be carefully and thoroughly researched and analyzed. This will lead to a clear path of treatment, whether it is preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction of the landscape.

---

1 With thanks to David Krause, Archivist at the Office of the National Park Service, Liaison to the White House, for his comments regarding the nomenclature of the Garden.
The Rose Garden and grounds of the White House, maintained by the National Park Service (NPS), form part of the larger President’s Park, which incorporates Lafayette Square, The Ellipse, the Executive Office Building and its grounds and the Treasury and its grounds. President’s Park is listed on the National Register of Historic Places under five nomination forms prepared between 1959/1960 and 1979 (see Chapter Four). The Park’s unique location and place in American history has long been acknowledged and celebrated, and the Rose Garden’s increasingly prominent role as a symbol of the president can be understood more fully when examined within the broader context of the White House’s history and development.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The grounds and gardens surrounding the White House are viewed as a palimpsest, with each alteration revealing the historic imprints of the Residence’s occupants. Artifacts discovered during the construction of the outdoor swimming pool in 1975 indicate Native American presence before the arrival of European settlers in the seventeenth century. During the eighteenth century, intensive tobacco farming led to deteriorating soil quality. Nevertheless, the area’s geographic location on the water, along with its potential to reach inland towards the Midwest made it an ideal location for the fledgling nation’s federal capital.

From the very first plan laid out by Pierre Charles L’Enfant in 1791 (figure 4, p.132), grounds dedicated for the president’s personal use have always been present. Nearly 83 acres of grounds were bought by the Federal Government in 1792, and construction of the main residence was largely completed by 1800. In the subsequent century, a pattern of change and modification was established under each successive president as they used and shaped the grounds for their own needs and wishes. Concerns over safety and privacy among others, juxtaposed with the need for the grounds to be open to all Americans, became a competing priority from the very first long-term resident, President Thomas Jefferson.

The area of the grounds now occupied by the Rose Garden has, due to its close proximity to the White House, almost always been dedicated to the more private side of presidential life. Surviving records suggest that prior to the twentieth century, early residents focused on using the area
for agricultural pursuits such as kitchen gardens, and installing tree/shrub cover as part of the larger landscape.

In the mid-1850s, the first greenhouse was constructed to the west of the south portico. By the turn of the twentieth century, a network of greenhouses and conservatories stood on top of and adjoined the west terrace, including a greenhouse dedicated to roses. The area immediately in front of the greenhouses was dedicated to vegetable production, as well as shrub cover laid out in ornamental patterns.

A significant change in the area's function was implemented in 1902 / 1903 by landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. of the Olmsted Brothers Firm, and architect Charles Follen McKim of McKim, Meade & White among others. The greenhouses and conservatories were demolished and moved off-site to make way for a new expanded West Wing - a direct result of President Theodore Roosevelt's wish to separate his residence from the working office of the presidency, which up until this point had all taken place under the roof of the main Residence.

From this point until the present day, there has been a dedicated ornamental flower garden to the west of the south portico. First Lady Edith Roosevelt commissioned a colonial style garden, with paisley-shaped planting beds that included native species such as solidago. Mrs. Roosevelt's garden lasted a decade before it was renovated by First Lady Ellen Wilson and landscape architect George Burnap in 1913. Mrs. Wilson replaced the colonial style garden with a more formal symmetry of elongated rectangular planting beds. This design was also the first time the garden incorporated roses as the dominant flower in the planting scheme.

During President Truman's administration (1945 - 1953), the White House was restored and renovated in the most extensive intervention since the reconstruction of the Residence after the fire in 1814. This work resulted in the Rose Garden being used as a building site for the duration of the works. Though the Garden was rebuilt to the same 1913 design after the renovation work had finished, it never fully regained its 1913 appearance, due to increasing public exposure and expanding crowds.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s years in the White House also meant change to the Garden’s layout, reducing the number of flowering plants
By 1961, President Kennedy was eager to build a new garden after his trip to Europe where ‘he noted that the White House had no garden equal in quality or attractiveness to the gardens that he had seen and in which he had been entertained […]'; he had recognized the importance of gardens surrounding an official residence and their appeal to the sensibilities of all people’ (Mellon 1983, p. 5).

President Kennedy turned to a close family friend, Rachel “Bunny” Lambert Mellon, for the new design. Mellon was a highly skilled and enthusiastic garden designer, noted for her own garden at Oak Spring in Upperville, Virginia. For professional landscape architectural guidance, she turned to the Washington, D.C. based Perry Wheeler, who could fully represent and detail her design. The resulting Garden sought a balance of both presidential ceremony and a secluded private retreat. The Garden was used by President Kennedy consistently during his time in residence.

Structurally, elements within the Garden have been altered or updated since the Garden’s 1962 installation. The largest addition to the Garden is a blue stone walkway, built along the east boundary, during President George H.W. Bush’s administration. Larger changes have occurred with respect to the original plant list. Shrubs and trees have been replaced as necessary throughout the years, most thoroughly in 1981 under the care of Head Gardener Irvin Williams, when First Lady Nancy Reagan requested that Bunny Mellon advise on the changes that should be made. In-depth analysis of these changes and the current conditions of the Garden are considered in Chapter Three.

The Garden has been used for a variety of functions by every subsequent president since President Kennedy, including state dinners, weddings, press briefings and festive celebrations such as the annual National Thanksgiving Turkey Presentation. The Garden’s design, including the successful larger lawn, lends itself to this continually rotating series of functions, with seasonal annual plants added three times a year. Additional plants are also added for special events.

The layouts and choice of plants indicate how fashion and taste, both
personal (with respect to presidents and their families) and within larger cultural shifts have influenced the Garden’s changes. The history of the Rose Garden reflects well-documented cultural and aesthetic changes, as evidenced by the five iterations built during the twentieth century, and the plants used within each iteration.

Nowhere is this more apparent than with the Garden’s most famous occupant, the rose. The relationship between this plant and the White House is entwined with virtually every president to occupy the residence, whether they bred roses, used roses for flower displays, or enjoyed the scent of roses when walking in the garden. The rose’s place in the canon of American horticulture, as well as its recognition as the national floral emblem of the United States of America, confirms its requisite nature and gravity with respect to the Garden’s plant palette.

Nevertheless, gardens are not stagnant - they change constantly. The Rose Garden is full of living plants that germinate, grow and die, in continual annual cycles. Bunny Mellon herself noted ‘[A garden’s] greatest reality is not a reality, for a garden, hovering always in a state of becoming, sums up its own past and its future’ (Holden 2018, p. 249). Attention to what lies within the historical record of the Garden and its rich horticultural heritage will inform its future allowing the garden to be as striking as its past.
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this Report is to construct a comprehensive plan for the future management and treatment of the Rose Garden. While the Garden is a part of President's Park, its unique location and historical importance have led to the necessity of a separate report. It is vital that any recommended changes or amendments to the landscape as a result of this report are documented for future use.

The Report is divided into two parts, both of which will inform the other in building a comprehensive plan. The first part will explore the historical background of the site, and those who contributed to the garden’s development over the decades. Detailed site analysis of existing conditions and constraints such as soils, current (and historic) vegetation, and circulation will be evaluated in tandem with the site’s importance. The Report also offers an analysis of older documentation relevant to the garden.

In the second half, the Report gathers information related to the garden’s historic, cultural, and environmental context. These findings will be
analyzed and evaluated, and lead to a series of future design and maintenance guidelines that will ensure the site’s aesthetic, historic and cultural significance for future generations. Appropriate recommendations will provide for layout of walkways, terraces, edging, vegetation, and other fixtures, in coordination with relevant stakeholders including the National Park Service, Office of the Chief Usher of the White House, and others who serve on the Subcommittee for Gardens and Grounds as part of the Committee for the Preservation of The White House.

This document will build on several reports published over the last twenty years. In 1989, The National Park Service (NPS) proposed a comprehensive design plan for the White House and President’s Park to address the growing issues and demands that a changing world necessitated. Together with the other federal departments that oversee President’s Park, the NPS held planning work groups to determine the purpose and significance of the different areas and features of the President’s Park and presented the resulting Design Guidelines, The White House and President’s Park in 1997 and the Comprehensive Design Plan and Environmental Impact Statement in 1999, along with further supporting studies. To complement these reports, the NPS published soon afterwards Dr. Susan Boyle’s 2001 Cultural Landscape Report (CLR), The White House & President’s Park, Washington, DC.

The current report will specifically provide further research into the Rose Garden specifically and will follow the format detailed by the National Park Service. Dr. Susan Boyle’s CLR extensively explores the site’s history and
initial evaluation of the entire White House grounds, and the rest of the larger President’s Park. It is unnecessary to repeat her extensive findings. This Report will not address the Rose Garden in relation to other features on the White House grounds, unless they directly impact an aspect of feature within the Garden.

Nevertheless, the 2001 report does not include the secondary phase of a CLR: a preservation strategy for long-term management and treatment of the grounds. The sole focus in this report will be on the Rose Garden and its future, as it includes no recent history or analysis of any other areas around the grounds. The latter part of this Report will then provide the important secondary phase of a CLR, in proposing a preservation strategy for the Garden.

The Report is constructed with the aid of a team of landscape architects, landscape architectural historians, civil engineers, horticulturalists, and soil scientists, alongside other disciplines. Due to time constraints, it has not been possible to include in-depth interdisciplinary research/data from archaeologists, architects, and ecologists among others.

STUDY BOUNDARIES

The grounds of the White House, including President’s Park, now cover slightly over 80 acres in central Washington, DC. They are located just north of the National Mall in the northwest quadrant of the City and align along the north-south axis of the City’s layout (right, above and below).

The White House’s Rose Garden is situated to the southwest of the main residence (see maps on following page). It is enclosed on two sides by buildings; with the West Wing to the west, and the West Colonnade to the north. The eastern border is defined by a blue stone terrace and the Jackson *Magnolia grandiflora* trees (Southern Magnolia) growing next to the South Portico. To the south, the South Drive marks the border between the Rose Garden and the expansive South Lawn. The site covers approximately a quarter-of-an-acre and gently slopes downwards from the northwest corner to the southeast corner. Access to the Garden is either from the Oval Office and West Wing offices, the Palm Room adjoining the main residence, or via the South Drive.
THE ROSE GARDEN (entire area is approximately 0.4 acres)
CHAPTER TWO: SITE HISTORY

INTRODUCTION

The history of the White House (the Executive Residence’s official name since President Theodore Roosevelt’s declaration in 1901), and its grounds are inextricably linked to the history of the United States of America. It encapsulates the full breadth of historical, cultural and social change of the nation as it has grown over the last 200 plus years.

As an integral part at the center of America’s history, there is an enormous wealth of source material available on the White House and its grounds, including contemporary letters, maps, plans, drawings, memoirs (both written and oral), photographs and newspapers. Beyond the primary sources listed above, secondary sources are plentiful, and include the 2001 Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) among them. Earlier historical research had largely concentrated on the Residence at the expense of the grounds and gardens, but this has gradually changed over the last twenty years.

The first part of the 2001 CLR examines in detail the development of President’s Park in conjunction with historical, social, and physical contexts. As such, much of the study and analysis of the overall site is not repeated here, the focus of this report concentrating specifically on the Rose Garden.

The earlier historical development of the grounds of the White House is therefore included in this chapter as a summary for when, how and why the existing Rose Garden was built.

WASHINGTON, DC: PRE-1600 TO 1814

The abundance of hunting, fishing and agrarian land around the Chesapeake Bay has attracted human settlement for thousands, if not tens of thousands of years. Archaeological evidence dates the earliest known human interaction with the area now covered by Washington, DC to nearly 10,000 years BCE (Lewis 2015, p. 2). Small items uncovered on the site of the present day grounds included quartzite points and pottery fragments (Humphey and Chambers 1984; Pousson and Hoepfner 1995).

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, several Native American
tribes lived around the Chesapeake Bay, and maintained a culture rich in trade and agriculture. The origins of the Anacostia River's name derive from the Anacostan tribe, which is a modified version of the original Indian word 'anaquashatanik' meaning 'a town of traders' (NPS website, 2019). The landscape of the area lent itself to early settlement, with physical features including hills, ridges, spring-fed streams, terraces and access to the rivers proving fertile ground for fishing and farming (Pousson and Hoepfner 1995, p 5).

European exploration began with Captain Smith's expedition up the Bay in 1608, where he made contact with and mapped the various tribes in Virginia (figure 1, p. 130). Smith's exploration eventually opened up the land to the trickle and then flood of European settlers attracted to the area for the natural resources and trading possibilities, especially fur.

By the time the fledging nation was in search of a new capital city in the 1780s, several small towns were flourishing along the banks of the Potomac River (below and figure 2, p. 130). Georgetown had been founded in 1751, being the farthest point up the Potomac River oceangoing ships could navigate. Its port had become a center for trade and shipment of goods from inland Maryland, and Georgetown University was established in 1789.

After a period of uncertainty over a permanent location for the new government, Congress approved the Residence Act into law in 1790, granting President George Washington (1732 - 1799, in office 1789 - 1797) the right to choose a "district of territory, not exceeding ten miles square, along the Potomac River." The site chosen by

![An 1874 facsimile map of Washington, DC with landholdings prior to L'Enfant’s 1791 survey overlaid on top. The site of the future White House is marked with a circle.](image-url)
Washington, with encouragement from Thomas Jefferson (1743 - 1826), was one of several possibilities shortlisted along an 80 mile stretch of the river. The new federal city would offer links to both north and south, via land and water, as well as inland across the Appalachian Mountains to the rapidly expanding west.

A new federal city would require careful surveying and planning, as well as a clear vision regarding the requirements of federal buildings. Before a single stone was laid, the idea of a president’s house and grounds was included in the planned design. In a 1791 letter to Washington, Jefferson sketched his early thoughts on how the city should be laid out (above and figure 3, p. 131). To the west of the future Capitol building embedded in his grid pattern, a large area covering over two blocks had been delineated for the ‘President.’

President Washington called on his one-time military member of staff, the Frenchman Pierre Charles L’Enfant (1754 - 1825) to survey the land, in collaboration with Andrew Ellicott (1754 -1820), a local surveyor.

The plans produced (figures 4 and 5, pp. 132-133) followed Jefferson’s overall theory that the city’s layout should adhere to a grid system, visually linking the separate branches (executive and legislative) of the newly formed government. L’Enfant’s and Ellicott’s additions to Jefferson’s initial theory include areas for congregation and several ‘nodes of development rather than a single concentrated settlement’ (Boyle 2001, p. 15).
The President's House was proposed by L'Enfant to be designed along the lines of a grand European palace, visible from all sides at the apex point of six wide avenues leading from each direction (Seale, 2008, p. 20). Grounds for the president are only included south of the house, which would sit at the top of a ridge running down to the to the Tiber Creek (a small tributary that runs into the Potomac River, see topographic map on previous page).

By December 1791, planning was sufficiently complete for L'Enfant to lay the foundations for the House. However, it soon became apparent that the planned residence would be too extravagant and ostentatious for a fledgling democracy; it would have been almost four times the size of the current building. L'Enfant's relationship with Ellicott was also starting to falter. Ultimately the situation became too tenuous, and Washington was forced to relieve L'Enfant of his duty at the start of 1792.

With L'Enfant's departure, the City was left without an architect for the President's House. In March 1792, at the urging of Thomas Jefferson, Congress placed notices in all the newspapers (image above) to announce a competition for the design of the Residence, and for the U.S. Capitol Building. The competition for the President's House was won by an Irish architect, James Hoban (1755 - 1831), who had immigrated from Ireland in 1785 and subsequently settled in Charleston, South Carolina.

Hoban's plan called for an understated neo-classical residence, inspired by the architecture of his native Ireland, including Leinster House in Dublin. Foundations for the smaller residence were laid in July 1792, and construction was sufficiently finished in time to host President John Adams (1735 - 1826, in office 1797 - 1801) and the First Family at the end of 1800.

President Adams only occupied the Executive Residence for four months, leaving him little time to develop the grounds. The only change he requested was the addition of a vegetable garden on the northeast side of the house.
In contrast, the now-President Jefferson (in office 1801 - 1809) moved in during the spring of 1801 with grand ideas for improving not only the house, but also the grounds. The most notable exterior improvements he implemented were the two terraces (above, and figure 6, p. 134) that would connect the Residence to the office buildings planned on either side. He had used a similar idea for his estate at Monticello. While the terraces built were not as extensive as those he originally designed, they still provided a physical separation between the north and south façades (see McDonald 2011 for an extensive history of the West and East Wings’ construction and development).

This division, and his construction of a stone wall ha-ha (a sunken ditch allowing for a continuous vista), indicate that privacy for the President and First Family was a concern from the beginning of the Residence’s history. The north façade would increasingly be seen as the public side of the White House, open for people to walk around. In contrast, the south façade and grounds were to be kept more private, and more for the use of the First Family exclusively. This uneasy balance between public and private would fluctuate between presidencies until President Grover Cleveland (in office 1893 - 1897; 1883 - 1885) closed the south grounds totally in 1893.

Despite detailed notes of his gardening work at Monticello, no records remain of any specific planting done during Jefferson’s years in the White House, apart from a vegetable garden to the southeast of the building. According to his friend, the noted diarist and political commentator Margaret Bayard Smith, ‘[Jefferson] was very anxious to improve the ground around the President’s House; but as Congress would make no appropriation for this and similar objects, he was obliged to abandon the idea’ (1906, p. 393). If Jefferson had been allowed to proceed, he had hoped to ‘have planted them exclusively with trees, shrubs and flowers indigenous to our native soil’ (ibid., p. 393). Recent research hints at the possibility of Jefferson designing a tapis vert (an open stretch of land) for
the grounds south of the White House (Pliska 2016, p. 15), but the plan was never executed.

Jefferson no doubt still surrounded himself with plants during his years in office, as attested by Smith: 'In the window recesses, were stands for the flowers and plants which it was his delight to attend and among his roses and geraniums was suspended the cage of his favourite mocking-bird... How he loved this bird! How he loved his flowers!' (Smith 1906, p. 385). Furthermore, in an 1808 letter to Jefferson from Mrs. Smith, she notes that she would like to send him some plants, including the 'black-rose'.1 However, she goes on to write 'If the President’s grounds afford no safe spot for these plants, Mrs. S. will take great pleasure in attending them until next winter' (Cornett, personal research). Whether it was lack of time or people to care for plants, Jefferson’s presidency lacks either reference in the historical record to any particular planting or any planting locations within the White House grounds.

The first list of trees and flowering shrubs (including roses) that were installed on the grounds dates to President Jefferson’s successor, James Madison (1751 - 1836, in office 1809 - 1817). The list is dated March 31, 1809, just weeks after Jefferson had departed, so Madison, in all probability, inherited the list from Jefferson. No plan exists for where the trees and shrubs were installed on the grounds, but before fire destroyed the White House in 1814, the grounds were apparently looking ‘very grand’ (see Pliska 2016, p. 197).

THE EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE: 1815 TO 1865

The British attacked the City in August 1814 during the War of 1812, and several buildings, including the White House, were burned, leaving only its shell. Work to rebuild the residence was quick, finishing in less than three years, and several improvements were implemented during

1 Peggy Cornett, Curator of Plants at Monticello, believes this rose could be Rosa gallica, R. pimpinellifolia, R. cinnamomea, or a native rose such as R. virginiana.
its reconstruction (such as the porticos on the north and south façade). The grounds surrounding the house would have been a construction site, so any development of the gardens would likely have been put on hold. President John Quincy Adams (1767 - 1848, in office 1825-1829), was a keen horticulturalist and spent much of his free time raising and growing trees (Boyle 2001, p. 48). He established a tree nursery during his residency, to the southwest of the Residence (see above), and a flower/kitchen garden to the southeast, but the existing pictorial evidence shows that no work had been done up to this point on the site of the future Rose Garden. His successor, Andrew Jackson (1767 - 1845, in office 1829 - 1837), divided the mixed-use garden into two, moving the kitchen garden portion southwest to replace Adams’ tree nursery.

Jackson’s most famous contribution to the White House grounds are the two Magnolia grandiflora (southern magnolia) trees planted between the South Portico and the start of the West Terrace. Despite circumstantial evidence that the trees were installed by him, as no textual or pictorial references exist until the second half of the nineteenth century (see Pliska 2016, 228-231), they appear before the end of the century, and provide the Residence with privacy from the south, as well as shade in the heat of the summer.

Minor improvements to the grounds were presided over by subsequent presidents (due in part to Congress refusing to appropriate sufficient money for the Residence, see Seale 2008, p. 264), but little appears to have been done to the southwest of the Residence on the site of the Rose Garden (figure 8). Both the flower garden and kitchen garden were tucked away to the sides of the Residence, and from what little description exists, they were not laid out as ornamental flower gardens designed to be admired or enjoyed by those in the Residence (ibid., p. 265).

The advent of photography in the 1840s allows for the first accurate
visual records of the grounds. The Library of Congress holds the earliest known daguerreotype of the White House (right), which dates to 1846. It does not show the entire west colonnade, but it gives a good idea of the planting at the time - consisting for the most part of deciduous trees and some evergreens. To the left, a free-standing trellis supports vine growth, but no further ornamental planting appears visible. Also unseen are the magnolia trees supposedly planted by President Jackson, providing further evidence that the trees were planted under a later president.

No known overall plan for the White House grounds had been produced since President Jefferson’s plan at the start of the century. Under President Millard Fillmore (1800 - 1874, in office 1850 - 1853), the first instance of a comprehensive plan for improving the public park that incorporated the National Mall as well as the grounds of the Residence was initiated. Andrew Jackson Downing (1815 - 1852) was the landscape architect charged with drawing up the design, which he presented in 1851 (above, and figure 7, p. 135). The plan that survives however does not include significant detail of the design for the White House. Remarking on
this, Downing wrote in the notes accompanying the plan:

‘I have not shown on the plan several ideas that have occurred to me for increasing the beauty and seclusion of the President’s grounds, because I would first wish to submit them for the approval of the President’ (quoted in Boyle 2001, p. 85).

While more detailed plans may have existed for the President’s grounds (ibid., p. 86), Downing’s accidental death in 1852 halted any major design changes to the grounds; perhaps the only change that was implemented was a metal fence that was installed around the northern edge of the South Drive, which would still be in place in 1935, as it is mentioned in the Olmsted Brothers’ report on the grounds.

A new administration in 1853 also impacted any of Downing’s suggested improvements. President Franklin Pierce (1804 - 1869, in office 1853 - 1857) was not particularly enthusiastic about Downing’s plan, and instead implemented a program of improving what was already in place (Seale 2008, p. 304). One of the larger jobs he approved was for the 1853 demolition of the old orangery near the Treasury building to the southeast of the Residence. It was rebuilt in the same year with an additional greenhouse, but only survived for four years as the Treasury building expansion moved westwards. The expansion altered the old flower garden, which completely disappeared as a result, but the old orangery was rebuilt at the western edge of the west terrace in 1860 (Pliska 2016, p. 266).

The rebuilt orangery was linked via an indoor staircase to a new conservatory built in 1857 during President James Buchanan’s (1791 - 1868, in office 1857 - 1861) tenure in the White House, though it had been approved by President Pierce. The Conservatory was located on top of the existing West Terrace and linked to the main floor of the Residence into the State Dining Room via a glazed passage, allowing the Conservatory to become part of the President’s suite of reception rooms. It was mainly used as a private retreat until later presidencies.

During President Abraham Lincoln’s (1809 - 1865, in office 1861 - 1865) time in office, the Conservatory was often used as a place of refuge. Despite the on-going Civil War, the grounds of the Residence were still, in-part, open to the public, and the Conservatory offered privacy away from the publicly accessible grounds.
President Lincoln’s wife, First Lady Mary Todd Lincoln, clearly enjoyed the Conservatory, and the grounds, writing to an old friend in Springfield, ‘We have the most beautiful flowers & grounds imaginable’ (quoted in Seale 2008, p. 380). A bouquet of fresh flowers was presented to her each day by the head gardener, John Watt, though their friendship would cause difficulties for the President, involving misappropriated funds and espionage (see Seale 2008, pp. 380-385).

Few changes occurred to the grounds during Lincoln’s time, as the Civil War was all-consuming (figure 9). Nevertheless, the gardens surrounding the south side of the Residence were clearly well maintained. A Washington, DC guide book dated 1864 describes them as ‘a lovely spot, and favorite resort. The grounds are laid out in a tasteful and romantic style, adorned with artificial mounds, trees, shrubbery, flowers, and a fountain’ (quoted in Boyle 2001, p. 94).

ROSES UNDER COVER: 1866 TO 1902

By the mid-nineteenth century, the taste for real flower indoor arrangements slowly replaced the earlier fashion for fake wax flower displays, as the myth of flowers containing dangerous “effluvia” slowly lost credence (Pliska 2016, p. 266). In Washington, DC, favorite flowers to either display in vases or wear as hair decorations included camellias and roses. Unlike the larger display conservatory above it, the greenhouse reconstructed in 1860 at the end of the West Terrace was specifically used to
grow plants for use within the Residence. However, as desire grew for more and more varied flowers, the greenhouse was unable to meet demand.

Under President Ulysses S. Grant (1822 - 1885, in office 1869 - 1877) and First Lady Julia Grant, a series of three additional greenhouses were built by 1873, housing geraniums, orchids, and roses. Even these additions were not enough to satisfy demand; his successor Rutherford B. Hayes (1822 - 1893, in office 1877 - 1881) enlarged the existing Conservatory and constructed a separate, larger, rose house immediately in front of the West Terrace (and now the site of the current Rose Garden). Purely functional in design and intent, it was built at grade with no underlying foundation (Pliska 2016, p. 273). Its sole purpose was to grow as many roses as possible, which it did year round: ‘The rose house is always riotous in bloom, and at any season affords ample cuttings for the home part of the White House life’ (The Washington Post, November 5, 1899). In front of the Rose House, President Hayes retained small parterres of roses and winding gravel paths that had been installed during the second half of the century (Pliska 2016, p. 262). These displays are rarely mentioned in contemporary sources.

By 1900, the Conservatory and greenhouses were at their largest extent, incorporating nine structures in addition

These photographs were taken from the nearby State, War and Navy Department building (now the Eisenhower Executive Office Building).
to the main Conservatory (figures 11 and 17, pp. 138, 142; see also image above). Early photographs of the south grounds show that beyond the greenhouse complex, a few ornamental beds and shrubs filled in the area to the South Drive (see left). These had first been installed during President Grant’s presidency (Seale 2015, p. 33), but changed considerably in the intervening years. Along with the two *Magnolia grandiflora* (Southern Magnolia) trees known as the Jackson magnolias, another unknown tree grew in this part of the grounds, but it had been removed between the years 1894 and 1900 (photo opposite dated 1894 it is visible, by 1900 it has disappeared).

**ROSES TAKE CENTER STAGE: 1903 TO PRESENT DAY**

Shortly after President Theodore Roosevelt (1858 - 1919, in office 1901 - 1909) and First Lady Edith Carow Roosevelt (1861 - 1948) moved into the White House, an exhibition was mounted at the nearby Corcoran Gallery of Art. On display were the concepts proposed by a commission (which included the landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. and architect Charles Follen McKim) for the improvement of the District of Columbia, focusing particularly on the National Mall. The McMillan Plan, as it came to be known (after Senator James McMillian), recommended the restoration of L'Enfant’s ‘axial relationships between the Capitol, the Washington Monument, and the White House,’ (Boyle 2001, p. 182) which had become obscured in the preceding century.
The 1903 Olmsted Brothers’ plan designed by Charles McKim, William Rutherford Mead, and Alexander White, showing their proposed improvements for the grounds immediately south of the White House.

The Plan did not specifically mention the grounds of the White House, but President Roosevelt attended the opening of the exhibition, and soon after, Mrs. Roosevelt asked Charles Follen McKim to advise on improvements to the Residence.

McKim’s main recommendations sought to reconnect the Residence to its colonial past ‘stripped to eighteenth-century simplicity but with functional Jeffersonian-style expansions’ (Griswold 2008, p. 6). This included the reconstruction of the East Terrace (which had been removed in 1866), and the restoration of the West Terrace both to an appearance closer to that during Jefferson’s era.

This would necessitate removal of the complex of conservatories and greenhouses, a plan that Mrs. Roosevelt was reluctant to carry out. After discussions between McKim and Mrs. Roosevelt in July 1902 at the Roosevelt’s house at Sagamore Hill, a compromise was reached in what McKim dubbed ‘The Treaty of Oyster Bay’ (see Seale 2008, pp. 638-640 for a full synopsis). The smaller conservatories would be removed and rebuilt on a site off the grounds at a nearby location, while the larger steel and iron structures would be dismantled carefully and reassembled elsewhere on the Residence grounds. Though agreed
upon by Mrs. Roosevelt, none of the greenhouses were ever in reality reconstructed on the Residence grounds (Boyle 2001, p. 186).

In February 1903, Olmsted Jr. and McKim were specifically asked to review the grounds. Despite Olmsted’s lack of official employment on the project, he toured the gardens with McKim and discussed potential changes. The two wings on either side of the terraces were under construction, with the western building being used for executive offices (soon dubbed the ‘West Wing’). These new wings framed the areas just south of the two terraces, providing a ready-made semi-enclosed framework for a new garden. In a letter from McKim to Olmsted shortly after their visit, he wrote: ‘The garden to the south is to be extremely simple ... something of the character of Mount Vernon, namely division into parterres, surrounded with close cut hedges’ (quoted in Boyle 2001, p. 186).

The designed gardens (previous page, and figure 12, p. 138) would have been more than twice the size of the current gardens (ibid., p. 186), and would have been united by a central thoroughfare joining the two main axial paths through the center of the gardens, the South Drive being pushed further outwards away from the south entrance.

The west garden, as constructed (similarly in the east garden) bears little resemblance to McKim’s plan (figure 18, p.143, with Mrs. Roosevelt having more input into the final design and execution (see for example Griswold 2008, pp. 10-16 for Mrs. Roosevelt’s probable inspirations). For the first time in the history of the grounds, precedence was given over to plants that would not be out of place in gardens across America.
The hot house plants held in the Conservatory and greenhouses would be replaced. A contemporary journalist noted, ‘It is to return to those sturdy plants which form the national flora that...[the garden has planned] to be made within the private grounds of the White House. Conspicuous among the new White House flora will be the golden rod, which has been urged as the national flower of the United States’ (The Washington Post, June 24, 1903, p.3). The article goes on to describe the new gardens as being ‘in bloom as many months as possible ... in the spring and late autumn, when Mrs. Roosevelt and the children are at the White House’ (ibid., p.3).

The article finishes by proclaiming ‘A huge bed of roses will form the center design [of the west garden and] already a rose bush is growing over the President’s office, and next season it is planned to have the office covered with climbing roses and clematis’ (ibid., p.3). Though the Garden is often historically referred to as the ‘Colonial Garden’, roses were already prevalent in the planting plans, having made the jump from their indoor cultivation under the greenhouse glass to the outdoor space of Mrs. Roosevelt’s gardens (figure 18).

There were certainly enough roses produced both in the gardens and the off-site greenhouses for Mrs. Roosevelt’s successor to enjoy their beauty and remembered afterwards: ‘[One of First Lady Helen Taft’s] chief pleasures she got out of her anticipated residence in the White House after her husband was elected was that she could have all the roses she could use. The gardener’s records show that thousands of roses were used during those four years’ (The New York Times, July 12, 1931).

Despite the garden being much-loved and admired by the Roosevelts and Tafts, fashions in gardens and planting changed considerably within the space of a decade. First Lady Ellen Wilson (1860 - 1914), wife of President Woodrow Wilson (1856 - 1924, in office 1913 - 1921) lost no time in deciding that the east and west gardens both required complete redesigns and enlisted the help of Landscape Designer Beatrix Farrand (1872 - 1959) and Landscape Architect George Burnap (1885 - 1938) to each design one of the gardens from her initial sketches (Boyle 2001, p. 191).

The new design for the [Rose] Garden was a definitive departure from the old, replacing the paisleyesque patterned beds with more symmetrical
ones, composed of long elongated beds and dividing hedges (figure 19, p. 144; see also images on right). Burnap also split the garden into two sections. The larger half was centered around a lawn area bordered by seasonal planting and shrub roses. The other half was a smaller 'President's Walk', lined on either side by standard rose bushes. This allowed the President to walk to the Oval Office without going through the service rooms still held in the west terrace at the time (Pliska 2016, p. 81).

At the western end of the garden, a latticed fence separated the garden from a drying yard, with a central arch and a statue of Pan set within (the origins of this choice is unknown, see Boyle 2001, p. 192). At the eastern end, a beautiful semi-circular bench, painted white, was installed in a semi-circular opening for seating. Soon after the garden was finished, President Wilson set up a large canvas tent over this bench (below), and used the garden enclave as an outdoor office during the heat of summer (Pliska 2016, p. 92).

Both the President and the First Lady enjoyed the new garden. Contemporary accounts note: 'The bewildering mass of roses, shading from the deepest crimson to the palest pink, now blooming in the White House gardens gives evidence of Mrs.
Wilson’s skill as landscape gardener and rose culturist’ (*The Washington Post*, June 8, 1914, p. 4). The article continues: ‘Possibly no one takes greater pleasure in the roses than the President whose out-door office or tent is pitched at the far end of the garden. Rising in masses, the young bushes, which were set out last fall under Mrs. Wilson’s personal direction, sweep tier after tier northward. The center bushes have roses of the darkest red shades, those at either end pale from blush rose pink to the palest tints.’ (ibid., p.4). Mrs. Wilson sadly died two months after the article was written, but the garden was maintained by President Wilson’s second wife, First Lady Edith Wilson (1872 - 1961).

The Garden remained largely unchanged through the next three administrations. President Herbert Hoover (1874 - 1964, in office 1929 - 1933) was primarily preoccupied with the Great Depression. Nevertheless, during his time in the Executive Residence, First Lady Lou Henry Hoover (1874 - 1944) installed a small bluestone terrace underneath the Jackson Magnolias in 1929 as a respite from the glare of the sun (left).

The simple lawn underneath the magnolia trees was separated from the rest of the area between the West Wing and South Portico when First Lady Edith Roosevelt built her garden in 1903. The areas remained separate after First Lady Ellen Wilson’s redesign in 1913 and all subsequent iterations until President Kennedy’s garden in 1962.

Mrs. Hoover’s terrace also highlights one of the problems that Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. had come across during the development of the overall grounds. Since his recommendations in 1902/3, Olmsted had periodically been asked back to the Residence to give further advice. In 1928, he wrote to the Director of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, Major Ulysses S. Grant III, about his current concerns:

‘...while the general effect is distinctly “respectable” ... and while the
general plan, as regards the form of the ground and the disposition of
the tree-masses and means of communication and their relation to the
building and to the exterior surroundings is emphatically good, it would
be fair to say that almost anyone of cultivated taste and a fairly broad
and appreciative acquaintance with fine examples of the landscape
surroundings of great mansions, both private and official, in this country
and elsewhere, would have to rate the White House Grounds as distinctly
disappointing.'

Olmsted concludes his letter:

'I wonder whether the time is not approaching to undertake this courageously
and broadly - with the utmost respect for what is good in the old design,
but with an appreciation that in detail the White House Grounds have never
approached the standards attained by the more distinguished examples
of the grounds of private and official residences in the United States ...
The White House Grounds ought to be such that an organization like
the Garden Club of America would proudly and unhesitatingly point them
out to its members or to foreign visitors of kindred interests as among
the best hundred examples of residential grounds in America' (quoted in

Though no undertaking was initiated during the rest of President Hoover's
presidency, his successor Franklin D. Roosevelt (1882 - 1945, in office
1933 - 1945) took up the challenge, instructing Olmsted in April 1935 to
prepare recommendations for improvements and continual maintenance
for the entire grounds, a revolutionary concept at the time (Boyle 2001,
p. 246; figures 13 and 14, p. 139). The remit would also include grading
work south of the newly constructed West Wing, which had been rebuilt at
the end of 1934.

Olmsted’s report shows little restraint regarding the unorganized nature
of the grounds’ development over the previous century, writing in great
detail about the numerous faults of previous administrations.

With regards to the west (and east) garden, they conclude:

'A greater richness and perfection of floral display than in the past
would be entirely appropriate and desirable in the two formal gardens
south of the east and west wings; both of which, while admirable in situation, are now wholly unworthy in detail and upkeep for the positions they occupy. These formal garden areas, however, cannot be very greatly extended without doing violence to the historically long-established, and in its own way admirable and dignified informal landscape of a simple and large-scale character which is the dominant characteristic of the general design’ (1935, p. 18).

Their proposed solution for the two gardens runs to eight and a half pages of the report. It argued that the gardens must be simplified, and treated together as a whole, with symmetrical layouts and restrained planting beds (see figures 15 and 16 for before and after plans, p. 141). It pared down the quadrants of the earlier 1903 proposed plan even further, but kept the connecting path between the two gardens, stressing the strong axial vista from the President’s new office (now known as the Oval Office) across to the East Wing. Roosevelt was largely positive about the report and its recommendations (Boyle 2001, p. 257), and implemented a few of the proposed plans with regards to the roads and viewsheds towards the Washington Monument. However, the rapidly deteriorating situation in Europe and the United States entry into World War II precluded his completing the designs as laid out by Olmsted.

At the end of 1949, President Harry Truman (1884 - 1972, in office 1945 - 1953) enacted the largest and most extensive restoration and reconstruction of the Residence since the British had burned it down in 1814. The original building had fallen into a state of disrepair over the years. As a result, it was gutted and a new steel frame shell was incorporated into the building’s fabric. Consequently, the grounds surrounding the Residence suffered immensely and were essentially a construction site while the work was carried out. Once the restoration project had finished, in 1952,
records state that the Garden was reassembled in a little more than six weeks (Boyle 2001, p. 299), with no changes to the previous design, save for new planting (figure 20, p. 145). This included ‘beni-geri azaleas along the east side of the West Wing and with 1,430 new rose bushes’ (ibid., p. 300).

However, only a year later the new President, Dwight D. Eisenhower (1890 - 1969, in office 1953 - 1961) ordered the removal of many of these roses to West Potomac Park as an economy measure (Boyle 2001, p. 301). In 1957 he continued by asking the NPS Landscape Architect James Howe (figure 21, p. 146) to design a plan that cleared away the partition hedges and removing some of the beds ‘so that he could hold more people in the Garden’ (Williams 1965, p. 9).

President John F. Kennedy (1917 - 1963, in office 1961 - 1963) and his family arrived at the Residence in January 1961, and were greeted with the sad sight of ‘Boxwood everywhere [that] had been invaded by privet and was harshly shaped by pruning shears’ (Seale 2015, p. 40). Few of the roses for which the Garden was known had survived Eisenhower’s cull, and overcrowding during events was still an issue.

That summer, President Kennedy turned to his family friend, Rachel “Bunny” Mellon, for help in redesigning the garden. Though not a professional landscape architect or designer, she was known to the
President for her beautiful garden at Oak Spring, Virginia and her discerning horticultural expertise. Upon seeing the Garden for the first time, she felt that it had ‘a sad unlived in feeling - staring like a pale man with dark eyes staring into space’ (Andy Jackson, personal communication). She asked Perry Wheeler, a Washington, DC-based landscape architect for guidance on the technical aspects of designing and building a garden.

In March 1962, less than a year after President Kennedy asked for Mellon’s help, the new Rose Garden was built in the space of only four weeks (figure 22, p. 147; see also Appendix E on p. 152 for a photographic timeline of construction) - the first event was held at the start of May (see p. 35 for a closer analysis of Mellon’s 1962 design). President Kennedy had hoped to have the first state dinner in the Rose Garden for Haile Selassie (Williams 1965, p. 9), but it had to be called off, and the first dinner wasn’t held in the Garden until President Lyndon B. Johnson’s administration. He did however hold numerous events in the Garden for a variety of purposes throughout 1962 and 1963.

Each and every subsequent president has used the garden since the Kennedy /Mellon redesign. The large lawn area has lent itself to events such as press conferences, state dinners, and seasonal events (see the historical timeline for examples, p. 49). Throughout the intervening, the Rose Garden has gone through small but noticeable changes.

In 1981, First Lady Nancy Reagan (1921 - 2016), wife of President Ronald
Reagan (1911 - 2004, in office 1981 - 1989) asked Bunny Mellon to return to the White House and re-energize the planting that had become lackluster over the preceding twenty years, in part because the Katherine crabapples had become too large, shading out the plants below. Mrs. Mellon suggested removing two of the crabapples in each bed and pruning them back into shape, along with new plantings of lilies and roses (Mellon, private correspondence).

By 1989 the grass at the eastern end of the garden had become worn and was being replaced frequently. Contrary to Mrs. Mellon’s designed path underneath the magnolia trees (so as not to disturb or distract the President working in the Oval Office), those on the grounds used the fastest and most direct way to reach the South Drive. The decision to pave this over created a path from the Palm Room door across the Garden to the South Drive. This has somewhat downplayed the importance of the patio at the eastern end, as it has become absorbed into the new path. Similarly, smaller changes in the plantings have occurred, often at the request of the president and the first family and their personal preferences. However, the overall framework has changed little since the last major work was done in 1989.

This history of the Rose Garden’s evolution into its present iteration, within the larger President’s Park, demonstrates the input that each president has had in the development of the White House and grounds. Every president has been associated with the building. George Washington was instrumental in choosing the site for the future Residence, and each subsequent president has called the White House home during their presidency. And while not every president was actively involved in the appearance and design of the Rose Garden, their contributions, both large and small, helped to shape the Garden as it is today, providing a visual connection to the White House’s past, but also continues to bear witness to defining moments in history each and every day.
‘All [President Kennedy’s] happiest hours were in the garden’

Jacqueline Kennedy, 1966
Rachel “Bunny” Lambert Mellon (1910 - 2014) grew up with a deep respect and appreciation for books and history, alongside a lifelong love of horticulture. As a child, she kept a record of horticultural observations, noting prices and characteristics of plants bought, and their progress as she grew them in her garden.

Alongside the practical aspects of gardening, Mrs. Mellon was fascinated by earlier generations of gardens, their designers and their caretakers. In a 1982 interview, she notes she ‘studied prints in old books of Italian and French gardens and then built miniature ones in wooden boxes incorporating small stone steps, real soil and tiny topiary trees’ (Deitz 1982). According to the current Head Librarian at Oak Spring Garden Foundation (2019, personal communication), of the major horticultural authorities from Europe, she was particularly influenced by the work of Jean de La Quintinie (1626 - 1688), Jacques Boyceau (c. 1565 - 1637), Claude Mollet (c. 1564 - c. 1649) and André Mollet (died c. 1665), Gilles de Mortain (died after 1723) and Louis Claude Noisette (1772 - 1849). Their writings and designs would permeate into Mrs. Mellon’s aesthetic sensibilities, as well as to her life-long adherence to their horticultural techniques, particularly with regards to shaping and pruning.

Closer to home, gardens of the founding fathers and other Virginia early estates also infused Mellon’s work. She spent a portion of her childhood at her father Gerard B. Lambert’s estate Albemarle in Princeton, New Jersey. The estate gardens were
designed by the landscape architects at Olmsted Brothers, and it was here that she designed her first garden outside the family dining room (Holden 2018, p. 14).

Ellen Biddle Shipman’s body of work (1869 - 1950) can also be seen reflected in Mellon’s designs (as suggested by Andy Jackson, current Head of Horticulture and Landscapes at Oak Spring Garden Foundation, 2019 personal communication). Mellon also included a Shipman-designed gate at her first home with husband Stacy Lloyd at Apple Hill, Virginia. Shipman was renowned during her career for her designs that ‘relied on principles [of] axial layouts, careful proportional relationships between house and garden architecture, and strong visual and physical connections between house and garden’ (Tankard 1996, p. 47). Most importantly, it was Shipman’s framework of clean lines that resonated strongest with Mellon’s design style. Shipman had advised would-be designers to ‘remember that the design of your place is its skeleton upon which you will later plant to make your picture. Keep that skeleton as simple as possible’ (ibid., p. 53).

This recommendation was echoed by Mellon herself when retrospectively writing about her design for the Rose Garden: ‘My theory of garden design calls for an overall outline, which I call the “bone structure,” the most important element’ (1983, p. 7). All of these thoroughly American influences can be clearly seen in Mellon’s design for the Rose Garden, and fit well with President Kennedy’s desire for the Garden to match the splendor of the gardens in England, France, and Austria he had visited while in Europe in 1961.

Mellon’s combination of comprehensive historical knowledge of gardens and practical horticultural skills made her ideal for President Kennedy’s goals for the Garden in 1961. Initial discussions with President Kennedy in Cape Cod had given her a clear idea of his brief: ‘He wanted an American garden, open and expansive, designed for function and beauty in the traditions established by two of America’s founding fathers - Washington and Jefferson’ (Holden 2018, p. 236).
She was supported in the design process by the Washington, DC based landscape architect Perry Wheeler (1913 - 1989). As a practicing professional, he planned and drew the more technical aspects of the design, and provided many critical suggestions to how the garden could be improved. Their finished design thoroughly follows the brief set by the President. Of the surviving preliminary drawings held at Oak Spring (following page), Mellon’s estate in Upperville, VA, there are remarkably few changes from initial thoughts to installed garden.

Mellon further expanded the size of the central lawn area to accommodate larger crowds, as specified by President Kennedy, and bordered this lawn with two elongated parterre borders. ‘Th[e] divisions,’ Mellon wrote, ‘gave the garden its own pattern, not unlike an early American garden in Southern Virginia, in which the earth could be left bare if need be and the garden would still have form’ (1983, p. 10).

The diamond pattern of the parterres provides strong visual direction along its length. No clear reason exists for this design decision on Mrs. Mellon’s part, though the device was not uncommon in American gardens (such as at Williamsburg). Nevertheless, the diamond motif appears in many of her houses as a distinctive feature (see right).

In her first study for the design, drawn in November 1961 (following page), the diamond pattern is continuous, and the plant to be used for the pattern isn’t labeled. By January 1962, the design had evolved and was installed three months later. The
diamonds, made from a gray perennial (santolina or dusty miller) now no longer joined one another at the longer tip, and would be separated by a running diagonal line of boxwood shrubs. The boxwood would link the front of the border to the back, and two short lines of boxwood would link the two borders across the lawn by drawing the eye horizontally from one to the other.

Each of the four corners of the lawn was anchored to the site by *Magnolia soulangeana* (Saucer Magnolia) trees. Mellon wrote that these four trees had been the catalyst for the rest of the design. Prior to their inclusion, she claimed she had struggled to know where to start. She had seen the species of magnolia growing on 5th Avenue at the Frick Museum in New York, NY while walking in October 1961, when the trees had started to lose their leaves. In a 1983 article, she wrote: ‘I had often admired these trees before, but this evening they had a special importance to me. Their pale silvery branches with heavy twigs seemed to retain the light of summer. I knew their pattern of growth would continue to give form in winter and would catch raindrops as well as tufts of falling snow’ (Mellon 1983, p. 6). She continues, ‘...these trees would soften the difficult corners that were now bare and would permit sufficient light to fall beneath and around them to allow planting’ (ibid., p. 6). She enlisted the help of a National Park Service horticulturalist from the gardens at Kenilworth, Irvin Williams (1926 - 2018), to help her not only acquire the trees, but also to help with the installation of the overall garden. Mr. Williams remained a gardener at the White House until his retirement in 2008.

In addition to emphasis on a garden’s framework, Mellon endeavored to respond to the light and the sky around the landscape (Jackson, personal communication). The light-and-shadow effect of the Magnolia trees was imitated by the *Malus* ‘Katherine’ (Crabapple) trees planted along the length of the two parterre beds. Not only would they shade the summer sun, but also provide structure in winter when all their leaves had disappeared, and lending color when little else was in bloom.
Perhaps more importantly, Mellon chose Crabapples as they are in the Rosaceae family, ‘and would blend well with the roses’ (Mellon 1983, p. 8). Five Crabapples were planted in each long bed, each in the center of a diamond constructed of either boxwood or perennials.

Roses were naturally a focus of the garden, and plans for their inclusion existed from the start of Mellon’s design. After press reports were first published in March 1962 suggesting that the existing Rose Garden was being ‘done away with,’ the White House press secretary had to tell reporters ‘It’s going to remain the Rose Garden. There will be roses in it’ (The New York Times, March 23, 1962, p. 67). The new Rose Garden contained perennials and other flowering plants in addition to the ubiquitous rose, echoing First Lady Mrs. Roosevelt’s 1903 plan to extend the flowering season through a greater part of the year.

No definitive plant list of roses appears to have survived from when the garden was originally planted, though they were planted in 26 separate areas of the garden (Pamela Turnure, April 20 1963, in Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy papers held at the John F. Kennedy Library and Museum). ‘Peace’ roses are listed on the original January 1962 concept plan (below), but other roses planted have been reconstructed from a later source (Kramer...
1973), in which Mrs. Mellon writes a commentary on the Rose Garden’s design. The roses used (see pp. 79-83 for a list and photographs) are all pale pinks, yellows and whites. She explains these choices, writing ‘that too many red roses mixed with other flowers tend to give a garden a heaviness and sadness that do not belong. Red roses are often the most beautiful of all roses, but they are better planted together, or with flowers related to them’ (in Kramer 1973, p. 79).

The roses in the garden were surrounded by flowering perennials and seasonal annuals to provide as much color throughout the year as possible. In her foreword to An Oak Spring Flora (a catalog of books in her library at Oak Spring) Mellon writes ‘Flowers are the paintbox of garden design, and they can create a sense of peace and simplicity’ (Tomasi 1997, p. xxv). Mellon’s sentiments had been echoed by President Kennedy in his initial brief: ‘The President loved flowers and asked if a variety of other types could be mixed with the roses. He had read the published garden notes of Thomas Jefferson [given to him by Mellon, see Seale 2015, p. 40] and hoped for flowers used in Jefferson’s period’ (1983, p.6).

Bunny Mellon chose perennials that she believed would reflect these wishes. Perennials used during President Kennedy’s tenure include
Santolina chamaecyparissus (Lavender Cotton), Alchemilla mollis (Lady’s Mantle), Aquilegia canadensis (Columbine), Achillea ‘Coronation Gold’ (Yarrow), and Sedum sieboldii (Stoncrop) among others.

Of Mellon’s original January 1962 design (previous pages), President Kennedy asked that she amend only two design elements. The first was the removal of tent at the eastern end - a simple change to remedy. The second change was more vital. Mellon’s January 1962 plan (p. 40 and image 1 above) enlarged the steps leading down from the Oval Office into the Garden, as requested. President Kennedy felt however that the scale still wasn’t befitting the importance that these steps would assume: he wanted them ‘to serve both as steps and as a platform or stage’ (Mellon 1983, p. 6).

The second design of the steps (image 2 above) had a central platform at the top, with two sets of smaller steps leading down in a ninety degree turn. These were also rejected as not quite right - President Kennedy wanted a platform to speak from, but he wanted these steps to also act as a fitting location to respect the men and women the ceremonies would be honoring. Mellon and Wheeler’s solution was a perfect compromise (image 3 above). One set of five wide steps was to lead from the Garden to the Oval Office Colonnade. The second step however is wider than the others, enough for President Kennedy to use as a platform. Above this wider step, three further steps lead up to the top. First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy later wrote ‘He had asked Bunny to make [the steps] so that they would let him stand
with - and not above - the men he was honoring’ (Kennedy 1966).

The garden was finished in May 1962. Over the next eighteen months, President Kennedy used the garden both privately as a retreat and for many public ceremonies. Publicly, the ceremony to bestow honorary citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill was ‘the Rose Garden’s proudest hour for [the President]’ as Mrs. Kennedy later wrote in a private scrapbook for Bunny Mellon. In photographs from the event, the President is standing on the platform step exactly as he has envisioned.

Away from the camera’s lens, the Rose Garden was also a private refuge for President Kennedy and his family. Mr. Williams, the gardener, recalled that ‘He’d ... go out and lie down in the grass on warm days and play with the children. They’d be all over him’ (1965, p. 8). In more somber moments, it would also provide peace and a space for contemplation. Mrs. Kennedy wrote, ‘When he had to talk about things that might change the world, it helped to look out at his garden’ (1966). This was no more true than during the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962. Two days after the height of the Crisis has passed, the President wrote a note of thanks to Mrs. Mellon, reiterating how important the Rose Garden was to him (see image on p. 101).

Mrs. Kennedy made a scrapbook of the Rose Garden project as a present to give to Bunny Mellon for Christmas 1966. The large elephant folio book is clothbound in green and turquoise stripes, and Mrs. Kennedy designed, drew, and wrote each page herself. The love and admiration that the Kennedys had for the Garden is apparent on each page. After pages dedicated to family photographs of the President in the Garden with his children, Mrs. Kennedy ends the book by writing ‘It was a place he could forget his cares, with his wife and his children’ and ‘What Bunny gave him [was] all his happiest hours ... in the garden.’
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The White House and its Grounds

PRE-1608
The site of present day Washington, D.C. is originally inhabited by the Algonquian-speaking people of the Nacotchtank. Artifacts discovered during the construction of the outdoor swimming pool in 1975 indicate that the land the White House is sited on was once home to Native Americans.

1608
First European explorers arrive in the area, including John Smith in 1608, who sailed up and mapped the Chesapeake Bay (above).

White House Grounds Stewards and Designers

United States Presidents

The Rose Garden
**1790**
Congress shortlists three possible locations for the new capital along the banks of the Potomac River. Thomas Jefferson recommends that the new capital should be laid out in a simple grid system (above), with two full city blocks dedicated to the President's House and gardens.

**1791**
Pierre Charles L'Enfant is commissioned by President Washington to survey and plan the new city (above). L'Enfant is dismissed in early 1792 due to disagreements and the surveyor Andrew Ellicott takes complete control of the city survey.

**1800**
President John Adams and his family move in to the newly finished Residence, designed by James Hoban (above), construction having started in 1792.

---

**White House Grounds Stewards and Designers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White House Grounds Stewards and Designers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson, President 1801-1809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**United States Presidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Presidents</th>
<th>The Office of the Presidency established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>1789-1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>1797-1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson</td>
<td>1801-1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison</td>
<td>1809-1817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**1802-1805**
As President, Thomas Jefferson makes several plans for the house and grounds, in collaboration with Benjamin Henry Latrobe and Robert Mills. Their sketch (below) of the southern pleasure garden shows two new terrace colonnades to the east and west of the Executive Residence.

While clearly part of the enclosed grounds, no design exists yet for the west area south of the White House. The boundary wall and terraces are constructed, but little else of Jefferson's plans is realized.
**The White House and its Grounds**

**1817**
Benjamin Latrobe, as well as James Hoban, rebuild the Executive Residence after it is burnt by the British in 1814 during the War of 1812. North and south (above) porticos are added.

**1829**
Many changes to the north side of the Executive Residence are made during Andrew Jackson's presidency. The south lawn was thoroughly graded and boxpaths installed. The Latrobe/Jefferson road is levelled and the Jefferson ha-ha wall remains in place.

**1850**
Andrew Jackson Downing produces a masterplan for the center of Washington, DC, including the National Mall, the United States Capitol and the grounds of the White House. One clear design element is the strong visual sight line he envisaged from the White House's southwards towards Tiber Creek and the Washington monument, construction of which had just started.

**1855**
The Residence remains open during the Civil War. The kitchen garden moves from the east to the west of the grounds and expands.

---

**White House Grounds Stewards and Designers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White House Grounds Stewards and Designers</th>
<th>United States Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Burls, Gardener 1817-1818</td>
<td>James Madison 1809-1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Jackson, Latin 1817</td>
<td>John Quincy Adams 1825-1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Quincy Adams, Gardener 1825-1829</td>
<td>Martin Van Buren 1837-1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Van Buren, Gardener 1837-1841</td>
<td>James Polk 1844-1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Polk, Gardener 1844-1849</td>
<td>Zachary Taylor 1849-1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James K. Polk, Gardener 1849-1850</td>
<td>Franklin Pierce 1853-1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Taylor, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1849-1850</td>
<td>Abraham Lincoln 1861-1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Taylor, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1849-1850</td>
<td>Ulysses S. Grant 1869-1877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**The Rose Garden**

**1814**
An 1815 watercolor by George Harriet (below) shows that the southern approach road was not affected by the fire, and there is no apparent damage to the grounds. The western Jefferson terrace is visible to the far left, but no further development exists for the area.

**1825**
President John Quincy Adams sets a precedent for treating the grounds of the White House as a kind of arboretum of American flora in its early days. T 1826 watercolor of the President's flower garden from the southeast by Andrew Jackson, Baker (below) shows a variety of flowering and deciduous trees and bushes, with hedges placed at intervals for climbing vines.

**184**
The earliest known daguerreotype of the White House taken by John Plumbe (below). No evidence of the kwan Magnolia grandifolia trees are visible.

**1853**
The first greenhouse and conservatory (built in the early 1850s) are constructed on the west side of the Residence after being moved from the east due to Treasury's expansion. They house the growing collection of plants and flowers, including roses, required by the president on a daily basis.
1871
Construction of the massive State, War, and Navy Building starts. Soil from the excavation of this construction is used in the area now covered by the Ellipse.

1870s
The greenhouses and conservatory grow and expand under President Grant and President Hayes. Over the next 40 years, this network develops to eventually consist of a large conservatory and nine smaller greenhouses (above and below).

1900
Chales Follen McKim of McKim, Mead & White is called in by President Roosevelt to remove and update the Executive Residence and its grounds. As part of his plans, McKimce designs two formal gardens for each side of the south portico (above). The east and west wings are built, though the gas is not constructed as he envisaged.

1902
First Lady Lou Hoover installs a small bluestone terrace underneath the Jackson Magnolia.

1858
This 1858 photograph shows deciduous trees, shrubs and vines on trellises growing in the area in front of the Conservatory.

1899
President Hayes takes office. He and his wife, First Lady Lucy Hayes, are committed gardeners and lovers of plants. Hayes builds a rose house (bottom center, and bottom right), being dismantled where the current Rose Garden stands today. In front of the rose house, vegetable beds and shrubs covered the area leading to the South Drive (bottom left).

1903
First Lady Edith Roosevelt (wife of Theodore Roosevelt) asks George Bunnell to help her create what became the first iteration of the Rose Garden. The design is a large departure from the garden’s previous layout (below), being classically symmetrical with a considerably smaller plant palette. A President’s Walk is included running parallel to the West Terrace.
HISTORIC TIMELINE

1950

1949-1952
President Harry S. Truman initiates a total renovation of the Executive Mansion, resulting in the grounds becoming a construction site, including the Rose Garden.

The garden is reinstated in 1952 with its previous layout, but on a smaller plan with fewer plant varieties, (below), notes and stripes predominating.

1957
President Dwight D. Eisenhower removes many of the planting trees and hedges to create a larger lawn.

Most of the roses have now also been removed from the garden.

1962
President John F. Kennedy wants to expand the Rose Garden for official ceremonies and events. He asks a family friend, Rachel "Butty" Merlin, to design a garden, with the aid of landscape architect Perry Wheeler.

The garden centers around a large lawn area, enclosed by boxwood parterres as edging to symmetrical planting beds. The Rose Garden becomes a green theater for the President to hold official ceremonies and press briefings.

1965
Rachel "Butty" Merlin designs a new Rose Garden, which is dedicated to First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy. The Kennedy asked her to design the East Garden with the assistance of the Rose Garden, but it was delayed after President Kennedy's assassination. First Lady Lady Bird Johnson organized for it to be finished.

Franklin D. Roosevelt
1933-1945

Harry S. Truman
1945-1953

Dwight D. Eisenhower
1953-1969

John F. Kennedy
1961-1963

Lyndon B. Johnson
1963-1969

Teddy Roosevelt
1901-1909

Theodore Roosevelt
1909-1913

Rachel "Butty" Merlin, Landscape Designer
1951-1961

H. Hawley, Grounds Superintendent
1972-1990

Irwin Williams, Chief Horticulturist
1962-2008

National Park Service, Grounds Jurisdiction
1933-1945

1935
At the behest of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the landscape architects of Olmsted Brothers submit a "Report to the President on the White House Grounds.

The report lays out a masterplan design and management approach that is still followed to this day, preserving the historic aspects of the grounds while simultaneously incorporating current and future demands upon the landscape.

1949-1952
President Harry Truman initiates an extensive restoration project for the original Residence after a 1945 report concludes the building has become unstable. Consequently, the grounds become a building site for duration of the work (see also below left).

1965
Rachel "Butty" Merlin designs the East Garden, which is dedicated to First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy. The Kennedy asked her to design the East Garden with the assistance of the Rose Garden, but it was delayed after President Kennedy's assassination. First Lady Lady Bird Johnson organized for it to be finished.
1966
President Lyndon B. Johnson poses with his family and their dogs in the Rose Garden.

1976
To mark the Bicentennial of American independence, President Ronald Ford hosts a State Dinner in honor of Queen Elizabeth II of the United Kingdom in a tent erected in the Rose Garden.

1988
President Ronald Reagan holds a State Dinner for President Faure of Togo. The Rose Garden allows for greater flexibility in numbers of people the President can invite to events.

1999
To date back to the time of President Abraham Lincoln, and formalized during the presidency of Ronald Reagan, President Bill Clinton pardons "Harry the turkey" for Thanksgiving in 1999. The Rose Garden has often held this annual tradition.

2016
President Barack Obama welcomes Prime Minister Justin Trudeau of Canada for an official state visit. The Rose Garden played host to their joint press conference.

1971
President Richard Nixon's daughter Tricia marries Edward Cox in the Rose Garden. This was the first time the garden has been used for a wedding. There have been a further two weddings held in the Garden since.

1977
President Jimmy Carter, First Lady Rosalynn Carter and their daughter Amy admire the spring bulbs soon after the President takes office in 1977.

1991

2001
Along with lighthearted events, the Rose Garden has often been the scene for more solemn moments. Here, President George W. Bush makes an announcement just after the 2001 terrorist attacks.

2018
President Donald Trump holds a press conference in the Rose Garden in front of members of the press, his staff, and guests.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Textual and pictorial records for the White House grounds are plentiful. They provide evidence of how the Rose Garden appeared physically and was used by past presidents. Dr. Susan Boyle’s 2001 Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) provides the most recent examination of the Rose Garden’s conditions, and is a useful framework to help investigate current conditions. This historical information will be integrated with the following current conditions of the site, collected from numerous surveys, reports and investigations, as well as on-site investigations.

Due to the high profile nature and relative small size of the Rose Garden, a schematic drawing of the site was deemed unnecessary. Future schematic drawings may be appropriate if the scope of work grows to include larger areas of the White House grounds.

The prestigious location and potential treatment requires a level of detail and accuracy. Accordingly, an existing conditions was provided on August 28, 2019 by the Office of the Usher of the White House. Existing features and characteristics are documented on this survey, including topography, drain locations, electrical power points, tree and vegetation locations and landscape tails among others. This information provides a platform for further documentation of topography, slope analysis, planting design, hydrology, irrigation, sun/shade exposure, spatial relations and decision. All of these factors will inform future design decisions and treatment.
TOPOGRAPHY
The diagram was derived from the survey titled 'Site Plan' received August 28, 2019 from the Office of the Chief Usher of the White House.

KEY
H.P + High Point
L.P + Low Point
Slope

The diagram demonstrates how there is a gentle slope southwards from the northwest corner of the Rose Garden down to the east side. South of the Rose Garden boundary hedge, the ground slopes down towards the southern boundary of the White House grounds.
SITE SURVEY OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

Current existing conditions derived from the survey titled 'Site Plan' received August 26, 2019 from the office of the Chief Usher of the White House. The plan has been shrunk to 40% of its actual size.
SUN EXPOSURE

The sun exposure diagrams serve as shade studies during the morning and afternoon of both the summer and winter solstices. The large *Quercus phellos* (Willow Oak) provides shade to the southern border of the Rose Garden which may impact plant growth compared to the northern border. The Jackson *Magnolia grandiflora* (Southern Magnolias) grove provides shade year round and will require shade tolerant species if planted.
Circulation was observed on site and information was passed on by White House Gardens and Grounds Staff.

**Key**
- Vehicular Circulation
- HMAX Helicopter Landing Pad
- Primary Circulation
- Secondary Circulation
- Media Congregation Areas

Press conferences, state dinners, and various other events take place on the lawn.

The President often encounters the media on the South Drive as he prepares to board Marine One.
HYDROLOGY
The lack of drainage causes inundation on the lawn near the West Terrace Steps, the southern border, and the east corners. The current strategy for providing positive drainage on the lawn would be to crown the center and slope to slot drains on the sides as initially discussed with civil engineer subconsultant Wiley Wilson. Their report is included in Appendix G on p. 171.
IRRIGATION

The existing irrigation system was installed in 2006. Currently the lawn is irrigated and the surrounding planting areas are watered by hand. The system is operational and in good condition. The full report is included in Appendix H on p. 172.

KEY

- Spray Heads
- Irrigated Area
- Irrigation Control Valves
SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS AND VIEWS

Important views and clear sightlines were observed on site. White House Gardens and Grounds staff also relayed information concerning the privacy screenings of the original 1962 Bunny Mellon design.

KEY

- Clear Sightlines
- Views
- Screening

---

1.  

2.  

---
ELECTRICAL AND LIGHTING

NOTE: All subsurface utilities will be verified in field. The landscape lighting in the trees were installed in 2006 during George H. W. Bush’s Presidency. See Appendix I on p. 173 for the full report.

KEY
- Green: Outlets
- Orange: Flood Lights
- Green: Electrical Boxes

Landscape Lighting
- Up Lighting
- Down Lighting
HARDSCAPE
Below is a detailed history of the main hardscape components within the Rose Garden. The changes were documented with the assistance of The White House Grounds and Gardens publications produced by the National Park Service, the site survey, and on-site reconnaissance.

Material elements noted on plan are accompanied by an image with date of installation and president in office at the time.

1962 (J.K.F.)
West Terrace
Steps designed by Bunny Mellon and Perry Wheeler

2006 (G.W.BUSH)
Indiana limestone steps replaced in kind by McLeod & Romborg Stone Company

2 FEET X 3 FEET BLUESTONE BISECT PAVING
1933-45 (ROOSEVELT) Ramped upward to Oval Office

1962 (KENNEDY) Steel edging original to Bunny Mellon design

1962 (KENNEDY) Terrace original to Bunny Mellon design

1989 (REAGAN) Walkway that connects the Palm Room entrance to the South Drive installed

2004 (G.W.BUSH) Removed and reset in a 6" stone dust base due to poor drainage and cracks from settling

1929 (HOOVER) Pennsylvania flagstone patio installed for shade underneath the Jackson Magnolias

1992 (CLINTON) Exterior restoration

2002 (G.W.BUSH) Sandstone paving removed and replaced

1987 (REAGAN) Resurfaced

1993 (CLINTON) 5 ft. jogging track of recycled rubber tires added to the interior of the South Drive

2004 (G.W.BUSH) Installed with handpicked Tennessee sandstone

1993 (CLINTON) 5 ft. jogging track of recycled rubber tires added to the interior of the South Drive

2004 (G.W.BUSH) Installed with handpicked Tennessee sandstone

63
SITE FURNISHINGS

There is currently an assortment of site furnishings that have accumulated in the garden over the years. A plan to furnish the site with a cohesive palette would be optimal. Past site furnishings could also be remade. Below is a brief inventory of the main furnishing components within the Rose Garden. The inventory was created with the assistance of The White House Grounds and Gardens publications produced by the National Park Service and on-site reconnaissance.

A  OVAL OFFICE TABLE AND CHAIRS  (current - not always in situ)
B  CAST IRON BENCH WITH FLORAL DESIGN  (current)
CAST IRON BENCH WITH FLORAL DESIGN
(current)

CAST IRON BENCH WITH FLORAL DESIGN
(current)

EASTERN PATIO SEATING

HOOVER PATIO SEATING
COMMEMORATIVE FEATURES
President John Quincy Adams inaugurated the custom of planting trees on the White House grounds, but it did not become a regular occurrence until President Rutherford Hayes reinstated the practice in the late 1870s. The Rose Garden and surroundings contain commemorative trees in honor of three presidents, as well as a time capsule marking the 200th anniversary of the White House's cornerstone foundation in 1792.
KENNEDY MAGNOLIAS 1962 (KENNEDY)

KENNEDY MAGNOLIAS 1962 (KENNEDY)

KENNEDY MAGNOLIAS 1962 (KENNEDY)

KENNEDY PLAQUE 1962 (KENNEDY)

KENNEDY MAGNOLIAS 1962 (KENNEDY)

KENNEDY PLAQUE 1962 (KENNEDY)

JACKSON MAGNOLIAS C. 1829-1837 (JACKSON)

JACKSON PLAQUE C. 1829-1837 (JACKSON)

JACKSON MAGNOLIAS C. 1829-1837 (JACKSON)

JACKSON PLAQUE C. 1829-1837 (JACKSON)

JOHNSON OAK 1964 (JOHNSON)

JOHNSON PLAQUE 1964 (JOHNSON)
PLANTING AND SOILS

The following pages document the existing soil conditions, along with the current existing planting.

The planting plans are broken down into trees, shrubs, roses and finally perennials, annuals and bulbs. With documentation provided by the NPS, it is possible to reconstruct a historical record of how long plants have been included in the Rose Garden, if and when they were replaced, and the season that they are grown in (with respect to the flowering plants). These records begin under President Jimmy Carter’s administration. The first reports for trees (1977), shrubs (1978) and gardens (1979) was published annually, but since then have been produced every four years. The most recent Report was produced in 2016, with a new one scheduled for 2020.

A separate section concerning the history of roses grown at the White House, and their strong association with the presidency is also included. The illustrated cultivars highlight the many roses that have been grown in the Rose Garden, along with changing tastes and preferences for particular types of roses.
SITE SURVEY OF EXISTING PLANTING

Current existing planting derived from the survey titled ‘Site Plan’ received August 28, 2019 from the Office of the Chief Officer of the White House and on-site analysis. The plan has been shrunk to 40% of its actual size.
SOILS
Soil borings were taken and a penetrometer was used on site to determine the existing conditions of the soil. Overall, the soil is in good condition and is mostly loam in both the garden beds and the lawn. The Soil Report by James Urban is included in Appendix F on p. 158.
TREES
Below is a detailed history of the trees within the Rose Garden. The changes were documented with the help of The White House Grounds and Gardens publications produced by the National Park Service, the site survey, and on-site reconnaissance.

KEY

# YEAR COMMON NAME (PRESIDENT)
Botanical Name
YEAR REMOVED OR REPLACED COMMON NAME (PRESIDENT)
Botanical Name
1829-37? SOUTHERN MAGNOLIA (JACKSON)
Magnolia grandiflora

1935 SOUTHERN MAGNOLIA (F.D.R.)
Magnolia grandiflora

1957 SOUTHERN MAGNOLIA (EISENHOWER)
Magnolia grandiflora

1962 WASHINGTON HAWTHORN (J.F.K)
Crataegus phaenopyrum

1994 WINTER KING HAWTHORN (CLINTON)
Crataegus viridis ‘Winter King’

2005 WINTER KING HAWTHORN (G.W.BUSH)
Crataegus viridis ‘Winter King’

2011 WINTER KING HAWTHORN (OBAMA)
Crataegus viridis ‘Winter King’

1962 JAPANESE FLOWERED CRABAPPLE (J.F.K)
Malus floribunda

1962 SAUCER MAGNOLIA (J.F.K)
Magnolia x soulangeana

1962 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (J.F.K.)
Malus ‘Katherine’

2003 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (G.W.BUSH)
Malus ‘Katherine’

2019 SPRING SNOW CRABAPPLE (TRUMP)
Malus ‘Spring Snow’

1962 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (J.F.K)
Malus ‘Katherine’

2003 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (G.W.BUSH)
Malus ‘Katherine’

2010 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (OBAMA)
Malus ‘Katherine’

2019 SPRING SNOW CRABAPPLE (TRUMP)
Malus ‘Spring Snow’

1962 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (J.F.K)
Malus ‘Katherine’

2003 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (G.W.BUSH)
Malus ‘Katherine’

2016 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (OBAMA)
Malus ‘Katherine’

2019 SPRING SNOW CRABAPPLE (TRUMP)
Malus ‘Spring Snow’

1963 WILLOW OAK (L.B.J.)
Quercus phellos
SHRUBS
Below is a detailed history of the shrubs within the Rose Garden. The changes were documented with the help of *The White House Grounds and Gardens* publications produced by the National Park Service, the site survey, and on-site reconnaissance.
1953 (EISENHOWER) CHINESE WISTERIA
Wisteria sinensis
2000s REMOVED (PRESIDENT?)
2 1978 (CARTER) SIEBOLD CAMELLIA
Camellia japonica ‘Tricolor Sieboldii’
3 1962 (J.F.K.) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
1991 HOLLY OSMANTHUS (CLINTON)
Osmanthus heterophyllus
4 1962 (J.F.K.) ENGLISH HOLLY
Ilex aquifolium
5 1962 (J.F.K.) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens ‘Suffruticosa’
1996 (CLINTON) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens ‘Suffruticosa’
2000 (G.W.BUSH) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens ‘Suffruticosa’
2009 (OBAMA) AMERICAN BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens
6 1945 (TRUMAN) ENGLISH IVY
Hedera helix
2009 (OBAMA) REMOVED
7 1962 (J.F.K.) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
1995 (CLINTON) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
8 1962 (J.F.K.) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
1981 (REAGAN) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens
9 1962 (J.F.K.) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
2014 (CLINTON) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
2017? (OBAMA) YEW
10 1962 (J.F.K.) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens ‘Suffruticosa’
2000 (G.W.BUSH) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens ‘Suffruticosa’
11 1962 (J.F.K.) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens ‘Suffruticosa’
12 1959 (EISENHOWER) FRUITLAND ELAEAGNUS
Elaeagnus pungens ‘Fruitlandii’
2009 (OBAMA) REMOVED
13 1976 (REAGAN) JAPANESE SPURGE
Pachysandra terminalis
14 1982 (REAGAN) PERIWINKLE
Vinca minor
2000 (G.W.BUSH) REMOVED
ROSES

Roses have been an integral part of White House history throughout the centuries. They have been grown in the gardens and greenhouses for table displays, personal buttonholes, and bouquets for guests. Presidents and First Ladies have had deeply personal reasons for displays of the flower and examples of their interactions with roses abound. First Lady Grace Coolidge would cut a perfect red rose each morning from a particular bush and place it in her room under a portrait of her son Calvin Coolidge Jr., who died as a teenager in the White House (New York Times, July 12, 1931). Under happier circumstances, President Jimmy Carter would place a fresh rose on First Lady Rosalynn Carter’s desk every day (Temple and Finegold 2002, p. 115).

On November 20, 1986, President Ronald Reagan echoed the importance given to the White House roses in the national sphere when he signed a Proclamation declaring the rose as the United States national flower. The Proclamation reads in part:

‘Americans have always loved the flowers with which God decorates our land. More often than any other flower, we hold the rose dear as the symbol of life and love and devotion, of beauty and eternity. For the love of man and woman, for the love of mankind and God, for the love of country, Americans who would speak the language of the heart do so with a rose.

‘We see proofs [sic] of this everywhere. The study of fossils reveals that the rose has existed in America for age upon age. We have always cultivated roses in our gardens. Our first President, George Washington, bred roses, and a variety he named after his mother is still grown today. The White House itself boasts a beautiful Rose Garden. We grow roses in
all our fifty States. We find roses throughout our art, music, and literature. We decorate our celebrations and parades with roses. Most of all, we present roses to those we love, and we lavish them on our altars, our civil shrines, and the final resting places of our honored dead.

‘The American people have long held a special place in their hearts for roses. Let us continue to cherish them, to honor the love and devotion they represent, and to bestow them on all we love just as God has bestowed them on us’ (Proclamation 5574, 1986).

As President Reagan notes, the White House’s Rose Garden has been at the forefront of the rose’s significance to presidents and their families. Nevertheless, early records of roses planted in First Lady Edith Roosevelt’s Colonial Garden and the subsequent Rose Garden installed by First Lady Ellen Wilson are scarce. At the time, the grounds were maintained by the US Army Corps of Engineers. In their annual reports, they note improvements and changes within the grounds of the White House but rarely mention specific rose cultivars. Two cultivars were mentioned in 1900 (see following list), but no further records exist of quantities or cultivars.

As the rose is now considered integral to the Rose Garden, evidence from sources including newspapers and contemporary accounts provide some information on which roses were favored by particular presidents. For example, no extant planting plan exists of the Colonial Garden, installed in 1903. First Lady Edith Roosevelt however, wrote that ‘My husband’s favorite rose was a very old-fashioned one ... the Duchesse de Brabant. In White House days he usually wore one in the buttonhole of his grey coat - as DeCamp painted him’ (quoted in The American Rose Annual 1920, p. 32).
The first extant large scale plan of roses planted in the Rose Garden dates to 1952, just after President Harry Truman’s monumental White House renovations were being completed. The NPS plan lists several cultivars, without citing numbers of plants, but nevertheless provides a clear picture of what was deemed popular at the time.

As no definitive rose planting plan exists for Bunny Mellon’s 1962 design, cultivars planted in President Kennedy’s Rose Garden are reconstructed from Mrs. Mellon’s 1973 commentary on the garden and other secondary sources.

The NPS took over day-to-day administration and maintenance of the Rose Garden in 1961. Records are scarce for plantings in the years after Bunny Mellon’s design (beyond commemorative tree planting), up until President Jimmy Carter’s time in residence. Due to his ‘keen interest in the White House Grounds’ (quoted in the 1977 Report), the NPS started to produce reports listing changes in the White House Grounds and Gardens that same year, including the roses grown and their location in the Garden.

These Reports, along with the scattered knowledge of roses grown previously at the White House, offer a glimpse into changing fashions and tastes in American gardens. The following list (listing associated president, cultivar, and brief descriptions) illustrates how color, rose type, and origins have changed and evolved over the years roses have been grown at the White House.
1899 (CLEVELAND)
*Rosa ‘American Beauty’*
- Introduced to US in 1886
- Deep pink hybrid perpetual. Grows 3ft.-7ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1900 (McKINLEY)
*Rosa ‘Empress of China’*
- Introduced to US in 1896
- Medium pink climber. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1900 (McKINLEY)
*Rosa rugosa*
- Native to Russia, Korea, Japan and China
- Bright pink species. Grows 4ft.-6ft. Flowers early summer.

1907 (ROOSEVELT)
*Rosa ‘Killarney’*
- Bred in UK, 1898
- Light pink hybrid tea. Grows 4ft.-5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1907 (ROOSEVELT)
1909 (ROOSEVELT)
*Rosa ‘Duchess de Brabant’*
- Bred in France, 1857
- Pink tea rose. Grows 3ft.-8ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1916 (WILSON)
1947 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa ‘Red Radiance’*
- Bred in USA, 1916
- Cherry-red hybrid tea rose. Grows up to 5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1916 (WILSON)
1930 (HOOVER)
*Rosa ‘President Herbert Hoover’*
- Bred in USA, 1935
- Pink/orange hybrid tea rose. Grows 2ft.-3ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1932 (HOOVER)
*Rosa ‘Madame Butterfly’*
- Bred in USA, 1918
- Light pink hybrid tea rose. Grows 2ft.-4ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.
1932 (HOOVER)
*Rosa 'General MacArthur'*
Bred in USA, c. 1901
Deep pink hybrid tea rose. Grows 5ft.-6ft. Continuous bloom throughout the season.

1933 (ROOSEVELT)
*Rosa 'Mrs. F.D. Roosevelt'*
Bred in USA, 1933
Golden yellow hybrid tea. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1942 (ROOSEVELT)
*Rosa 'Grande Duchesse Charlotte'*
Bred in Luxembourg, 1938
Bright red hybrid tea rose. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1952 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa 'Mrs. P.S. DuPont'*
Bred in France, 1929
Yellow hybrid tea. Grows 2ft.-3ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1952 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa 'Etoile de Hollande'*
Bred in Holland, 1919.
Crimson hybrid tea rose. Grows 2ft.-3ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1952 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa 'Diamond Jubilee'*
Bred in USA, 1947
Light yellow hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1932 (HOOVER)
*Rosa 'My Maryland'*
Bred in USA, 2007
Salmon pink hybrid tea rose. Blooms in flushes throughout the season. No longer available.

1935 (ROOSEVELT)
*Rosa 'Texas Centennial'*
Bred in USA, 1935
Pink red hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1947 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa 'Radiance’*
Bred in USA, 1908
Light pink hybrid tea rose. Grows up to 5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1952 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa 'Christopher Stone'*
Bred in UK, 1935
Scarlet red hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1952 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa 'Eclipse’*
Bred in USA, 1935
Golden yellow tea rose. Grows 3ft.-5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1952 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa 'Crimson Glory’*
Bred in Germany, 1935
Crimson hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-6ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.
1952 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa ‘Pinocchio’*
Bred in Germany, 1940
Salmon pink floribunda. Grows 2ft.-3ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1952 (TRUMAN)
*Rosa ‘Condesa de Sástago’*
Bred in Spain, 1930
Orange-red hybrid tea rose. Grows 4ft.-6ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1952 (TRUMAN) 1962 (KENNEDY)
*Rosa ‘Peace’*
Bred in France, 1935
Yellow and pink hybrid tea rose. Grows 4ft.-6ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1963 (KENNEDY)? 1969 (JOHNSON)? 1973 (NIXON)
*Rosa ‘Queen Elizabeth’*
Bred in USA, before 1951
Light pink grandiflora. Grows 5ft.-10ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1963 (KENNEDY)? 1969 (JOHNSON)? 1973 (NIXON)
*Rosa ‘Pascali’*
Bred in Belgium, 1963
White hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-6ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1963 (KENNEDY)? 1969 (JOHNSON)? 1973 (NIXON)
*Rosa ‘Nevada’*
Bred in Spain, 1927
White/pink shrub rose. Grows 7ft.-13ft. Prolific, blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1961 (EISENHOWER)
*Rosa ‘Helen Traubel’*
Bred in USA, before 1951
Bright pink species. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season. No longer available.

1962 (KENNEDY)
*Rosa ‘Speaker Sam’*
Bred in USA, 1962
Yellow with red hybrid tea rose. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1963 (KENNEDY)? 1969 (JOHNSON)? 1973 (NIXON)
*Rosa ‘King’s Ransom’*
Bred in USA, before 1961
Golden yellow hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1963 (KENNEDY)? 1969 (JOHNSON)? 1973 (NIXON)
*Rosa ‘Betty Prior’*
Bred in UK, 1935
Carmine pink floribunda. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Continuous blooms throughout the season.
1963 (KENNEDY)
1969 (JOHNSON)
1973 (NIXON)

*Rosa ‘Saratoga’*
Bred in USA, 1963
White floribunda. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1979 (CARTER)

*Rosa ‘White Bouquet’*
Bred in USA, 1956
White floribunda. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1979 (CARTER)
1984, 1988 (REAGAN)
1992 (BUSH SR.)
1996, 2000 (CLINTON)
2004, 2008 (BUSH JR.)
2012, 2016 (OBAMA)

*Rosa ‘Pat Nixon’*
Bred in France, 1972
Dark red floribunda. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.
1984, 1988 (REAGAN)
2008 (BUSH JR.)

*Rosa ‘Nancy Reagan’*
Bred in USA, 1967
Pale orange-red hybrid tea rose. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.
1992 (BUSH SR.)
1996, 2000 (CLINTON)
2004, 2008 (BUSH JR.)
2012, 2016 (OBAMA)

*Rosa ‘Iceberg’*
Bred in Germany, 1958
White floribunda. Grows 3ft.-5ft. Prolific blooms in flushes throughout the season.
1992 (BUSH SR.)
1996, 2000 (CLINTON)
2004, 2008 (BUSH JR.)
2012, 2016 (OBAMA)

1969 (JOHNSON)
1973 (NIXON)
1996, 2000 (CLINTON)

*Rosa ‘John F. Kennedy’*
Bred in USA, 1965
White hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

1979 (CARTER)

*Rosa ‘Rosalynn Carter’*
Bred in Holland, before 1973
Coral-red grandiflora. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.
1984, 1988 (REAGAN)
1992 (BUSH SR.)

*Rosa ‘Sea Foam’*
Bred in USA, before 1963
Creamy white climber. Grows 6ft.-10ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.
1984, 1988 (REAGAN)
1992 (BUSH SR.)

*Rosa ‘White Lightnin’’*
Bred in USA, before 1979
White grandiflora. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.
2004, 2008 (BUSH JR.)

*Rosa ‘Erfurt’*
Bred in Germany, 1939
Pink/white hybrid musk. Grows 3ft.-8ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.
2004, 2008 (BUSH JR.)

*Rosa ‘Danaë’*
Bred in UK, 1913
Light yellow/white hybrid musk. Grows 5ft.-6ft. Continuous bloom throughout the season.
2008 (BUSH JR.)
2012, 2016 (OBAMA)

*Rosa ‘John Paul II’*
Bred in USA, before 2006
White hybrid tea rose. Grows 4ft.-5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

2008 (BUSH JR.)

*Rosa ‘Laura Bush’*
Bred in USA, 2007
Orange-coral red floribunda. Grows 2ft.-3ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

2008 (BUSH JR.)

*Rosa ‘Opening Night’*
Bred in USA, before 1997
Dark red hybrid tea rose. Grows 4ft.-6ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

2008 (BUSH JR.)

*Rosa ‘Ronald Reagan’*
Bred in USA, 2002
Red hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Continual blooms throughout the season.

2008 (BUSH JR.)

*Rosa ‘Barbara Bush’*
Bred in USA, before 1990
Salmon-pink/cream hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

2012, 2016 (OBAMA)

*Rosa ‘Love’s Promise’*
Bred in France, 1994
Dark red hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.

First Lady Laura Bush being presented with a rose named in her honor by the firm Jackson & Perkins in 2006.
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For full titles, see bibliography.

Images of roses and accompanying text are from www.helpmefind.com/roses (accessed online) and Beales, *Classic Roses*, 1985
‘The one flower that unites all the occupants through the history of the White House is the rose.’

Bunny Mellon 1983

Watercolor done by First Lady Caroline Harrison, White House Collections
PARTERRE BORDER PLANTING BEDS

Below is an overall list of plants used since 1962 within the boundaries highlighted in orange. The plants were documented with the help of The White House Grounds and Gardens publications produced by the National Park Service, the site survey, and on-site reconnaissance.

ROSES
ROSE Rosa 'White Bouquet' (1979)
ROSE Rosa 'Sea Foam' (1984, 1988, 1992)
ROSE Rosa 'Rosalynn Carter' (1979)
ANTIQUE ROSES Rosa 'Erfurt', 'Francesca', 'Danae' (2008)
ROSE Rosa 'Barbara Bush' (2008)
ROSE Rosa 'Ronald Reagan' (2008)
ROSE Rosa 'Laura Bush' (2008)
ROSE Rosa 'Love's Promise' (2012, 2016)
PERENNIALS

CATNIP Nepeta cataria (1979)
CATNIP Nepeta mussinii (1984, 1988)
CATNIP Nepeta mussinii ‘Blue Wonder’ (1992)
GARDEN PINKS Dianthus plumarius ‘Boutonniere’ (1984, 1988)
GARDEN PINKS Dianthus chinensis ‘Ideal Crimson’ (1992)
BLACK EYED SUSAN Rudbeckia hirta ‘Gloriosa Daisy’ (1979)
DAYLILY Hemerocallis (1979)
DUSTY MILLER Senecio leucostachys (1979, 1984, 1988)
LADY’S MANTLE Alchemilla speciosa (1979)
MEALYCUP SAGE Salvia farinacea (1979)
GRAY SANTOLINA Santolina chamaecyparissus (1979 - 2016)
PANSY Viola x wittrockiana ‘Majestic Yellow with Blotch’ (1992)
PANSY Viola x wittrockiana ‘Universal White’ (1992)

SEASONAL PLANTINGS

SUMMER

AGERATUM Ageratum ‘North Sea’ (1979)
BLUE SALVIA Salvia faraceana ‘Blue Bedder’ (1984-2016)
COLEUS Coleus x hybridus (1979)
GARDEN GERANIUM Pelargonium x hortorum ‘Snow Mass’ (1984-2016)
GARDEN GERANIUM Pelargonium x hortorum ‘Carefree Bright Pink’ (1979)
GARDEN GERANIUM Pelargonium x hortorum ‘Carefree Red’ (1979)
GARDEN GERANIUM Pelargonium x hortorum ‘Sincerity’ (1979-2016)
GARDEN GERANIUM Pelargonium x hortorum ‘Wendy Anne’ (1979-2016)
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana ‘Elfin White’ (1979)
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana ‘Super Elfin White’ (1984, 1988)
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana ‘Futura Salmon’ (1979)
LILY Lilium speciosum ‘Golden Splendor’ (1979)
FLOWERING TOBACCO Nicotiana alata ‘Lime Green’ (1979)
FLOWERING TOBACCO Nicotiana alata (1979)
WAX BEGONIA Begonia semperflorens (1979)
WAX BEGONIA Begonia x semperflorens-cultorum ‘Viva’ (1979)
WAX BEGONIA Begonia x semperflorens-cultorum ‘Pizzazz White’ (1992)
WAX BEGONIA Begonia x semperflorens-cultorum ‘Ambassador White’ (1996)
PETUNIA Petunia x hybrida ‘Mercury’ (1988)


BORDER DETAILS (CONTINUED)

SPRING

GRAPE HYACINTH Muscari armeniacum (2012, 2016)
WHITE GRAPE HYACINTH Muscari botryoides 'Album' (2000)
FOSTERIANA TULIP Tulipa fosteriana 'Purissima' (1984, 1988)
FOSTERIANA TULIP Tulipa fosteriana 'Red Emperor' (1984, 1988, 1992)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Apeldoorn' (1979-2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Dover' (1979-2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Gudoshnik' (1979-2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Golden Oxford' (1984-2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Oxford' (1979-2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Ivory Florendale' (1984-2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Jewel of Spring' (1979-2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Pink Diamond' (1979)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Elizabeth Arden' (1979)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Perry Como' (1979)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa 'Daydream' (1992-2016)
GREIGII TULIP Tulipa greigii 'Bokara' (1979-2016)
LILY-FLOWERED TULIP Tulipa 'White Triumphator' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992)
LILY-FLOWERED TULIP Tulipa 'Elegant Lady' (1979)
COTTAGE TULIP Tulipa 'Bond Street' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992)
COTTAGE TULIP Tulipa 'Ivory Glory' (1979-2016)
S P R I N G  (C O N T I N U E D)

COTTAGE TULIP  Tulipa 'Mrs J.T. Scheepers' (1984-2016)
COTTAGE TULIP  Tulipa 'American Flag' (1992)
DARWIN TULIP  Tulipa 'Florence Nightingale' (1979, 1984,1988)
DARWIN TULIP  Tulipa 'Flying Dutchman' (1979-2016)
DARWIN TULIP  Tulipa 'Golden Niphetos' (1979-2016)
DARWIN TULIP  Tulipa 'Niphetos' (1979, 1984, 1988, 2012)
DARWIN TULIP  Tulipa 'Queen of the Bartigons' (1979, 1984, 1988)
DARWIN TULIP  Tulipa 'White Jewel' (1984-2016)
DARWIN TULIP  Tulipa 'Zwanenburg' (1979-2016)
PARROT TULIP  Tulipa 'Black Parrot' (1979-2016)
PARROT TULIP  Tulipa 'Red Parrot' (1979)
PARROT TULIP  Tulipa 'Orange Favorite' (1979-2016)
LADY'S MANTLE  Alchemilla speciosa (1979)

F A L L

DUSTY MILLER  Centaurea cineraria (1979)
PITCHER'S SAGE  Salvia pitcheri (1979)
LADY'S MANTLE  Alchemilla speciosa (1979, 1984, 1988)
TUBULAR PEDDLE MUM  Chrysanthemum grandiflorum 'Joanette' (1984-2016)
CUSHION MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Penguin' (1984, 1988)
GIANT HARVEST MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Pumpkin' (1979-2016)
CUSHION MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Rolcall' (1979, 1984, 1988)
CUSHION MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Ironside' (1979)
CUSHION MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Golden Promise' (1979)
CUSHION MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Freedom' (1979)
CUSHION MUM  Chrysanthemum x morifolium 'Zonta' (1979)
CUSHION MUM  Chrysanthemum x morifolium 'Buckeye' (1992, 1996)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Yellow Jessamine Williams' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'White Jessamine Williams' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Minnwhite' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Minnautumn' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Rajah' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'White Grandchild' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Starlet' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Festive Cushion' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'King's Ransom' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Chrysanthemum 'Lipstick' (1979)
GARDEN MUM  Dendranthema x grandiflorum 'Alexis' (2004)
EAST AND WEST PLANTING BEDS
Below is an overall list of plants used since 1962 within the boundaries highlighted in orange. The plants were documented with the help of The White House Grounds and Gardens publications produced by the National Park Service, the site survey, and on-site reconnaissance.

PERENNIALS
EPIMEDIUM Epimedium x versicolor (1979, 1984, 1988)
EPIMEDIUM Epimedium alpinum (1979, 1984)
PLANTAIN LILY Hosta marginata (1979, 1984, 1988)
PLANTAIN LILY Hosta fortunei (1979)
ROSE Rosa 'Peace' (1979)
TOPIARY ROSE Rosa hybrida (2004)
SEASONAL PLANTINGS

SPRING
ORNAMENTAL ONION Allium 'Purple Sensation' (2016)
CROWN IMPERIAL Fritillaria imperialis 'Rubra' (1979-2016)
KAUFFMANNIANA TULIP Tulipa kaufmanniana ‘Shakespeare’ (1984-2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa ‘Golden Parade’ (1979)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP Tulipa ‘Golden Parade’ (1979)
COTTAGE TULIP Tulipa ‘Bond Street’ (1979, 1984, 1988)
GREIGII TULIP Tulipa greigii ‘Red Riding Hood’ (1984-2016)
BLUE PANSY Viola tricolor hortensis ‘Sea Blue’ (1984, 1988)
WHITE PANSY Viola tricolor hortensis ‘Moonmoth’ (1984, 1988)
WHITE PANSY Viola tricolor hortensis ‘Paper White’ (1979)
PANSY Viola tricolor hortensis ‘Adonis’ (1979)
PANSY Viola x wittrockiana ‘Crown Blue’ (1992-2016)
PANSY Viola x wittrockiana ‘White Blue’ (2004)
PANSY Viola x wittrockiana ‘Universal White’ (1992)

SUMMER
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana (mixed red and white) (1984, 1988)
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana ‘Super Elfin White’ (1984, 1988)
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana ‘Elfin Salmon’ (1979)
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana ‘Elfin Red’ (1979)
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana ‘Elfin White’ (1979)
IMPATIENS Impatiens walleriana ‘Futura Salmon’ (1979)
FANCY-LEAVED CALADIUM Caladium x hortulanum ‘Pink Beauty’ (1979)
SAPPHIRE FLOWER Browallia speciosa ‘Major’ (1979)
BEGONIA Begonia semperflorens ‘Red Wonder’ (1979)
FANCY-LEAVED CALADIUM Caladium x hortulanum (1979)
AGERATUM Ageratum ‘North Sea’ (1979)

FALL
CUSHION MUM Chrysanthemum x morifolium ‘Zonta’ (1979, 1992, 1996)
CUSHION MUM Chrysanthemum x morifolium ‘Sunny Denise’ (2000)
CUSHION MUM Chrysanthemum x morifolium ‘Viking’ (2000)
GARDEN MUM Chrysanthemum ‘Minnautum’ (1979)
GARDEN MUM Chrysanthemum x morifolium ‘Starlet’ (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992)
GARDEN MUM Chrysanthemum ‘Festive Cushion’ (1979)
GARDEN MUM Chrysanthemum ‘White Jessamine Williams’ (1979)
GARDEN MUM Dendranthema x grandiflorum ‘King’s Ransom’ (1996, 2000)
GARDEN MUM Dendranthema x grandiflorum ‘Grace’ (2004, 2008)
CUSHION MUM Chrysanthemum ‘Yellow Delaware’ (1979)
CUSHION MUM Chrysanthemum ‘Headliner’ (1979)
GARDEN MUM Chrysanthemum x morifolium ‘Spicy Cheryl’ (2012, 2016)
GRAY SANTOLINA Santolina chamaecyparissus (1979)
### Summary of Landscape Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics/Features</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden and building</td>
<td>Contributing 1805, 1903, 1962</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The historic spacial organization is reinforced by the White House, West Terrace, and West Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential/official</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The Garden has been a private refuge since 1903, and a more public garden since 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and private residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography - Page 52</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively flat area with open views out</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The Garden retains its historic character of a relatively flat area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation - Pages 56-57;62-63</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone Paving</td>
<td>Contributing 2004?</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Paths function but lawn areas at entrances wear out quickly and get muddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Crab Orchard</td>
<td>Contributing 1933-45</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stone is failing and shows signs of water damage and a potential tripping hazard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone Paving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonnade Paving</td>
<td>Contributing c. 1805</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Paving is showing signs of water damage and pavers edging the garden side have been poorly installed or maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Terrace Steps</td>
<td>Contributing 1962</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Steps replaced in kind in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Paver Meandering</td>
<td>Non-Contributing 1962</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Path no longer makes sense with the addition of the 1989 Bluestone path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Contributing 2002</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics/Features</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Description/Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape Elements - Page 62-63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Edging</td>
<td>Non-Contributing 1962</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Functional but may be damming drainage along the beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Bluestone</td>
<td>Contributing 2004</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Uneven and spalling stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstone Terrace (Hoover)</td>
<td>Contributing 1929</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Provides a shaded wooded area to sit, shape of terrace is lack luster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone at South Portico</td>
<td>Contributing 2002</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting Beds</td>
<td>Contributing 1962</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Mixed planting make this area a challenge to maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern patio for more intimate outdoor meetings</td>
<td>Contributing 2004</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Original 1962 Terrace was removed in 1989 and again in 2004 as a dry laid terrace due to issues with drainage and cracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Hoover Patio under Jackson Magnolias</td>
<td>Contributing 1929</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Area has remained relatively unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Lawn for large functions</td>
<td>Contributing 1962</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Issues with surface wetness and wear and tear due to heavy usage in concentrated areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Views - Page 60          |                            |           |                                                                                     |
| Centerline from door of President’s Secretary’s Office | Contributing | Good | This axis has remained important throughout the design history of the garden        |
| View to Washington Monument | Contributing 1903       | Good      |                                                                                     |
| View from Oval Office to Garden | Contributing 1903   | Good      |                                                                                     |
| Open views through Colonnade | Contributing 1903 | Good      |                                                                                     |
| View of Garden exiting Palm Room | Contributing 1903 | Good      |                                                                                     |
| Security views           |                            |           |                                                                                     |

<p>| Site Furnishings - Page 64-65 |                            |           |                                                                                     |
| Oval Office White Metal Table and Chairs (2) | Non-contributing | |                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics/Features</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Floral design Cast Iron Bench (2)</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Metal Arm Chair (4), Small White Metal Side Tables (2) and Mini Metal Tables (2)</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Metal U back Chairs (4) and White Metal Round Table</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Wooden Bench</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Floral design Cast Iron Bench</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Floral design Cast Iron Chairs (4) and White Cast Iron Table (1)</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commemorative Features - Pages 66-67</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Capsule</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Commemorates the 200th anniversary of the White House cornerstone ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnolia grandiflora</em>-#1 (Southern Magnolia)</td>
<td>Contributing 1829-37?</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Providing shade for the terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnolia grandiflora</em>-#2 (Southern Magnolia)</td>
<td>Contributing 1829-37?</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Tree in decay, only important as a historic relic at the end of its day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnolia grandiflora</em>-#3 (Southern Magnolia)</td>
<td>Contributing 1935</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Providing shade and screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnolia grandiflora</em>-#4 (Southern Magnolia)</td>
<td>Contributing 1857</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Providing shade and some screening from drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Magnolia x soulangeana</strong> (Saucer Magnolia)</td>
<td>Contributing 1962</td>
<td>(2) Good</td>
<td>(2) Fair Trees on to the west are doing better than those to the east of the garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation - Pages 72-91</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Crataegus viridis</em> ‘Winter King’ (Hawthorne)</td>
<td>Contributing 2011</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Great tree but only one of its kind in the garden. Hawthornes were used in the original design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malus floribunda</em> (Japanese Flowering Crabapple)</td>
<td>Contributing 1962</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Part of the original installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics/Features</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Osmanthus heterophyllus</em> (Holly Osmanthus)</td>
<td>Contributing 1962</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Original hedge remains along north edge of garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buxus sempervirens</em> -various cultivars</td>
<td>Contributing 1962</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Part of the 1962 garden but many are overgrown or not in peak health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Boxwood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roses - various cultivars</td>
<td>Contributing 1962 onwards</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>See pp. 76-84 for history of roses in the garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other vegetation</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Shrubs are generally in good condition. Annuals are replaced frequently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter evaluates the historical significance and integrity of the Rose Garden, which will include analysis of the physical character of the landscape. In this context, historic significance is defined as ‘the recognized importance a property [or landscape] displays when it has been evaluated, including when it has been found to meet National Register Criteria’ (Little et al. 2000, p. 8). The evaluation is assessed via the authenticity of a property or landscape’s historic integrity, which is measured against the survival of physical characteristics visible in the landscape. Information and data gathered from the Rose Garden’s site history and existing conditions discussed in previous chapters will contribute to the assessment of the site’s significance.

DEFINING SIGNIFICANCE

To define the significance of the Rose Garden and assess its historic integrity, the landscape’s features are measured against criteria listed in the National Register. Under their guidelines for evaluation, a site can be considered eligible if it meets three out of four criteria that were defined in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966:

‘The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.’  (Taken from NPS Bulletin 15 1997, p.2)
The White House and grounds were entered into the National Register as a National Historic Landmark in December 1960. However, the submission pre-dates the current criteria listed in the 1966 Act. Moreover, at the time, landscape architecture was rarely considered a significant contributing factor, as emphasis was predominantly placed on architecture and engineering. Thus the White House nomination does not clearly emphasize the contributions of landscape architectural history (architecture, military and politics/government are listed in the 1960 statement of significance). Today, landscape is considered an essential and significant component of American historic landmarks, and contributions are now noted and documented accordingly. As such, it is appropriate to reconsider the contributions of the White House grounds and gardens to the historic character of the site.

This process of re-assessment is evident in Boyle’s 2001 CLR, which includes a section dedicated to the evaluation of the significance of President’s Park (pp. 464-501). The CLR concludes that the landscape of President’s Park meets three out of four of the criteria - A through C (association with events, association with people, and artistic design/construction) - and that the fourth criterion, D, is evaluated separately in the 1995 Archeological Evaluation. The Report’s findings are worth quoting at length.

Under Criterion A (association with events), Boyle summarizes:

‘The landscape of President’s Park has evolved over time, responding to its functions as a private home, a ceremonial residence, an executive office park, a military headquarters, a tourist site, and a point of assembly and recreation. Sometimes development of the site has been formal, relying on dialogue and plans. More often it has been informal, in reaction to various pressures over the years. Of the various plans prepared for President’s Park, only L’Enfant’s was comprehensive.

‘As a symbol of the American presidency, which serves a dual administrative and ceremonial function, the landscape of President’s Park is unique to the nation. Within this context, the landscape of President’s Park has national significance. The period of significance is 1791 to the present’ (p. 466).
For Criterion B (association with people), Boyle writes:

‘President’s Park is significant under criterion B of the National Register of Historic Places because it is associated with all presidents of the United States, including George Washington, who helped select and plan the site but never resided in the White House. The site is also associated with first ladies, many of whom played an important role in the development of the landscape; with many presidential children who either lived at the White House or frequently visited; and with the official hostesses of unmarried or widowed presidents.

‘President’s Park is also associated with many heads of state who have visited. In some cases they have left a specific reminder of their visits, such as a commemorative tree that they helped plant. For most visits a level of flexibility in landscape management has been required that is not normally associated with historic properties. The White House is a special site that must constantly adjust to the changing needs and styles of presidents and their guests.

‘President’s Park is also significant through its association with other important individuals - leading landscape architects and designers, gardeners, architects, sculptors, administrators, and engineers who have contributed to its development ... Within this context, President’s Park has national and possibly international significance for the period 1791 to the present’ (ibid., pp. 466-467).

For Criterion C (artistic design/construction), Boyle concludes:

‘Several problems in evaluating the significance of the President’s Park landscape are unique to this site. First, President’s Park, in a strict design sense, comprises five different landscapes ... Second, because this landscape, particularly the White House grounds, has been in a constant state of evolution, it is probable that no one period, style, method of construction, or master designer is represented here in a very pure state. President’s Park should be considered a layered landscape in which everything to the present may be significant, even though only remnants of the earliest periods may have survived. For the White House grounds it is likely that the Olmsted plan of 1935 survives with fairly high integrity, except for the east and west gardens, which have been redesigned twice since then.
'Under criterion C the landscape of President's Park meets three of the four requirements to make a property eligible for the national register:

'It embodies the distinctive characteristics of at least three types, styles, and periods - late 18th century Baroque formalism in city planning, mid-19th century romanticism in landscape architecture, and the early 20th century “City Beautiful” movement.

'It represents the work of at least three masters associated with these periods - Pierre-Charles L’Enfant, Andrew Jackson Downing, and Frederick Law Olmsted Jr.

'It possesses high artistic value' (ibid., pp. 467-468).

Many of these contributing factors remain relevant as the criteria are applied to the Rose Garden, with a number of characteristics equally applicable for President’s Park and the Rose Garden. Additionally, while the Rose Garden meets the same three criteria A through C, when viewed in isolation, additional criteria allow for increased significance and specificity.

**Criterion A: Association with events**

As a physical manifestation of the American presidency, the White House grounds embody the dual nature of the private and public side of life in the White House. This is certainly true for the Rose Garden, as it is at the juncture between the Oval Office (the public, executive side) and the White House Residence (the personal, private side). While it is important to note that a garden has existed on the same site since 1903, its period of political relevance doesn’t properly begin until the Kennedy Administration. President Kennedy commissioned a new garden in 1961 for the express purpose of holding ceremonial events...
and public press briefings in it. The new Rose Garden allowed for a larger central area that could accommodate more people against the backdrop of visually attractive planting.

Also contributing to the Rose Garden’s increasing visibility was the growing influence of television and its use to increase the dissemination of news in American life. Prior to President Kennedy, the Rose Garden had predominantly been the secluded retreat of the president and his family. Events to which the press were invited did occur in the garden, but the designs were not conducive for large gatherings (see for example image on p. 31). The press had enjoyed a permanent presence in the White House since 1902 when President Theodore Roosevelt’s new West Wing extension provided them with a dedicated work space (Jacobs 2015, p. 5). Their close physical proximity to the president allowed for accessibility via the Oval Office, but also via the garden we now know as the Rose Garden - the exterior conduit between the two. Nonetheless, the garden was not a primary setting for such public or official activities until the installation of Kennedy’s Rose Garden.

The influence of television coverage and the exposure of the Rose Garden as an official part of President’s Park grew in tandem with one another during this era. Although the growth of radio at the beginning of the twentieth century was important, news reports are not known to mention the garden with any frequency, and while the garden was identified in occasional photographs in newspapers and magazines, these often presented the garden as part of the president’s private life, not in their official role. It
is likely the advent of television in the second half of the century that spurred President Kennedy to reimagine what was once a private garden as a space in service of both private and public facets of presidential life.

In 1950, 9% of American homes contained a television, but by the end of the decade, this figure had dramatically increased to 85.9% (*Encyclopedia Britannica* online 2019). Approximately 70 million Americans watched the 1960 presidential debates between incumbent Vice-President Richard Nixon and the Democratic candidate John F. Kennedy (ibid.). Five days after he became president, Kennedy held the first live press conference on television (though President Eisenhower had held staged press briefings covered by television from 1955 onwards).

President Kennedy had recognized the power of television early on in his career as a politician. Before running for the presidency, he wrote an article for TV Guide about how for better or worse ‘the impact of TV on politics is tremendous’ (1959, accessed online). During his time in the White House, both before and after the 1962 Mellon redesign, President Kennedy used the garden weekly, if not more (Seale 2015, p. 66) for events at which television crews and cameras were present. He welcomed visiting heads of state - and often gave them a tour of the Garden on their arrival (see image on previous page). On a more private note, during the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962, when the country faced nuclear war, the Garden acted as a refuge for the President from the Oval Office, as demonstrated by his letter to Bunny Mellon shortly after the crisis has passed (see right).

Photographs and newsreels taken of the President in the Rose Garden were published in newspapers and magazines, and increasingly shown on television, giving the Rose Garden greater visibility in American and international consciousness an extension of the presidency. President Kennedy, and First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy,
were the first inhabitants of the White House to recognize how television and the media could be used to project the stability and legitimacy of American presidential power through projecting a link with past historical presidents (included Mrs. Kennedy’s guided tour of her restoration work at the White House, shown on CBS in February 1962). The garden’s evocation of early American gardens reinforces this connection. And as previously demonstrated in the historic timeline, and at the end of Chapter Two, each president since President Kennedy has continued to use the Rose Garden, serving as a setting with which the American presidency is presented to the world. And as the Garden acts as a physical symbol of the presidency, so it becomes associated with the president’s actions, that inform the country, and the world.

Given this assessment, the period of significance for this criterion is 1962 to the present day.

**Criterion B: Association with people**

As home to every president since John Adams, the White House is undeniably associated with each subsequent president. With regards to the landscape on which the Rose Garden now sits, it first came into significance once the old greenhouses on the site were torn down in 1902 at the direction of Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. and First Lady Edith Roosevelt. While previous occupants of the White House had, on occasion, been involved in developing the area (such as President Jefferson), it was in 1903 that the landscape begins its association with distinct individuals. This is due in part to Mrs. Roosevelt’s designation of the area as a ‘Colonial Garden’ (as labeled on the Master Plan) - the first time the landscape has a defined designation.

First Lady Ellen Wilson’s redesign in 1913 suggests how integral the landscape was to the President and his family’s daily life. The redesign also reflected the
changes in style and personal preference of the first family. President Wilson often used the garden during his presidency, as it served as an outdoor office when the summer heat became too excessive (see image on p. 27).

Echoing criterion A, President Kennedy has one of the strongest relationships with the present garden, as it was his vision of a green theater that Bunny Mellon turned into reality in 1962. With subsequent occupants of the White House often changing the interior, the Rose Garden has remained broadly unchanged, and its association with President Kennedy is one of the few remaining visual historic records of Kennedy's time at the White House.

For well over 100 years, every president, the most powerful and influential individual in the country, has associated themselves with the Rose Garden in a multitude of ways. The Rose Garden becomes linked with their actions, as part of their office and their home.

Therefore, the period of significance for this criterion is 1903 to the present day, with emphasis placed on the period from 1962 to the present day.

**Criterion C: Artistic design/construction**

As an unofficial architect and landscape architect to the White House during his presidency, Thomas Jefferson’s involvement in improving the Residence and the grounds had an enduring role in shaping the future design of the Rose Garden. The two terraces that he added to the White House’s east and west façades split the northern and southern sides of the grounds. These additions provide a solid demarcation between the more public north grounds, and the somewhat more private southern grounds. The Jefferson terraces also provide a clearly defined boundary that discourages any subsequent amendments to the landscape south of them. While he left no surviving traces of vegetation on the landscape, his architectural designs defined every subsequent landscape design for the site.

President Jefferson was the first in a long line of American presidents who took a strong interest in the White House grounds, wanting to improve and enhance them by adding trees and flowering plants. John Quincy Adams
was the first president to install a flower garden, and initiate the planting of trees around the grounds. Nevertheless, after L’Enfant’s initial layout of President’s Park in 1791, the White House did not have an association with a renowned landscape architect or designer until the early twentieth century as Andrew Jackson Downing died before he could complete a design for the White House grounds in 1852.

Throughout the twentieth century, the White House enjoyed a long association with prominent and distinguished designers and landscape architects. Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. acted as a consultant to President Theodore Roosevelt and First Lady Edith Roosevelt in 1902/1903, at the start of his career, and then again at the culmination of his career in 1935 for President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Many of Olmsted’s 1935 design recommendations were implemented, and are still considered guidelines today. However, his contributions only indirectly affected the Rose Garden, as neither of the designs he proposed for the garden were fully implemented.

The first rose garden designed on the site was by George Burnap for First Lady Ellen Wilson in 1913. As the landscape architect for the Office of Public Buildings and Grounds in Washington, DC between 1912 and 1917, he was also responsible for the designs at several of the capital’s most famed landscapes, including the Tidal Basin and Meridian Hill Park. First Lady Ellen Wilson also commissioned the landscape designer Beatrix Farrand to redesign the east garden. Commissioning two celebrated and renowned contemporary designers demonstrates that the First Lady was keen on employing designers with the greatest skill and expertise - and that the White House’s gardens were to be a reflection of American prestige, talent, and ingenuity.

President Kennedy also understood the necessity for a well-designed and beautiful garden to visually represent the presidency and the nation. His visit to Europe in the summer of 1961 included a state dinner with President Charles de Gaulle at Versailles, and there the gardens of Le Nôtre had impressed on him the importance of beautiful and inspiring landscapes to signify power and influence. His decision to ask family friend Bunny Mellon to design a garden that would reflect the importance of the White House was born in the belief in employing the best design talent that America could offer.
The landscape now known as the Rose Garden has always been associated with gardens and horticulture. During the second half of the nineteenth century, it was covered by a greenhouse dedicated to the cultivation of roses, and after the greenhouse’s demolition, the landscape’s function has always been as an ornamental garden.

Thus, the period of significance runs from 1801 to the present day.

Conclusion

With the three criteria taken together, three areas of significance emerge. First, the period from 1801 to 1903, in the development of landscape and its emergence as an area for designed ornamental gardens.

Second, the period running from the creation of the Colonial Garden in 1903 to 1961, as noted landscape architects and designers become involved in the garden’s development.

Finally, the period from 1962 to the present day, where the Rose Garden has retained its overall appearance from its installation by President Kennedy and Bunny Mellon and provides a location for official ceremonies as well as first family gatherings.

Understandably, the final period of significance could not exist without the previous two periods, and is a direct result of the earlier periods, as they informed many of the design decisions reached in 1962. The traditional, simple elegant character of Kennedy’s Rose Garden also reflects the design character of the previous gardens, each of which reflected contemporary interests in early American and colonial revival styles. What these areas also confirm is that the Rose Garden has been an area of continual changes, as the changing needs and styles of presidents evolve continuously.
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The White House (and immediate grounds) was entered into the National Register of Historic Places as a National Historic Landmark on December 19, 1960. As such, its significance has long been recognized on a national level. However, as mentioned previously, the nomination form laying out the White House’s significance does not mention the grounds as being a contributing factor in its historical importance as it was not customary to consider the landscape as a significant element of a historic site. Today, the integrity of historic landscapes is considered equally to that of architectural structures in determining the designation for historic sites.

The statement of significance included in the original nomination lists three time periods for White House significance, with a broad overall period of 1792 (when the cornerstone of the building was laid), to 1955. Particular reference is paid to its importance relating to political and military affairs (the early federal period, 1789-1800 and the War of 1812, 1812-1815), as well as its architectural development (federal 1780-1820). The nomination concludes that ‘the White House is representative of the shifts in national culture and ideals as each administration added its own imprint to the interior of the building’ (Fenton 1960, p. 6).

Though the form concentrates nearly exclusively on the White House building, many of the contributing factors can also be applied to the landscape, as President’s Park also reflects the inputs and changes of subsequent presidencies. The grounds contain memorials commemorating historical events and people in the nation’s history, areas of respite and privacy, and ceremonial landscapes, with each president adding their own mark on the grounds.

The White House Rose Garden is a significant landscape on its own merits. The Rose Garden was redesigned and altered five times over the twentieth century, consistently representing design trends and that national appreciation for early American garden styles. Its final design, as noted in Chapter Two, was during President Kennedy’s administration in 1962. Although much of what he and First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy altered or updated within the White House has been lost as subsequent presidents made their own changes, the Rose Garden is essentially unaltered since 1962.
EVALUATION OF HISTORIC INTEGRITY

After defining a landscape’s significance, the National Historic Preservation Act (and are repeated as National Register requirements) goes on to identify seven areas or qualities that convey historic integrity for a historic landscape that are visible (i.e. not buried underground). The areas include location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association (NPS Bulletin 15, p. 44). These current landscape characteristics and associated features are used to determine whether the Rose Garden still retains its identity for the historic periods determined as significant earlier in the chapter. Some aspects of these areas are particularly important, though it is necessary to note that as with all living landscapes, the materials change over time with growth and decay (Page et al. 1998, p. 71). Nevertheless, spatial relationships, design styles, and associated uses can remain consistent.

LOCATION
The Rose Garden’s location in the very heart of American history makes it unique, and has remained so since its installation in 1962, while the site has always been associated with horticulture. Its location between the White House Residence and the Oval Office gives it a strong visual and public presence, a factor recognized by President Kennedy when he commissioned Bunny Mellon to redesign the garden during his presidency. Its setting within the grounds of the White House remains unchanged, thus retaining the highest integrity of location.

DESIGN
Combining elements of form, plan, space, structure, and style of the landscape, the Rose Garden maintains a high level of integrity for its primary period of significance, from 1962 to the present day. It also retains a moderate level of integrity for its secondary and tertiary periods of significance, from 1801 to 1961, as the current design replicates the overall outline of the earlier gardens on the site - and the initial form of the site as determined by Jefferson’s West Terrace.

While elements within the Garden have been replaced or restored (as evaluated in Chapter Three), including the steps leading up to the Oval Office, and the plantings renewed as needed, careful attention has been paid to replicating in kind the materials originally used to uphold the original design intent. This allows for the spatial relationships, visual
rhythms of the planting, and the overall framework of the 1962 garden to remain unaltered.

SETTING
The physical environment of the Rose Garden is essentially identical to the start of its primary period of significance and retains similarities to its secondary period of significance. The topography remains essentially flat, and the Rose Garden continues to visually link the main portion of the White House with the West Terrace and West Wing. The Rose Garden remains separated from the South Lawn by the hedge barrier and the five Crabapple trees. A minor change in 1989, during George H.W. Bush’s administration, saw the addition of a bluestone path that connects the Palm Room with the South Drive. The formal setting of the parterre beds, large central lawn, and framework of trees are unaltered, and all contribute to the high integrity of the historic landscape’s setting.

MATERIALS
The majority of hardscape materials and vegetation in the landscape have either been restored or replaced (often in kind) during subsequent projects since the 1962 installation, maintaining moderate to good levels of integrity. However, materials have in general remained in the same location, including the steps, the east patio, and the Jackson Magnolia patio, retaining the shape of the original 1962 landscape. The Jackson Magnolias pre-date the 1962 Rose Garden, and remain in their original location, as do the four Magnolia x soulangeana (Saucer Magnolia) trees planted in 1962. All of the Malus ‘Katherine’ (Crabapple) trees have been replaced, as have many of the shrubs, but much of this is due to the transient lives of plants.

WORKMANSHIP
This area of integrity examines whether there is any physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people. The Rose Garden maintains moderate integrity in this regard, as the physical elements of the garden have been replaced since installation, with only the patio under the Jackson Magnolias retaining its original elements. The condition of this stonework is generally fair, with some areas requiring possible updating. Furthermore, the garden’s recognition as a formal garden requiring horticultural craft has been maintained and suggests appropriate integrity in workmanship.
FEELING
The landscape of the Rose Garden retains a strong feeling of historic integrity. The Garden has changed little since its installation in 1962, and has been maintained to a similar standard in the intervening years. The function and purpose have remained consistent with the original intent, serving as both an official ceremonial space for the President, and a personal garden for the First Family.

ASSOCIATION
This aspect refers to whether a landscape still retains a direct link with its significant historic event or person. In this instance, there are clear and definitive links between the Rose Garden and American presidents, with many features either being original to this period or being replaced in kind. The landscape, therefore, maintains a high level of integrity.

INTEGRITY OF THE LANDSCAPE AS A WHOLE
Overall, the historic integrity of the Rose Garden is high. Since 1801, when President Jefferson moved in to the White House and designed the two terraces either side of the Residence, the location and context have remained constant, focusing on horticulture and plants. The area has been used for no other purpose.

By 1903, this focus shifted slightly, once the greenhouses were removed. The vegetation remained, but now serving to define and refine spatial relationships in the landscape, featuring flowers and ornamental plants set within a green framework. The layout of the Garden has changed since 1903, first in 1913 with First Lady Ellen Wilson and George Burnap’s rose garden design, and then subsequently with amendments in 1952 and 1957 under President Truman and President Eisenhower respectively. While each of these layouts reflected the use of the garden as a formal garden for the President and his family, it was under President Kennedy that the Garden became a location for official presidential events.

From 1962 onwards, the Rose Garden has retained much of its design, with plants and materials being replaced in kind when necessary. It has also retained its original purpose, as a formal flower garden serving the President and the First Lady, and thus continues to hold a strong level of integrity to the present day. Additionally, a crucial aspect of its integrity is its reflection of the tastes and trends of a nation, which will invariably change over time.
DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR PRESIDENT'S PARK

Before any changes or designs are proposed, certain design criteria need to be considered that are unique to President’s Park. The following chart is taken from the 1997 White House Design Guidelines document, pp. 10-12. The Design Principles covers the entirety of President’s Park, yet many of the points are relevant to design considerations for changes to the Rose Garden.

The following points are not rigid rules that will dictate future design decisions. Instead, they serve together as a guiding philosophy from which to initiate new concepts and designs.

1. Site elements from earlier significant planning efforts will be respected and conserved, including the classical 18th century forms that are inherent to the layout of President’s Park and the city of Washington, DC. All components of President’s Park are designed historic landscapes, and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation will be followed in the management and treatment of these landscapes.

2. The distinct character of each of the site’s three areas - Lafayette Park, the White House, and the Ellipse - will be respected, while recognizing that together these areas function as a significant design element in the layout of Washington, DC.

3. The design vocabulary and palette for the site will complement and articulate the dignity and importance of the resource, drawing from the existing appropriate architecture and landscape architecture in and around the site. To this end, proposed design elements will respect the size, scale, mass, proportion, and aesthetics of existing elements, and the spatial relationships between them.

4. The traditional vistas from the White House to the north and south, as well as vistas toward the White House, will be respected at all times.

5. All designs will incorporate sound environmental principles and environmentally and economically beneficial resource management technologies and practices.

6. The quality of the pedestrian experience will remain a high priority in all designs.

7. The needs to accommodate service, security, and ceremonial functions will be met in a manner that is consistent with the dignity and importance of the site.

8. Neither security nor aesthetics will be compromised by actions on site.
9. Design elements that communicate appropriate visual quality, continuity, and consistency will define the boundaries of President's Park and will create a specific identity for the park, but will also complement the design qualities of adjacent areas.
   - Materials used on the site will be compatible with its unique character. To this end, all items used in the park - benches, stonework, grillwork, fences, light posts, and other elements - will relate to the whole and will complement the overall District of Columbia federal park system.
   - All elements must be designed to withstand intense use while still imparting a sense of dignity and elegance.
   - Transitions into President's Park should show a connection with the city. The quality and appearance of materials will announce a special precinct. President's Park and the National Mall need special treatment as transition zones that reinforce mutual relationships.
   - Signs and signals will be kept to a minimum within and adjacent to President's Park, consistent with adequate visitor orientation and safety messages.

10. Plant materials will reflect traditional landscape elements in mass and alignment. The choice of specific planting materials will remain flexible but will be guided by the intent of principle 1 and will complement the palette of existing plant materials.
   - The landscape design will continue to use vegetation to define and refine spatial relationships.
   - Planting and planting designs outside the White House fence will complement those inside the fence in quality, scale and selection.

11. Designs for President's Park will remain flexible and capable of being appropriately adapted in response to technological advances, future demands, and changes in adjacent historic and commercial neighborhoods.

Previous designs for the site of the Rose Garden have been studied, in order to evaluate what is successful aesthetically and for practical purposes.

From these, two design alternatives are proposed. The first closely respects the 1962 design whereas the second alternative looks back further, to the earlier 1913 and 1957 designs, as well as the 1962 design, and integrates elements of both into a new design.

NOTE:
More detailed design decisions and treatment will be included in the completed Report, once feedback has been received from the Committees and Subcommittees after the meeting takes place on December 9, 2019.
Distinctive design feature:

- Semi-circular eastern patio

Note: This plan is also reproduced in Appendix C on p. 144
Distinctive design features:

A  Wide paths around the central lawn area
B  Planting beds south of the main Rose Garden
C  Center line from the Palm Room door

Note: This plan is also reproduced in Appendix C on p. 146
Distinctive design features:

A  Central stone steps with larger platform step

B  *Magnolia x soulangeana* (Saucer Magnolia) trees

C  Planting beds with diamond parterre boxwood
During the analysis of historic integrity and existing site conditions, it became clear that some elements of the existing Rose Garden should remain undisturbed. These include:

A. The Center Line

B. Steps leading from the Rose Garden up to the West Wing

C. Four commemorative *Magnolia x soulangiana* (Saucer Magnolia) trees

D. Two Jackson Magnolia trees

E. Eastern patio (retains overall appearance but amended slightly)

F. Main lawn (retains overall appearance but amended slightly)
DIAMOND PARTERRES - ALTERNATIVE I

Alternative I realigns the trees and the diamond parterres with the West Colonnade columns and window arches.
Alternative II realigns the trees and the diamond parterres with the West Colonnade columns and window arches.

Two trees are removed from each bed and the corresponding diamond parterres are elongated to synchronize with the reduced tree number.
A  The central lawn will have diagonal corners at the east border.

B  The eastern patio will be extended.
A. The central lawn will have a stone mow strip.

B. The eastern patio will be semi-octagonal.
The *Osmanthus ilicifolius* (Holly Osmanthus) hedge will run around the circumference of the Rose Garden.
The *Osmanthus ilicifolius* (Holly Osmanthus) hedge will run around the circumference of the Rose Garden, save at the far eastern end.
DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

The preceding pages illustrate the features that retain historical integrity, or that have previous precedence in earlier designs before 1962.

The two alternatives presented on the following pages are for the Committee’s and Subcommittee’s consideration. After their feedback has been received, a full design and treatment program will be written and included in the complete Report.

-Oehme, van Sweden and Associates
December 9, 2019
This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.
This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.
**TO BE COMPLETED POST CONCEPTUAL DESIGN**
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Figure 1: Virginia. John Smith and William Hole. [London, 1624]. Library of Congress, Geography and Maps Division.

Figure 2: Sketch of Washington in Embryo, Viz.: Previous to its Survey by Major L’Enfant. E. F. M. Faehrz and F. W. Pratt, 1874. Library of Congress, Geography and Maps Division.
Figure 3: *Proclamation of the Federal District with Map*. Thomas Jefferson, 30 March 1791. The Thomas Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress.
Figure 5 (and detail): *Plan of the City of Washington in the Territory of Columbia*, Andrew Ellicott, Engraved by James Thackara and John Vaillance, Philadelphia, 1792. Library of Congress, Geography and Maps Division.
Figure 6: *Sketch Plan for Improving the Grounds*, Attributed to Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Latrobe, Robert Mills. No Date (c. 1802-05?) Library of Congress, Geography and Maps Division
Figure 7: Plan Showing Proposed Method of Laying Out the Public Grounds at Washington, D.C. (detail), Andrew Jackson Downing, 1851. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Record Group 77.
Figure 8: *Isometric View of the President’s House, the Surrounding Public Buildings and Private Residences*, No Date (c. 1845 - 1850). Library of Congress, Geography and Maps Division

Figure 9: *White House Grounds at the Close of the Civil War*, c. 1865. National Archives and Records Administration
Figure 10: *Plan for the President's Park, Excluding Lafayette Park*. Office of the Chief of Engineers, 1877. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79
Figure 11: Guide to Trees and Shrubs in the Grounds of the Executive Mansion. J. A. Lane and Henry Pfister, 1900. National Archives

Figure 12: General Plan of the President's House and Garden. Charles Follen McKim, William Rutherford Mead, Alexander White - Olmsted Brothers, 1903. National Park Service, Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site.
Figure 13: Executive Mansion Grounds, Plan showing Existing Conditions Immediately About Buildings as of January 1, 1935. Olmsted Brothers, October 1935. National Park Service, Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site.

Figure 14: Executive Mansion Grounds, Proposed Improvements about Executive Mansion. Olmsted Brothers, October 1935. National Park Service, Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site.
Figure 15: Executive Mansion Grounds: General Survey showing Existing Conditions as of January 1, 1935
Figure 16: Executive Mansion Grounds: General Plans for Improvements. Olmsted Brothers, October 1936. National Park Service, Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site.
APPENDIX C: WEST GARDEN PLANS

Note: The following historical plans have been overlaid over a plan of the garden as it is today.

ROSE HOUSE

YEAR: 1899

PRESIDENT: WILLIAM McKinley

FIRST LADY: IDA SAXTON McKinley

DESIGNER: -

Figure 17: Basement Plan of Executive Mansion and Conservatories. Under the Direction of Col. Theo. A. Bingham, US Army. 1895. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79
COLONIAL GARDEN

YEAR: 1903

PRESIDENT: THEODORE ROOSEVELT

FIRST LADY: EDITH ROOSEVELT

DESIGNER: EDITH ROOSEVELT / SPENCER COSBY

Figure 18: West Colonial Garden, White House. Prepared for Mrs. Wilson under the direction of Colonel Spencer Cosby, US Army. [1903]. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79
ROSE GARDEN

YEAR: 1913

PRESIDENT: WOODROW WILSON

FIRST LADY: ELLEN WILSON

DESIGNER: ELLEN WILSON/GEORGE BURNAP

Figure 19: White House: The South West Garden and The President's Walk [1913]. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79
ROSE GARDEN

YEAR: 1952

PRESIDENT: HARRY TRUMAN

FIRST LADY: BESS TRUMAN

DESIGNER: NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Figure 20: Diagram - Roses, West Garden & Azalea Bed, Executive Mansion, April 6, 1952. National Park Service, National Capital Parks Planning Division. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79
ROSE GARDEN

YEAR: 1957

PRESIDENT: DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

FIRST LADY: MAMIE EISENHOWER

DESIGNER: JAMES HOWE / NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

ROSE GARDEN

YEAR: 1962

PRESIDENT: JOHN F. KENNEDY

FIRST LADY: JACQUELINE KENNEDY

DESIGNER: RACHEL MELLON/ PERRY WHEELER

Figure 23: Development and Planting Plan, West Garden - Executive Mansion. March 12, 1962. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79 (Image courtesy of Oak Spring Garden Foundation)
Figure 24: Planting Layout, West Garden - Executive Mansion, Washington, DC. May 28, 1962. Oak Spring Garden Foundation

Figure 25: Planting Layout, West Garden - Executive Mansion, Washington, DC. No date. Oak Spring Garden Foundation
Figure 26: Planting Layout, West Garden - Executive Mansion, Washington, DC. No date. Oak Spring Garden Foundation
The following photographs provide a chronology of the installation of the Rose Garden in March and April 1962, together with photographs of the garden before and after construction.

All images are courtesy of the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum.
November 11, 2019

Eric D. Groft, FASLA | Principal / Vice President
OEHME, van SWEDEN | OvS
Landscape Architecture
800 G Street SE
Washington, DC 20003

RE: West Garden – Soil Observations

Dear Eric:

On October 9, 2019 I visited the project site to make field observations of the soil conditions. The purpose of the investigations was to determine the quality of the soil that would guide recommendations for changes to the soil during the propose renovations of the site.

The area of the project site consists of a large lawn panel with planting beds on the north and south sides of the lawn. Steps lead down to the lawn from the west and the lawn ends on its east end at a stone walk. Planting in the beds include boxwood hedges, annual plantings that replaced seasonally and small flowering trees.

Grading and surface drainage:
The surface grade on the east west axis of the lawn slopes at 0.8% percent from west to east. The recommended slope for lawn is 2.0%. There is only one inlet at the east end of the lawn area in the SE corner of the lawn adjacent to the walk. It was reported that water puddles on the lawn along the east walk. At the NE corner of the lawn the lawn is not in good condition and appears to be declining partially from too much moisture and also is the point where many people enter the space from the building. The grades in this corner are almost flat. The grade conditions in this location combined with the surface compaction and abrasion of many feet is creating the difficult turf maintenance condition. Any recommendations to the lawn should address these impacts.

Soils General:
The soil properties observed indicate that they are all natural soils from local sources. Subsoils are likely original soils, but with localize disturbance at utility trenches. This would be consistent with the approach to soil at the time of the gardens construction in the 1960’s, as well as what is seen in the photos of the garden construction and other earlier photographs. The 1960’s garden construction photos show significant disturbance of the top several feet of soil. A deep trench on photo IMG_3155.JPG appears to show a soil profile with an upper layer of topsoil over a lighter subsoil.
Five soil samples were removed and sent to Waypoint Analytical for chemical and physical analysis. The testing results are attached. These results include recommendations for chemical modifications.

The soil in the garden area is loam soil. The subsoil, below 18-20 inches is lighter in color and denser than the upper layer of soil. There is a sharp interface (change in soil color and type) between the lower and upper layer of soil. The upper soils are likely topsoil from the garden area that were disturbed and, graded and or compacted during the garden construction and the several projects that preceded the 1960’s work. The sharp soil interface between the lighter sub soil and the topsoil, a thin layer of greater sub soil density that was observed, but not in all places, and the consistency of the upper soil depth would all indicate a constructed or disturbed soil profile. Traces of plaster debris, observed in the subsoil, further indicate that the subsoil was exposed during some phase of the building construction, imported from off site or moved within the site with the topsoil then applied over the subsoil. This disturbance could have occurred at any time during the long and complex construction work at the site.

A soil profile was dug in the bed on the east side of the garden under the magnolia trees as a reference soil outside of the influence of the garden construction. The upper soil was sandy loam texture with significantly more sand and less clay that the garden soils. This soil was inconsistent to the natural soils in this part of the city and likely is an imported soil. The subsoil was consistent with other subsoils found in the investigations.

The soils texture and structure observed indicated good quality soil and should be preserved. No issues were observed where soil texture was affecting plant or turf quality.

Lawn soil:
The lawn soil upper 18-20” is USDA classified loam soil texture, dark brown in color. Clay content at about 15% does not suggest potential drainage issues and is high enough to contribute to good soil ped development. Soil pH is low at 6. and might benefit from the recommended lime application. Other soil chemistry is suitable for lawn. A small application of sulfur is recommended by the soil test fertility guidelines. Sulfur will slightly lower pH, but not significantly at the rates suggested. Nitrogen application rates and schedule are likely already adequate given the turf color. Nitrogen recommendations in this test is based on the relatively low organic matter 2.6% in the soil. Low organic matter in turf is typically compensated by regular fertilizer applications. No additional organic matter is recommended. While the soil organic matter is low it is not unusually.

The soil below the top 2” of surface soil is draining well. The top 2” of soil in the lawn area was much more compacted that the soils below and a dense layer of soil directly under the turf was observed. This is typical of turf conditions where frequent use is experienced. The sod is adding its own soil interface as the sod thatch decomposes and the soil in the sod is a different soil type than the soil below. This likely increased irrigation in hot periods. There were places where there was a layer of excessively moist soil above the interface between the lawn soil and the subsoil below. However, the upper lawn soil was not exhibiting grey color or mottling that would typically indicate that the water stays in the soil for any length of time. This condition is normal for soils over denser subsoils but also indicates that the subsoil is draining sufficiently.

Planting bed soils:
The planting bed upper 18-20” soils was very dark brown to black with significantly greater organic matter than the lawn soil. Soil textures was quite similar to the upper level lawn soil. Subsoil was identical to the color and density of the lawn subsoil with the same sharp interface between the two soils. The beds have experienced constant annual planting rotations and mulch applications. The potting medium in the annual plants has changed the top 6-9” of the soil to be a soil heavily influenced
by these activities, and bed soil levels have risen over the years because of the added potting material. Soil pH is 6.7, adequate for almost all plant types that may be proposed for this type of garden. Soil chemistry is good with only small amounts of potassium and sulfur recommended. Nitrogen is only needed when indicated by plant performance.

The upper soil layer is loose due to the constant planting. The soil color does not exhibit any drainage issues at the soil interface with the subsoil.

Discussion:
Plants and turf are generally growing well. Maintenance is excellent.

In the lawn area, solving the puddling and slow drainage at the east end would help with turf quality. There are several options to improve this condition.

1. Increasing the slope on the lawn by lifting the grade at the west end, eliminating one riser in the stair. This has significant historic preservation issues, require bringing in additional lawn soil and would increase the slope on the lawn to about 1.2%. However, this would not solve the most difficult issue of the low point in the NE corner.

2. Increasing the drainage rate in the soil along the walk. This would reduce maintenance. This could be done by adding a vertical strip subdrain under the sod along the walk edge attached to the drain in the SE corner. (Example ADS - AdvanEDGE site drain pipe). Adding a drain to the NE corner that connects to the drain in the SE corner would pick up little of the surface water. The survey indicates a minor low point further south along the walk edge. Adding a drain at this low point would impose a significant visual interruption in the turf/walk edge.

3. Reconstruct the walk paving, some portion of the small patio outside the Palm Room and some portion of the patio at the east end of the lawn to remove the low point on the walk at the NE corner of the lawn and regrade about 30’ of the NE corner of the lawn from the centerline of the lawn to about the 5.43 spot elevation in the lawn to warp the lawn grade to meet the new walk elevation. This would require minor amounts of soil to be added. This soil could be coarse sand mixed into the existing soil. In addition to raising the grades, this would serve to locally increase the soil drainage rate in this area. If combined with adding a strip drain along the walk edge as suggested in option 2, it is reasonably certain that the puddling would be eliminated.

In addition to the lawn grades and water ponding issue, the sod, particularly the NE corner suffers from compaction and abrasion from foot traffic. While turf decline is often attributed solely to compaction, abrasion or wear of the turf surface by feet and other physical impacts is a significant problem in high impact turf areas that receive repeated traffic. The turf is accessed from limited points with the NE and SE corners particularly during event set up and maintenance activities. Small pieces (4’x8’) of temporary translucent matting similar to the types used by the National Park Service on the National Mall for turf protection, placed at these two critical points during maintenance and event set up would distribute traffic patterns as people and equipment turn the corner from the walk to the lawn and likely solve the majority of compaction and abrasion issues.

The bed soils are performing well, however, the constant addition of potting soil from the annual rotations may eventually cause issues with grades and boxwood plantings as soil begins to mound up over the stems of the boxwood. Attention to adjusting the relationship of grades and boxwood stems over time, should be considered.

Recommendations:
The following are recommendations for the work in the West Garden.

1. Retain the existing topsoil in place. Plan project work approaches to protect the soils from compaction during construction. Include in the specification some backhoe lofting or fracturing of the soil to reduce any construction induced compaction. Make the minor fertilization modifications indicated by the soil test.
2. Modify the grades in the lawn area and stone walk as described in option 3 above and add the strip subdrain noted in option 2 to correct the drainage issues in the NE corner of the lawn.

3. After project completion, adopt temporary turf protection at the critical east corners of the turf during event staging and significant maintenance operations such as changing out annual plantings.

4. Periodically remove soil in the bed areas to keep soil from rising on boxwood stems and to reduce the buildup of potting soil in the upper layer of the soil. When changing out annual plantings remove the previous plants potting soil to the extent possible.

5. Continue with current turf management practices such as aeration, over seeding, fertilizing and irrigation.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about this report and recommendations.

Sincerely,

James Urban, FASLA, ISA

Attachments:
Soil Testing and Profile Locations
Soil Profile Descriptions
Soil Testing Results
RE: West Garden – Soil Observations

Soil Testing and Profile Locations

Notes:
1. Penetrometer testing indicated soil penetration resistance suitable for root growth with a consistent harder layer at about the depth of the subgrade soil noted in the soil profiles.
2. Boring Sample locations were observed to the depth of the subgrade.
3. Boring 13 was an existing hole dug in the planting bed that showed the soil profile to the subgrade. There were numerous such hole in the beds, preparation for new plants. These holes indicated a consistent depth and condition of upper level planting soil.
4. Boring 15 was dug outside the primary scope area to check the soil profile not impacted by the 1960’s west garden work.
5. Boring 16 was dug in the lawn in a location where the turf was under performing the rest of the lawn.
RE: West Garden – Soil Observations

Soil Profile Descriptions 1 of 3
Boring 13 Bed on north side of lawn

0 to 10” Loam, very dk brown, density SF, fine roots observed, moisture MO, Vermiculite, gravel and other potting soil remnants observed

10 to 20” Loam, very dk brown, density SF to FM, fine roots observed and worms, moisture DP (see soil test 13 A)

20” + Loam, light brown, density HD, moisture DP (see soil test 13 B)

Note:
Profile was observed in a hole previously dug for a new plant. Numerous other open planting holes on the north and south beds indicate a consistent bed profile similar that described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moisture code</th>
<th>Density code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damp</td>
<td>Soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RE: West Garden – Soil Observations

Soil Profile Descriptions  2 of 3
Boring 15 Bed at east of West Garden under magnolia trees

0 to 2”  Shredded bark mulch, moisture DR

2 to 11” Sandy loam, brown, density FM, coarse roots observed, moisture DR to DP
(see soil test 15 A)

11 to 19” Sandy loam / some small rounded gravel, brown, density FM, fine roots observed, moisture DP

19 to 29” Sandy loam / some small rounded gravel, Light brown, density FM, few roots observed, moisture DP (see soil test 15 B)

29” Auger Refusal

Note:
Soil was unusually warm. Staff reported that this soil pit may be over a structure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moisture code</th>
<th>Density code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damp</td>
<td>Soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RE: West Garden – Soil Observations

Soil Profile Descriptions 4 of 3
Boring 16 Lawn in NE corner

0 to 1”  Sod, moisture WT
1 to 2’  Loam, Grey Brown, density SF, moisture MO, Sharp interface with layers above and below.

2 to 10”  Loam, brown, density SF, moisture DP (see soil test 16)

10 to 20”  Loam, brown, density FM, Moisture MO

20” +  Loam, orange brown, density FM to SF, moisture MO, Sharp interface with layer above, Soil included lumps of white plaster, coal, burnt coal, gravel.

Note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moisture code</th>
<th>Density code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damp</td>
<td>Soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Soil Testing Results 1 of 5
Soil test location 13 A (North Bed upper soil layer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Varieties</th>
<th>Soll Test Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium (Ca)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium (Mg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beano (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper (Cu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron (Fe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese (Mn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc (Zn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium (Na)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate Salts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Fixing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Yield Goal</th>
<th>Rec Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LB/1000 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All recommended fertilizers are on an actual elemental basis. To convert to product basis, divide the recommended quantity in the first page by the percentage of the active ingredient then multiply by 100.
- Use Ammonium Sulfate as N source to supply sulfur.
### Soil Testing Results 2 of 5

Soil test location 13 B (North Bed lower soil layer)

---

**Waypoint Analytical**

**Client:** James Urban/UT&S  
915 Creek Dr  
Annapolis MD 21403

**Genius:** James Urban - Urban Trees and Soils

**Report No.:** 19-200-1007  
**Date Printed:** 10/21/2019  
**Date Received:** 10/17/2019

---

#### SOIL TEST RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>% Exchangeable</th>
<th>% Available</th>
<th>% Saturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer pH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus (P)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>150 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium (K)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>57 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium (Ca)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>1592 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium (Mg)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>177 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur (S)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>17 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen (N)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>96 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper (Cu)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>7.4 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron (Fe)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>201 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese (Mn)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>50 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc (Zn)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>53 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium (Na)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>69 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES

**Crop:** Shrubs  
**Yield Goal:** 0  
**Rec Units:** LBA/1000 SF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Rec Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2O5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2O</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Shrubs**

- All recommended fertilizers are on actual elemental basis. To convert to product basis, divide the recommended quantity in the first page by the percentage of the active ingredient then multiply by 100.
- Use Ammonium Sulfate as N source to supply sulfur.
RE: West Garden – Soil Observations

Soil Testing Results 3 of 5
Soil test location 15 A (East Bed Upper Soil Layer)

**SOIL ANALYSIS**

**Lab No:** 21385
**Method:**
**Results:**

**SOIL TEST RATINGS**

- **Test:**
  - Soil pH: 4.4
  - Buffer pH: 4.4
  - Phosphorus (P): 20 ppm
  - Potassium (K): 700 ppm
  - Calcium (Ca): 800 ppm
  - Magnesium (Mg): 50 ppm
  - Sulfur (S): 11 ppm
  - Boron (B): 0.5 ppm
  - Copper (Cu): 0.5 ppm
  - Iron (Fe): 100 ppm
  - Manganese (Mn): 10 ppm
  - Zinc (Zn): 20 ppm
  - Sulfur (S): 20 ppm
  - Sulfate Ratio:
  - Organic Matter: 11.9%
  - Nitrogen: 0.6%

**CALCULATED VALUES**

- **_mg/100g_**
  - **K:** 0.4
  - **Ca:** 18.5
  - **Mg:** 1.7
  - **K:** 0.3
  - **Mg:** 0.6

**SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES**

- **Crop:** Shrub
- **Yield Goal:** 0
- **Rec Units:** LB/1000 SF

**Crop:**
- SHRUBS:
  - All recommended fertilizers are on actual elemental basis. To convert to product basis, divide the recommended quantity in the first page by the percentage of the active ingredient then multiply by 100.
  - Phosphate is more efficient if applied near the plant, apply all phosphate beside the row. Broadcast N and/or K2O then mix into the soil. If there is no fertilizer meets the ratio, you can use single element fertilizer such as Urea, Triple Super Phosphate and Muriate of Potash to achieve the requirements. Consult the enclosed instruction sheet on lime and fertilizer application.
  - Use Ammonium Sulfate as N source to supply sulfur.
RE: West Garden – Soil Observations

Soil Testing Results 4 of 5
Soil test location 15 B (East Bed lower soil layer)

![Image of a soil analysis report]

**Soil Test Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Test</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer pH</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>13.9 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus (P)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>9.3 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium (K)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>170 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium (Ca)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>213 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium (Mg)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>11.6 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur (S)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>17 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boron (B)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>1.8 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper (Cu)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>4.8 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron (Fe)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>423 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese (Mn)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>34 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc (Zn)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>21.0 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium (Na)</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>4.4 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Silicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Matter</td>
<td>LoM</td>
<td>2.4% Soluble B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate Nitrogen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Soil Fertility Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Yield Goal</th>
<th>Rec Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- All recommended fertilizers are on an actual elemental basis. To convert to product basis, divide the recommended quantity in the first page by the percentage of the active ingredient then multiply by 100.
- Use Ammonium Sulfate as N source to supply sulfur.
**RE: West Garden – Soil Observations**

**Soil Testing Results 5 of 5**

Soil test location 16 (Lawn)

---

**SOIL ANALYSIS**

- **Lab No.**: 31654
- **Field**:

**SOIL TEST RATINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil pH</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Nitrate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES**

- **Crop**: Lawn
- **Yield Goal**: 0
- **Rec. Units**: LB/1000 sq ft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient</th>
<th>Rec. Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comments**: Lawn

Lime application is targeted to bring soil pH to 6.5.

- **Apply the amount of lime recommended in first page to raise pH**

  The amount of fertilizer recommended on the first page is the total amount needed for the entire growing season. Split into 2-4 applications to keep the lawn green and prevent fertilizer loss. You should not apply more than 8.7 lbs of soluble nitrogen per 1000 square feet in a 30 day period. Or more than 0.9 lbs of nitrogen per 1000 square feet if you are using a slow or controlled release product in a 30 day period. Custom blend is best to meet exactly the requirement, if this is impossible, the above specific fertilizer application is a general guideline. If the specified grades cannot be found, replace with fertilizer having similar N:P:K ratio. The best time to apply fertilizer for cool season grasses (bluegrass, fescue, ryegrass) is in the Fall when the grass is growing. For Mid-Atlantic region the time is from late August to November. For Northeast region the time is from mid August to October. Fall application should start as soon as the day time high temperature is below 80-85F, apply with the interval of one month. If you start application late in the Fall and do not finish all three applications, repeat the same applications in the Fall of next year. Spring application is recommended when exceptional fertilizer loss due to heavy spring rain leaching and the grasses look pale green. Spring application can start as soon as the grass starts to grow in April. In the case of exceptional warm spring, the application can be made earlier.
Existing Hydrology

The garden has a generally flat grade with less than a one percent gradient draining from west to east. The central lawn area has a slight crown in the center that provides approximately one percent gradient towards the north and south lawn edges. Two small yard drains are located along the north and south lawn edges (See diagram page 57) that provide drainage of stormwater runoff.

The site drainage is insufficient to support the intended uses of the garden. Areas of poor drainage and/or ponding are located near the West Terrace steps, along the south lawn edge, and in the northwest corner. This drainage condition is resulting in additional maintenance of the lawn and operational challenges during garden events.

Hydrology Improvements

The garden drainage improvements will include modifications to existing site grading and the subsurface drainage infrastructure. The crowning of the lawn area will be regraded to provide a minimum of one percent drainage in both the east/west and north/south directions. This regrading will provide consistent surface drainage towards the outer lawn edges. New subsurface drainage infrastructure will be integrated into the hardscaping features along the north, west, and south lawn edges. The drains will allow the surface runoff to infiltrate through the hardscape and into slotted pipes below the surface. The new infrastructure and grading will eliminate ponding and enhance the operations and maintenance of the garden.
IRRIGATION

The Garden has an existing irrigation system that was originally installed in 2006. The system is part of the overall irrigation system for the White House Grounds and is controlled by the Central Computer located in the Maintenance Building southwest of tennis courts. Currently, only the central lawn panel of the Garden is automatically irrigated as part of this system. The remainder of the surrounding plantings are hand-watered as needed. The automated lawn system consists of a single zone of six turf rotors. The remote control solenoid valve for this zone is located in a polymer concrete valve box located just outside the southwest corner of the Garden. There is a 3” mainline pipe and low voltage 2-wire path available at this location which can expand the system as needed to add additional zones for the proposed plantings if desired. In addition, there are six quick-coupling valves located around the perimeter of the lawn. These provide hose connections for general wash-down and hand-watering.

The existing system is operational and appears to be in good condition.
George Sexton Associates (GSA) visited the West Garden on October 9, 2019 to observe the existing lighting condition. Luminaires and accessories were found in a general state of disrepair operating within an obsolete infrastructure. Observations related to specific components are noted below:

A. **Uplight fixtures**

The uplight fixtures are mounted on stakes instead of being permanently installed on the ground. Many fixtures are corroded and are no longer working.
B. Tree mounted fixtures

Wiring leading up to the tree-mounted fixtures are visible. The wire color should match the tree trunk and branches to blend in the landscape.
C. Junction boxes

Junction boxes are located above grade in the garden. Most are obsolete and in a state of disrepair.

D. Wiring

Loose and exposed wires were found everywhere and connected using electrical tape. All wiring should be concealed and connected as per code.
E. Lighting Control

The current lighting control system is not operational. Based on comments from our meeting, a new dimming system should be installed.

Please contact us with questions or comments. Thanks.
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C  Four Commemorative Saucer Magnolias
D  Two Southern Magnolias
E  Eastern Terrace
F  Main Lawn
G  Diagonals
H  Center Line (N to S)
CONCEPT EVOLUTION

ALTERNATIVE I
CONCEPT EVOLUTION

SECTIONS
CONCEPT EVOLUTION
WATERCOLOR RENDERING
CONCEPT EVOLUTION
WATERCOLOR RENDERING
CONCEPT
PAVING PLAN

WEST COLONNADE

ENTRANCE HALL

GARDEN ROOM

ELEMENT OF DIAMOND PATTERN PAVING EVIDENT THROUGHOUT HALLWAYS & CORRIDORS.

THE WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN
PROPOSED PAVING PLAN

ONE CENTIMETER EQUALS ONE FOOT SCALE
FEBRUARY 12, 2001
OFFICE OF FRYE & WYLLI DDJ
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48907
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CONCEPTS
PERSPECTIVE

THE ROSE GARDEN VIEW OF WEST WING WITH ADDED PERIMETER LIMESTONE WALK
CONCEPTS
PERSPECTIVE

WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN NORTH VIEW TO THE PALM ROOM & WEST COLONNADE
PROPOSED LIMESTONE EAST WALK LOOKING NORTH
CONCEPTS
PERSPECTIVE

PROPOSED LIMESTONE EAST WALK LOOKING SOUTH
GARDEN ELEMENTS
ISAMU NOGUCHI
FLOOR FRAME 1962, BRONZE

LIMESTONE BENCH 19" HT, 20" D, 7'-6" L
PAIR OF LIMESTONE BENCHES TO ACCOMPANY SCULPTURE PIECE ON IMPROVED EAST TERRACE
PLANTING STRATEGY AND PLANT PALETTE
PLANTING STRATEGY

THE ROSE GARDEN PLANTING SCHEMATIC

3/8" = 1'-0"

MARCH 18, 2020
CURATED PLANT PALETTE

Rosa x 'Queen Elizabeth'
Grandiflora Rose
Height: 5-7 feet. Tall bushy upright shrub
Pest/Disease Resistant: Excellent
Bloom: Repeat Blooming
Historical Significance: Yes
Fragrance: f
Rating/Description: -

Named in honor of Queen Elizabeth II of Great Britain, this rose was historically grown in the White House in the 1960s and 1970s.

This was the founding rose of its class due to its large, double light pink flowers that consistently flower providing color throughout the season.

Rosa x 'Danae'
Hybrid Musk Rose
Height: 6-8 feet. Elegant arching shrub
Pest/Disease Resistant: Yes
Bloom: Repeat Blooming
Historical Significance: Yes
Fragrance: fff
Rating/Description: -

This historic creamy yellow rose has previously been grown in the Rose Garden. It is constantly covered in clusters of elegant blooms throughout the season and produces orange/red hips in the autumn.

Rosa x 'Mrs. R. Cant'
Tea Rose
Height: 6-8 feet. Large upright shrub
Pest/Disease Resistant: Very good
Bloom: Repeat Blooming
Historical Significance: No
Fragrance: fff
Rating/Description: -

Recommended by the US Botanic Garden as a rose that will thrive in the Washington, D.C. climate. An antique rose first introduced in 1901, it continues to provide color in the garden with smoky pink, almost carmine flowers with pale pink highlights. As with many roses of its era, it also has a strong rich fragrance.

Rosa x 'Iceberg'
Floribunda Rose
STANDARD ROSE (36"
Pest/Disease Resistant: Yes
Bloom: Repeat Blooming
Historical Significance: Yes
Fragrance: f
Rating/Description: -

'Iceberg' has been grown in the Rose Garden for the last 30 years, if not longer. Its strong disease resistance, dark green lush foliage and winter hardiness make it an ideal selection for continuous white blooms throughout the season.
CURATED PLANT PALETTE

ROSE GARDEN

Rose x 'Duchesse de Brabant'

Tea Rose
Height: 4-6 feet
Pest/Resistant: Yes
Bloom: Repeat Blooming
Historical Significance: Yes
Fragrance: fff
Rating/Description:

This rose has a unique association with the White House. President Theodore Roosevelt used it as a bouquet, and the rose appears in his 1908 portrait by Joseph Rodefer DeCamp.

Alonside its historical past, its large heavily perfumed soft pink flowers add a luxurious feel to the garden. It is also winter hardy and shade tolerant.

Rose x 'Tuscany Superb'

Gallica Rose
Height: 4-5 feet
Pest/Disease Resistant: Yes
Bloom: Once in summer
Historical Significance: Yes
Fragrance: fff
Rating/Description:

This rose is the descendant to the 'black rose' planted by Thomas Jefferson at Monticello and mentioned several times in contemporary sources.

A superb rose that has rich velvety dark red flowers and a strong fragrance. It has few thorns, is shade tolerant and produces decorative hips in autumn.

Rose x 'John F. Kennedy'

Hybrid Tea Rose
Height: 4-5 feet. Medium bushy habit
Pest/Disease Resistant: Yes
Bloom: Repeat Blooming
Historical Significance: Yes
Fragrance: fff
Rating/Description:

Named in honor of President Kennedy, who commissioned the present day garden from Bunny Mellon.

The flower bud has an unusual greenish tinge before opening into a creamy white flower, that stands up well to hot weather.

Rose x 'Basye's Blueberry'

Modern Shrub Rose
Height: 4-6 feet. Upright habit
Pest/Disease Resistant: Yes
Bloom: Repeat Blooming
Historical Significance: No
Fragrance: fff
Rating/Description:

Bred in Texas, this rose is recommended by the US Botanic Garden as suitable for the DC climate.

Large pink flowers with yellow stamens emerge from almost thornless branches during blooming season. Attractive red autumn foliage extends this rose's seasons of interest.

CURATED ROSE PALETTE: 4-6 FEET
CURATED PLANT PALETTE

First Ladies:
- Rosa 'Madame Taft'
- Rosa 'Mrs. F.D. Roosevelt'
- Rosa 'Lady Bird Johnson'
- Rosa 'Rosalynn Carter'
- Rosa 'Pat Nixon'

Other First Lady roses that are no longer readily available:
- 'Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt'
- 'Mrs. Warren G. Harding'
- 'Mrs. Calvin Coolidge'
- 'Mrs. Herbert Hoover'

Presidents:
- Rosa 'Mr. Lincoln'
- Rosa 'Barbara Bush'
- Rosa 'Laura Bush'
- Rosa 'First Lady Hillary'
- Rosa 'President Herbert Hoover'
- Rosa 'President Eisenhower'
- Rosa 'President Ronald Reagan'
CURATED PLANT PALETTE

Sarcococca hookeriana / Sweet Box

Helleborus niger / Hellebore

Skimmia japonica / Japanese Skimmia

Geranium maculatum / Cranesbill

Euphorbia amygdaloides / Spurge

Helleborus 'Honeyhill Joy' / Hellebore

Phlox divaricata 'Blue Moon' / Wood Phlox

Heuchera villosa 'Autumn Bride' / Coralbells

Cytisium falcatum / Japanese Holly Fern

Camellia 'Winter Snowman' / Camellia

Hosta 'Halcyon' / Hosta

ROSE GARDEN AND HOOVER TERRACE

SHADE APPROPRIATE PERENNIALS
LIGHTING PLAN
DISCUSSION
PARTNER DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT

Between the

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

And

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

And

THE TRUST FOR THE NATIONAL MALL

For

THE ROSE GARDEN

This Partner Design & Construction Agreement (the “Agreement”) is hereby entered into and between the National Park Service (“NPS”), an agency of the United States Department of the Interior, and the Executive Residence at the White House, Executive Office of the President (“Executive Residence” and together with NPS, the “Federal Parties”), and the Trust for the National Mall (“Trust” or “Partner”). Throughout this Agreement, NPS, the Executive Residence, and the Partner may be referred to collectively as the “Parties.” The purpose of this Agreement is to set out the terms and conditions under which the Parties will cooperate with each other in connection with the design and construction of infrastructure, aesthetic, and interpretive improvements in the White House Rose Garden as further described herein (the “Project”), which Project, upon completion, shall be donated to the NPS.

In consideration of the Partner’s offer to accept pledged donations and donate the Project, the Federal Parties will not seek federal appropriations for the construction of the Project. It is the intent of all Parties to be legally bound by this Agreement.
ARTICLE I. BACKGROUND

The White House and President’s Park (the “Park”) serve as a private residence, the official workplace of the President, a museum, and a public park. Multiple federal agencies work in collaboration to administer and manage the Park. The NPS administers the Park pursuant to the NPS Organic Act, 54 U.S.C. 100101 et seq., and works with components of the Executive Office of the President (including, in particular, the Executive Residence at the White House), the White House Military Office, the U.S. Secret Service, and the U.S. General Services Administration, to ensure both the preservation and use of one of the most recognized houses in the world and its grounds, which are included within the Park. The Executive Residence provides for the use of the White House and its grounds as the official home of the President and his or her family, supports the official ceremonial functions of the President, and works with the NPS and other entities to promote the preservation and public appreciation of the White House and its contents.

The Trust for the National Mall is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, incorporated and doing business in the District of Columbia. The Partner’s office is located at 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 370, Washington, D.C. 20004. The Partner’s mission is to steward private support to design and deliver modern and resilient solutions that will transform the visitor experience and preserve the historic legacy of the National Mall and associated public spaces. The Partner has a longstanding philanthropic partnership with the NPS to bring critical resources to the National Mall and Memorial Parks. The Partner and the NPS recently expanded this partnership to include the Park.

The Federal Parties identified a need to redesign and make improvements to the White House Rose Garden. The Partner agreed to cooperate with the Federal Parties on the Project by accepting pledged donations and donating the Project. This redesign will provide the Rose Garden with improved paths of egress, plant material (i.e. boxwoods, flowering trees, rose bushes, and hedges), overall layout, hard materials, program for annual plantings, and an exterior art program. The new infrastructure will ensure technological upgrades to the garden’s irrigation systems, lighting, and materials. The improved design will ensure to preserve the historical integrity of the garden, while incorporating modern technology, materials, and equipment. These modern features are necessary to maintain the ever-growing events, needs, and requirements from both the current and future administrations.

The Partner will accept sufficient pledged donations to complete the Project pursuant to the terms of the Third Party Contract (as defined below) approved by the Federal Parties. The Executive Residence has separately procured the design documents for the Project. The NPS is planning to separately fund a complementary project or projects in the Rose Garden, which will complement the improvements to be made pursuant to this Agreement.

This Agreement establishes the Parties’ understandings and obligations regarding the design,
construction, and donation of the Project.

A detailed description of the Project is contained in Attachment A to this Agreement. A site plan for the Project is attached as Attachment B to this Agreement.

ARTICLE II. AUTHORITY

The NPS enters into this Agreement pursuant to 54 U.S.C. § 101101, which authorizes the NPS to accept donations for purposes of the National Park System; 54 U.S.C § 101701, which authorizes the Secretary to enter into agreements with individuals and entities to share costs and services in support of NPS projects; and, 54 U.S.C. §§ 100101 et seq. (the NPS Organic Act), which authorizes the NPS to take actions in furtherance of the NPS’s mission.

The Executive Residence enters into this Agreement pursuant to the first section of Public Law 87-286 (3 U.S.C. § 110 note), which provides for the President to use and occupy the buildings and grounds of the White House as the home of the President and his or her family; 3 U.S.C. § 105(d), which provides for the President to repair, alter, and improve the Executive Residence; and provisions of annual appropriations Acts, e.g., Title II of Division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-6).

ARTICLE III. DEFINITIONS

As used in this Agreement, the following terms have the following meanings, and are applicable to both the singular and plural forms of the term:

“Contractor” means the construction company retained by the Partner under the Third-Party Contract who will perform the Construction in connection with the Project.

“Construction” means any fabrication, installation, improvements to, or modifications of real or personal property owned by the United States, including any ground or site disturbance, associated with this Project.

“Construction Documents” means the drawings and specifications that fully describe the construction work to be completed under this Agreement. (Documents prepared by Oehme Van Sweden & Associates, Inc.)

“Design” defines the construction requirement (including the functional relationships and technical systems to be used, such as architectural, landscape architectural, environmental, structural, electrical, mechanical, and fire protection) and requires the production of the technical specifications and drawings for the Project which shall become the Construction Documents and the preparation of the cost estimates for the Construction. Design includes the development of conceptual alternatives through a variety of means as necessary; at the discretion of the NPS, the development of regulatory compliance documentation for NPS review and approval, including
National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act compliance; value analysis and alternative refinement during design development; required NPS design-related reviews and approvals; and the preparation of Construction Documents.

“Federal Parties” means the National Park Service, an agency of the United States Department of the Interior, and the Executive Residence at the White House, Executive Office of the President, both of whom are parties to this Agreement. The term “Federal Parties,” as used in this Agreement, does not refer to any federal agency not a party to this Agreement.

“Guaranteed Maximum Price” means the guaranteed maximum price identified in the Third-Party Contract between the Partner and the Contractor whose services are being retained to construct the Project.

“Targeted Completion Window” means the two-week period between August 1, 2020 and August 29, 2020 targeted for Construction of the Project.

“Third-Party Contract” means the contract between the Partner and the Contractor whose services are being retained to construct the Project.

ARTICLE IV. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES

A. The NPS agrees to:

1. In a timely manner, and in coordination with the Executive Residence, review, provide comments on and, if appropriate, approve the Design of the Project and final cost estimates for the Project.

2. In a timely manner, and in coordination with the Executive Residence, obtain any and all approvals needed for the Construction of the Project.

3. In coordination with the Executive Residence and the Partner, timely review and approve of the Third-Party Contract such that the Partner can timely enter into the Third-Party Contract so that the Project can be completed during the Targeted Completion Window.

4. Coordinate with the Executive Residence and the Partner to monitor the Construction of the Project as it progresses, including periodic site inspections.

5. Use its best efforts to avoid causing or requesting a change order, or creating a Construction delay, which would increase the cost of Construction above the Guaranteed Maximum Price.

5. Upon completion of the Project, conduct a final inspection and, with the
6. Be and remain responsible for completing any compliance documents required by federal law, securing any necessary federal approvals for the Project, and notifying the Partner and the Executive Residence regarding such approvals. The NPS will timely provide the Partner and the Executive Residence with copies of any required compliance documents and of any documents relating to required approvals.

B. The Executive Residence agrees to:

1. In a timely manner, and in coordination with the NPS, procure and approve the Design of the Project, and to review, provide comments on and, if appropriate, approve the final cost estimates for the Project.

2. In a timely manner, and in coordination with the NPS, obtain any and all approvals needed for the Construction of the Project.

3. In coordination with the NPS and the Partner, timely review and approve of the Third-Party Contract such that the Partner can timely enter into the Third-Party Contract so that the Project can be completed during the Targeted Completion Window.

4. Coordinate with the Partner, the Contractor, the NPS, and any other relevant federal agencies, as necessary, to ensure that:

   a. The Design complies with all applicable laws, regulations, legal requirements, building codes, design requirements, and applicable management requirements;

   b. Applications for any necessary special use permits for access to the Park are timely submitted to the NPS;

   c. Construction is undertaken only when all necessary written approvals have been obtained; and

   d. The Contractor has all required licenses to do the work contemplated by the Third-Party Contract and demonstrates relevant experience and competence to perform the work contemplated by the Third-Party Contract.

   e. The Contractor establishes and maintains, throughout the course of the Project: (i) security in favor of the United States in the form of a performance
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bond covering the Contractor’s performance of its obligations under the Third-Party Contract; and (ii) a payment bond assuring payment of all persons supplying labor and material in the execution of the work undertaken for the Project with the following conditions:

1. All bonds must be in the amount required by the NPS. The NPS may require additional performance and payment bond protection if the estimated costs increase during Project Design or Construction;

2. All bonds must be in the form of a firm commitment from a certified company listed in Treasury Department Circular 570;

3. Bonds obtained pursuant to this Article must be consistent with the term of this Agreement; and

4. Should any bond issued pursuant to this section be canceled or withdrawn, the Partner must immediately notify the Federal Parties in writing.

5. Provide coordination and awareness of other government activities on the White House grounds that might affect the Construction of the Project in order to minimize the extent to which these activities disrupt Construction of the Project, delay completion of the Project during the Targeted Completion Window, or cause the Partner to incur unanticipated costs for the Project. And further to use its best efforts to avoid causing or requesting a change order, or creating a Construction delay, which would increase the cost of Construction above the Guaranteed Maximum Price.

6. Coordinate with the NPS and the Partner to monitor the Construction of the Project as it progresses, including periodic site inspections.

7. In coordination with the NPS, timely notify the Partner of any change in applicable federal law or policy that may affect implementation of this Agreement.

8. Upon completion of the Project, provide its final sign off on the Project so that the NPS can accept the donation of the completed Project.

C. The Partner agrees to:

1. Accept donations to cover the cost of: (a) the Construction up to the amount as set forth in the Third-Party Contract; (b) contingency expenses for the Project; and, (c)
management and administrative fees for the Project.

2. Once the Federal Parties review and approve of the Third-Party Contract, enter into a Third-Party Contract for the Construction and provide the NPS and the Executive Residence with a copy of the final, signed Third-Party Contract.

3. Prior to entering into the Third-Party Contract, coordinate with the Executive Residence to ensure, and provide written confirmation that the Contractor has all required licenses to do the work contemplated by the Third-Party Contract, is not suspended or debarred from federal contracting, and demonstrates relevant experience and competence to perform the work contemplated in the Third-Party Contract.

4. Coordinate with the Executive Residence and the Contractor to ensure that Construction is undertaken only when all necessary written approvals have been obtained and when it has received sufficient donations to fund the completion of the Project pursuant to the terms of the Third-Party Contract.

5. Coordinate with the Executive Residence and the Contractor to ensure that the Contractor establishes and maintains, throughout the course of the Project: (i) security in favor of the United States in the form of a performance bond covering the Contractor’s performance of its obligations under the Third-Party Contract; and (ii) a payment bond assuring payment of all persons supplying labor and material in the execution of the work undertaken for the Project with the following conditions:

   a. All bonds must be in the amount required by the NPS. The NPS may require additional performance and payment bond protection if the estimated costs increase during Project planning, design, or construction;

   b. All bonds must be in the form of a firm commitment from a certified company listed in Treasury Department Circular 570;

   c. Bonds obtained pursuant to this Article must be consistent with the term of this Agreement; and

   d. Should any bond issued pursuant to this section be canceled or withdrawn, the Partner must immediately notify the Federal Parties in writing.

6. Include the following requirements verbatim in the Third-Party Contract:

   “The contractor agrees:

   a. That the National Park Service is a third-party beneficiary of this contract, with all legal rights associated with that status, including the
right to enforce the contract.

b. To comply with all applicable laws, regulations, rules, orders, and other legal requirements, and federal policies;

c. To comply with the terms and conditions of the Construction Documents relating to the Project;

d. To obtain, and transfer to the NPS from subcontractors, manufacturers or suppliers for work performed and materials furnished all warranties that would be given in normal commercial practice:

   i. For a period of not less than one year; and

   ii. Executed, in writing, for the benefit of the Partner and the United States;

e. To be responsible for all damages to persons or property that occur as a result of the contractor’s fault or negligence because of, or in any way related to the Project;

f. To waive any defense to any claim based on the contractor’s alleged reliance on the Partner’s or the Project monitoring, inspections or tests by federal officials. All monitoring, inspections or tests are for the benefit of the Partner or the NPS and do not relieve the contractor of responsibility for (i) providing adequate quality control measures, or (ii) ensuring against damage or loss before Project acceptance. In addition, such monitoring, inspections or tests do not imply acceptance of the contractor’s work by either the Partner or the NPS, nor does it affect the continuing rights of the Partner or the NPS after acceptance of the contractor’s work.

g. That neither the Partner’s nor the NPS’s review, approval, or acceptance of the contractor’s services nor the Partner’s payment for those services will be construed to operate as a waiver of any rights of the Partner or the NPS, or of any cause of action that the Partner or the NPS may have, and the contractor will be and remain liable to the Partner and the NPS in accordance with the terms of this Contract and applicable law for all damages for which the contractor is legally responsible.

h. That in the event of a conflict between the provisions of this Contract and the provisions of the Partner Design and Construction Agreement
for the Rose Garden between the NPS, the Executive Residence at the White House, Executive Office of the President (Executive Residence) and the Trust for the National Mall, dated [INSERT], recognize that the terms of the Partner Design and Construction Agreement control.

i. To obtain and maintain insurance consistent with the requirements of Article IX of the Partner Design and Construction Agreement for the Rose Garden;

j. That the contractor has no recourse against the United States or its agencies, with respect to any aspect of construction activities and will not lien any land, structures, fixtures, or improvements associated with this Contract; and

k. To be jointly and severally liable under this Contract if the contractor consists of more than one legal entity.’’

In addition to provisions a-k above, any Third Party Contract for the provision of architectural or engineering services must contain verbatim the following provisions:

“The contractor agrees:

l. That it is solely responsible for the professional quality, technical accuracy, and the coordination of all designs, drawings, specifications, and other services furnished by the contractor and warrants that the Project can be built as designed;

m. To correct or revise any errors or deficiencies in its designs, drawings, specifications, and other services without any additional compensation; and

n. That the final signed and sealed Final Construction Documents provided by the contractor, as reviewed and approved in writing by the NPS and the Executive Residence, are the only true contract documents of record for this Project. By submission of the Final Construction Documents to the Partner, the contractor warrants that all review comments have been resolved to the satisfaction of the NPS and the Executive Residence and have been incorporated into the Final Construction Documents.”

NOTE: Additional Third-Party Contract terms are described in Article X.A.1.
7. Include the provisions in Attachment C verbatim in the Third Party Contract.

8. Coordinate with the Executive Residence and the NPS to monitor the Construction of the Project as it progresses, including periodic site inspections.

9. Upon completion of the Project, donate the Project to the NPSs. This donation is made by the Partner of its own volition and without compensation.

10. Before the NPS accepts the Project, certify in writing that the Project is free and clear of all debts, liabilities, liens, or obligations.

D. The Parties further agree as follows:

1. The Federal Parties review or approval of documents under this Agreement will not be construed to operate either as a waiver of any rights of the Federal Parties or as a waiver of any cause of action the Federal Parties may have under this Agreement or any Third-Party Contract.

2. The Parties further agree that the United States will own all right, title, and interest in or to the completed Project, including all fixtures and other property described in Attachment A, and the Partner hereby waives all claims of right, title, or interest in or to the completed Project. At the NPS’s request, the Partner will execute any documents necessary to confirm the United States’ title.

ARTICLE V. ATTACHMENTS

Attachments include: A—Project Description, B—Site Plan, C-- Security Provisions, and D -- Contractor Certification. Attachments A, B, C, and D are hereby incorporated into this Agreement.

ARTICLE VI. KEY OFFICIALS

For the Trust for the National Mall

Teresa Durkin
Executive Vice President
Trust for the National Mall
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 370
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: 202.407.9421
Cell: 610.675.7808
E-Mail: tdurkin@nationalmall.org

For the National Park Service:

John Stanwich
National Park Service Liaison to the White House
Office of the NPS Liaison to the White House
1849 C Street NW #1426 Washington DC 20240
Phone: (202) 219-0322
Cell: (202) 438-1200
Fax: (202) 208-7628
E-Mail: john_stanwich@nps.gov
For the Executive Residence at the White House:

Timothy Harleth  
Chief Usher, The Executive Residence  
Executive Office of the President  
Phone: (b)(6)  
E-Mail: (b)(6)

ARTICLE VII. TERM OF AGREEMENT

This Agreement will be effective on the date of final signature and, unless modified or terminated by the Parties in accordance with Article VIII below, will continue in force and effect until the Project is completed and donated to the NPS as contemplated in this Agreement.

ARTICLE VIII. MODIFICATION, DISPUTE RESOLUTION, AND TERMINATION

A. This Agreement may be modified only by a written instrument executed by the Parties’ authorized representatives.

B. The Parties agree that in the event of a dispute between them, they will promptly use their best efforts to resolve the dispute in an informal fashion through communication and consultation, or other forms of non-binding alternative dispute resolution that are mutually acceptable to the parties.

C. If any Party reasonably believes that any other Party has breached its obligations under this Agreement, the alleging Party must provide the other Party a written Default Notice (Notice) of such alleged breach. The party receiving the Notice will have 30 days (the Cure Period) after receipt of the Notice to cure such alleged breach. The Cure Period may be extended by mutual agreement of the Parties.

D. If the alleged breach is not cured within the Cure Period the alleging Party may, without first obtaining a judgment or declaration of breach by any court, board, arbitrator or any other adjudicator, exercise its rights to proceed against the bonds required in Article IV of this Agreement, or seek any alternative or additional remedies available to it, including termination of this Agreement.

ARTICLE IX. INSURANCE AND LIABILITY

A. Insurance

1. Before Construction commences under the Third-Party Contract, the Partner shall obtain from the Contractor certificates of insurance demonstrating that the Contractor
has acquired all insurance required by this Article and shall provide copies of same to the NPS and the Executive Residence. Insurance coverage must be reviewed every year beginning on the date of execution of this Agreement and must be modified if necessary to ensure consistency with generally accepted insurance practices and applicable federal policies. The Partner shall promptly notify the NPS if it obtains knowledge that an insurance policy required of the Contractor hereunder is canceled or terminates for any reason.

2. The Partner shall, in coordination with the Federal Parties, ensure that the below insurance requirements are included in the Third-Party Contract and that the Third-Party Contact requires the Contractor to include these insurance requirements, as appropriate, in any subcontracts.

   a. Insurance must be acquired before the initiation of any in-Park activities and must be maintained until the Project is accepted as complete by the NPS.

   b. Insurance coverage must be commensurate with foreseeable risk, and coverage limits may ultimately be greater than the minimum limitations required below. The Federal Parties will not be responsible for any omissions or inadequacies of any insurance coverage or amounts in the event that insurance purchased by the Contractor proves to be inadequate or insufficient for any reason.

3. The Partner, in coordination with the Federal Parties, will ensure that the Contractor has procured and maintains the following insurance and comply with the following associated requirements:

   a. The Contractor must have appropriate insurance including coverage for commercial general liability, contractual liability, automobile, valuable papers, umbrella coverage, and workers’ compensation, from a responsible company or companies. Unless higher limits are required by the NPS in writing, commercial general liability insurance and automobile insurance must each have a minimum limitation of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) per person for any one claim, and an aggregate limitation of Three Million Dollars ($3,000,000) for any number of claims arising from any one incident.

   b. The Contractor must have Builder’s Risk Insurance sufficient to cover the replacement cost of the Project.

   c. The Contractor must have appropriate insurance coverage when warranty work is conducted. This provision will survive termination or expiration of this Agreement. Warranty work requires the NPS Superintendent’s prior approval.

   d. Contractors providing architectural or engineering service must have Professional
Error and Omissions Insurance coverage that, at a minimum, conforms to the requirements of applicable state, territorial, or district law.

e. Where a Contractor is authorized to utilize federally owned structures or facilities in conjunction with this Agreement, the Contractor must procure and maintain, at its sole cost and expense, fire and hazard protection insurance in an amount equal to the replacement cost of structures or facilities utilized. This insurance must be maintained for the term of use.

4. All insurance policies required by this Agreement shall be payable to the Partner, and the Partner will use insurance proceeds to correct the damage, harm, or deficiency that is the basis of the insurance claim. Partner expenditure of insurance proceeds will be in conformance with law, federal policies, and federal approvals. Insurance proceeds that are paid to the Partner, but that are not needed or cannot be used to correct the harm or deficiency at issue, must, if allowed under the insurance policy, be used to further Park projects and programs as agreed to by the Parties.

5. All insurance policies required by this Agreement must name the United States as an additional insured and must specify that the insurer must specify that the insurer has no right of subrogation vis-à-vis the United States with respect to claims against other parties. If the Partner is unable to meet its obligation to correct the damage, harm, or deficiencies at issue to the satisfaction of the Federal Parties, then the Federal Parties may file insurance claims and use insurance proceeds consistent with law and applicable federal policies.

6. Insurance Carrier Requirements:

a. Each issuer of the insurance required by this Article must be rated no lower than A - by the most recent edition of the A.M. Best’s Key Rating Guide (Property-Casualty Edition).

b. All insurers for all coverage must have a Best’s Financial Size Category of at least VII according to the most recent edition of A.M. Best’s Key Rating Guide (Property-Casualty Edition).

c. All insurers must be admitted, licensed, and approved to operate in the state, territory, or district in which the Project will occur.

B. Liability

1. The Partner assumes liability for and does hereby agree to save, hold harmless, defend, and indemnify the United States of America, its agencies and employees from and against any and all liabilities, obligations, losses, damages, or judgments...
(including without limitation penalties and fines), claims, actions, suits, costs, and expenses (including without limitation attorneys’ fees and experts’ fees) of any kind and nature whatsoever including fire or other peril, bodily injury, death, or real, personal, or Intellectual Property damage of any nature whatsoever, and by whomsoever made, in any way arising out of the activities of the Partner, its employees, agents, representatives, or Contractors (including a Contractor’s subcontractor) in furtherance of the Project or this Agreement, unless caused by the negligence or misconduct of the NPS or the United States. This indemnification will survive the termination or expiration of this Agreement.

2. The Partner must pay the NPS or the Executive Residence, as applicable, the full value of all damages to the lands or other Personal Property of the United States directly caused by the Partner, its employees, agents, representatives, or Contractors (including a contractor’s subcontractor) in connection with any activities under this Agreement.

3. The Partner must cooperate with the Federal Parties in the investigation and defense of any claims that may be filed with or against one or both of the Federal Parties arising out of the activities of the Partner, or the Partner’s employees, agents, representatives, or Contractors (including a Contractor’s subcontractor).

ARTICLE X. CONFIDENTIAL AND PROPRIETARY INFORMATION AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

A. With respect to confidential and proprietary information and intellectual property created in association with this Agreement the Partner agrees that:

1. Rights to Works Produced in the Performance Contract

The Partner is bound by the following provisions. Additionally, the Partner will ensure that provisions a through c below are incorporated into the Third-Party Contract. These provisions should be modified by including the Partner’s name and the Contractor’s name when such provisions are inserted into the Third-Party Contract.

    a. “The NPS will own any and all rights, titles, and interests, including design and construction documents and any and all patents, copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets, inventions, products or other intellectual property rights created as a result of, arising from, or relating to this Agreement, including without limitation intellectual property utilized in bid proposals and any pre-existing intellectual property belonging to the Partner and/or contractor that is provided in association with the Project, provided, however, that the Partner may request from the NPS a non-exclusive license to use any intellectual property for
purposes related to the Partner’s fundraising and promotional activities associated with the Project. The NPS will consider the request for such non-exclusive license on a case-by-case basis. This provision will survive expiration or termination of this Agreement.

b. The Partner and the contractor will fully cooperate with the NPS in the protection and enforcement of any intellectual property rights resulting from activities and services performed in connection with this Agreement. This obligation includes timely execution, acknowledgment, and delivery to the NPS of all documents and papers that may be necessary to enable the NPS to utilize in any manner any copyrights, patents, trademarks, trade secrets, and other intellectual property and proprietary rights to owned by the NPS.

c. If any invention or material created in the course of performing tasks under this Agreement or any associated agreement is patentable intellectual property, the contractor will report the invention or patentable intellectual property to the Partner within thirty days of its creation and the Partner will immediately report the invention or intellectual property to the NPS.”

2. Confidential Information

Any information delivered in writing or by other tangible form from the Partner to the Federal Parties, or from the Federal Parties to the Partner, that is to be considered Confidential Information must be conspicuously labeled on every page as “Confidential and Proprietary” at the time of delivery. If proprietary information is delivered orally by either the Partner (including information provided by the bidder) or the Federal Parties, the Partner or the Federal Parties (as the case may be) must identify such information at the time of disclosure, subsequently reduce it to writing, label it “Confidential and Proprietary,” and provide this writing to the appropriate Key Official. Each Party will implement reasonable internal controls to protect confidential information in its possession. The Federal Parties’ retention, release, and destruction of information that is labeled “Confidential Information” are governed by applicable federal law. This provision will survive termination or expiration of this Agreement.

ARTICLE XI. ACCOUNTING AND REPORTS

The Partner must maintain, and must require its Contractor to maintain, accounting books and records under a system of accounts and financial controls meeting Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and must permit the Department of the Interior or its designee, including the NPS Comptroller and the Department’s Office of the Inspector General, to verify and audit
financial documents from the books, correspondence, memoranda and other records of the Partner relating to this Agreement, during the period of this Agreement, and for such time thereafter as may be necessary to accomplish such verification. This Article does not authorize the Department of the Interior to audit the Executive Residence's records, or to access any records protected by executive privilege.

ARTICLE XII. STANDARD CLAUSES

A. Non-Discrimination: All activities pursuant to or in association with this Agreement will be conducted without discrimination on grounds of race, color, sexual orientation, national origin, disabilities, religion, age, or sex, as well as in compliance with the requirements of any applicable federal laws, regulations, or policies prohibiting such discrimination.

B. Appropriations: Pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 1341, nothing contained in this Agreement will be construed to obligate the government to any current or future expenditure of funds in excess or advance of the availability of appropriations from Congress, nor does this Agreement obligate the government to spend funds on any particular project or purpose, even if funds are available.

C. Limitations on Lobbying: To the extent that the Partner commits in this Agreement or any related agreement to raise funds from non-federal sources for the Project, the Partner further agrees that it will not lobby for or otherwise seek the appropriation of funds from Congress to meet that commitment. The Partner may not use any appropriated funds (including property, utilities, or services acquired with or supported by appropriated funds) to lobby or attempt to influence Congress or any official of any government.

D. Compliance with Applicable Law: This Agreement and performance hereunder is subject to all applicable laws, regulations, and government policies whether now in force or hereafter enacted or promulgated. Nothing in this Agreement will be construed as in any way limiting the general powers of the Federal Parties for supervision, regulation, and control of their property under such applicable laws, regulations, and management policies.

E. Release of Information: The Partner will obtain, and will require its Contractor to obtain, prior written approval through both the NPS and Executive Residence Key Officials for any public information releases that refer to this Agreement or Project. The specific text, layout, photographs, etc., of the proposed release will be submitted with the request for approval. The Key Officials will use their best efforts to respond to the request within 10 days.

F. Assignment: No part of this Agreement may be assigned to any other party without prior written approval of all Parties to this Agreement.
G. Agency: The Partner is not an agent or representative of the United States, the Executive Office of the President, the Executive Residence, the Department of the Interior, the NPS, or the Park, nor will the Partner represent itself as such to third parties. The NPS and the Executive Residence employees are not agents of the Partner and will not act on behalf of the Partner.

H. Non-Exclusive Agreement: This Agreement does not restrict the Partner or the Federal Parties from entering into similar agreements, or participating in similar activities or arrangements, with other public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals.

ARTICLE XIII. AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives as of the date the last signature is affixed:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

LISA MENDELSON-IELMINI
Digitally signed by LISA MENDELSON-IELMINI
Date: 2020.03.27 / 08:30:06 -04'00' [Signature Image]
Lisa Mendelson, Acting Regional Director
National Capital Region

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

[Signature Image] Timothy Harleth, Chief Usher
Date: 4.2.20

TRUST FOR THE NATIONAL MALL

[Signature Image] Catherine Townsend the President and Chief Executive Officer
Date: 4.1.20

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment A – Project Description
Attachment B – Site Plan
Attachment D – Contractor Certification Form
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ATTACHMENT A – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project:  Construction of Rose Garden on the South Grounds
Location:  The White House - District of Columbia, DC

Description of Action (Project Description):

Plans are in place to begin a redesign and new construction of the Rose Garden, located on the South Grounds of the White House. This redesign will provide the Rose Garden with improved paths of egress, plant material (i.e. boxwoods, flowering trees, rose bushes, and hedges), overall layout, hard materials, program for annual plantings, and an exterior art program. While the new design pays homage and incorporates former elements of the Rose Garden’s past eras, the new infrastructure will ensure technological upgrades to the garden’s irrigation systems, lighting, and materials. The improved design will ensure to preserve the historical integrity of the garden, while incorporating modern technology, materials, and equipment. These modern features are necessary to maintain the ever-growing events, needs, and requirements from both the current and future administrations.

The new design will feature two rectilinear parterres placed opposite of one another on the north and south sides of the garden (similar to the 1961 design). These parterres will be constructed of boxwoods and will be designed with half-diamond shaped flower beds. Flowering rose bushes and annual plantings will be incorporated into the parterres. New hedges and bushes will not only capture the spirit of neoclassical symmetry, but they will serve as functional and strategic boundaries for movement of persons and event logistics. Additionally, they will better define the footprint of the garden. A new limestone path (designed to reflect the diamond patterns of marble flooring within the Executive Residence) will create a perfectly aligned and straight path from the south door of the Palm Room to the South Drive. Other new limestone paths will line all four sides of the center lawn, defining the parterres and improving accessibility for guests. The east end of the garden will continue to serve as a terrace. The new terrace (constructed of limestone) will be shortened in depth to provide more clearance for a more defined pathway to the South Drive. Most importantly, the terrace will serve as the new holding space for an exterior art program. The garden’s lighting will greatly be enhanced with advanced systems that evenly highlight the garden after sunset. The West Colonnade will also be equipped with a new lighting system that will evenly wash the columns, fan windows, and northern/western walls with warm light.

Lastly, the colonnades and the President’s patio (just outside the Oval Office) will be furnished with new period appropriate lanterns. These decorative lanterns will enhance the colonnades and reflect the historic era of the building.

Overall the redesign of the Rose Garden will reflect the past while incorporating new elements that aid its evolvement into a new era of design and function. Extreme care and attention to detail will be taken in order to minimize disturbance to the current trees and structures surrounding the garden. Great measures will be taken to properly redevelop our country’s most important garden into a modern decade.
ATTACHMENT C - SECURITY PROVISIONS

PART 1 - GENERAL

1.1 SUMMARY

A. This Section includes the following:
   1. Work covered by the Contract Documents
   2. Work phases
   3. Work under other contracts
   4. Government Furnished Property
   5. Contractor use of site
   6. Public use of site
   7. Occupancy requirements for buildings
   8. Work restrictions
   9. Temporary work stoppages
   10. Publicity, advertising, or commercial use
   11. Security
   12. Photography and cell phones
   13. Documents provided by the Government
   14. Historic structures and landscapes

1.2 CONTRACTOR USE OF SITE

A. General: Contractor shall have limited use of the site for construction operations. Limit use of site for work, storage, and construction operations to allow for:

   1. Work by others.
   2. Occupancy of site and buildings on the site by Government personnel and the First Family for the conduct of normal operations.
   3. The least inconvenience to the general public. The Executive Residence will remain open to the visiting public throughout the project. Tours enter the East Wing and exit via the North Portico, Tuesday through Saturday between 8 a.m. and 1 p.m. The tour route is as shown on the drawings.
   4. Permit parking of vehicles owned by the Government or its employees.
   5. Contractor shall confine all operations within the contractor’s material storage area and the work area for the stage of the project under construction.
   6. Government Holidays: For holiday that fall on Saturday, the holiday is observed on the previous Friday. For holidays that fall on Sunday, the holiday is observed on the following Monday. Official holidays are:

      a. New Year’s Day, January 1
      b. Martin Luther King Jr.’s Birthday: January – third Monday
c. Inauguration Day (January 20, 2021). Inauguration Day is a Government Holiday only in the DC Region. No work shall be permitted on the north grounds anytime during the month of January 2021 due to the Presidential Inauguration ceremony. The north grounds must have an undisturbed, pristine appearance.

d. President’s Day: February – third Monday

e. Annual Easter Egg Roll on-site – Monday following Easter Sunday

f. Memorial Day: May – last Monday

g. Independence Day: July 4th

h. Labor Day: September – first Monday

i. Columbus Day: October – second Monday

j. Veterans Day: November 11

k. Thanksgiving Day – November – fourth Thursday

l. Christmas Day: December 25

B. Do not disturb portions of Project site beyond areas in which the Work is indicated for the contract. Confine storage of materials to construction limits and primary storage area. Obtain and pay for the use of additional storage or work areas needed for operations. Move any stored products under Contractor's control which interfere with operations of the Government or separate contractor.

C. Preservation of Natural Features:

1. Prevent damage to natural surroundings. Restore damaged areas, repairing or replacing damaged trees and plants, at no additional expense to the Government.

2. Provide temporary barriers to protect existing trees and plants and root zones.

3. Do not remove, injure, or destroy trees or other plants without prior approval. Consult with Contracting Officer and remove agreed-on roots and branches that interfere with construction.

4. Do not fasten ropes, cables, or guys to existing trees.

5. Carefully supervise excavating, grading, filling, and other construction operations near trees to prevent damage.

D. Driveways and Entrances: Keep driveways and entrances serving premises clear and available to Government, Government's employees, and emergency vehicles at all times unless indicated otherwise by construction limits or security requirements or as directed by the Contracting Officer. Do not use these areas for parking or storage of materials.

1. Schedule deliveries to minimize use of driveways and entrances.

2. Schedule deliveries to minimize space and time requirements for storage of materials and equipment on-site.

E. Construction Camp: Establishment of a camp within the park will not be permitted.

F. Hauling Restrictions: Comply with all legal load restrictions in the hauling of materials. Load restrictions on park roads are identical to the District of Columbia load restrictions with such additional regulations as may be imposed by the Contracting Officer, and given to the Contractor on a zone-by-zone basis. A special permit will not relieve Contractor of liability for damage which may result from moving of equipment.
G. Transportation and Handling: Arrange deliveries of materials in accordance with construction schedules. Coordinate to avoid conflict with work and conditions at the site. Deliver materials in undamaged condition, in manufacturer’s original containers or packaging, with identifying labels intact and legible.

H. Storage and Protection: Store materials in accordance with manufacturer’s instructions, with seals and labels accessible for inspection. For exterior storage, store products subject to damage by the elements in weather tight enclosures; store fabricated products above the ground on blocking or skids; prevent soiling or staining; cover products subject to damage or deterioration with impervious sheet coverings; provide adequate ventilation to avoid condensation; and store loose granular materials in a well-drained area on solid surfaces to prevent mixing with foreign matter. Provide adequate coverings as necessary to protect installed materials from damage resulting from natural elements, traffic, and subsequent construction. Remove protection when no longer needed. Any off-site storage proposed must be bonded and secured with segregated location for Government property and is subject to approval by the Contracting Officer.

1. Protection after Installation: Provide adequate coverings as necessary to protect installed materials from damage resulting from natural elements, traffic, and subsequent construction. Remove when no longer needed. Contractor shall repair any damage to the satisfaction of the Contracting Officer if protection is removed prior to Substantial Completion and acceptance.

1.3 SECURITY

A. The Contractor shall comply with all security requirements under this contract as contained in the DD254, incorporated by reference to the contract and made a part of the contract therein.

B. The Contractor shall comply with security requirements of the United States Secret Service (USSS) in accordance with the issued Classification Guide and including but not limited to the following:

1. All conversations, drawings, sketches, personal observation and other information regarding underground utilities and/or structures within the perimeter fence of the White House grounds or which serve support facilities in Lafayette Park are classified by the USSS as Confidential.

2. All persons having access to classified material in association with this project must have a Department of Defense security clearance at the SECRET level.

3. The Contractor and all subcontractors having access to classified material in association with this project must protect, maintain and store this material in accordance with classified Confidential requirements.

C. Personnel: All Contractor’s personnel, subcontractor’s personnel, suppliers and anyone else entering the grounds or passing a United States Secret Service (USSS) vehicle checkpoint will be required to obtain an access clearance from the USSS. Workers that are not driving a vehicle can be dropped off on a perimeter street and not go through the USSS vehicle checkpoint.
1. All Contractors will be required to fill out an Excel spreadsheet listing of ALL personnel requiring access to the site indicating each individual’s full name, date of birth (DOB), social security number, and other personal information. Verify all data for completeness and correctness. Include back-up or alternate personnel in case the desired personnel become unavailable or must be substituted. The COR will provide a template Excel file for insertion of data by the Contractor. The Contractor must password protect the Excel file before submitted it to the COR or use other file transfer methods that adequately protect personal identifiable information. The Excel access form must be submitted a minimum of three (3) business days before access to the site. All cleared individuals will be placed on an active Work Order (WO) for the site.

2. In addition to Item 1, for all individuals requiring access to the site for more than 14 days in a period of 60 calendar days, the individual must also fill out a SSF-1888 and be fingerprinted by the USSS. All SSF-1888 submissions must be filled out electronically using the template provided by the COR. The individual must TYPE all information on the form and print a hard copy to bring to their fingerprint appointment. Hand written forms will not be accepted. The individual shall NOT sign the SSF-1888 until it can be witnessed by a USSS employee administering their fingerprinting. All individuals requiring a SSF-1888 must submit their form and be fingerprinted within 14 calendar days of being on an active WO.

3. Any workers requiring fingerprinting will be required to present themselves to the USSS at 1724 F Street, NW, Washington DC, 20502 along with their unsigned SSF-1888 and the proper forms of identification listed below:

   a. US citizens (born in the US): State Driver’s license or US passport
   b. *Naturalized US citizen: State Driver’s license, passport, and Naturalization Certificate
   c. *Foreign Nationals (born in a foreign country that are not US citizens): State Driver’s license, Green Card with ARN, etc.
   d. *US Citizen born abroad (i.e. born in a foreign country on a US military base): State driver’s license, and State Department birth certificate

   *Please make sure that all foreign-born individuals regardless of citizenship bring proper documentation – originals NOT copies of driver’s license, ARN card, green card, naturalization documents, social security card, passport, etc.)

4. All personnel shall provide personal photo identification (i.e., driver's license) upon entering the secured perimeter and will be required to clearly display an identifying badge issued by USSS while on-site.

5. USSS reserves the right to confiscate an individual’s badge at any time and remove the individual from the site. The COR will notify the Contractor’s Project Manager in these instances.

D. Vehicles: All cars, trucks, vans, trailers, towed equipment and any other wheeled or tracked motorized vehicle entering the White House grounds or passing a USSS vehicle checkpoint will be required to be included on a vehicle access listing.
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1. Contractor shall prepare an Excel spreadsheet listing of all such vehicles indicating company name, state of license plate, license plate, year of vehicle, manufacturer of vehicle, manufacturer model name, and color of vehicle. Include back-up or alternate vehicles in case the desired vehicle becomes unavailable or must be substituted. The Government will provide a template Excel file for insertion of data by the Contractor.

2. Provide completed spreadsheet in electronic form with an attached paper copy as a submittal for the Pre-Construction Meeting. Also, provide updated versions, additions, or scrubs to this data per paragraph 1.13.E of this section.

3. All equipment, vehicles and materials within proximity of the project site will be subject to security searches.

4. Any vehicle, equipment, or materials that USSS cannot adequately screen at the White House, will be required to be screened at an offsite facility within 10 miles of the White House. Contractor shall coordinate the delivery of any unique equipment or material in advance with NPS and USSS to determine if screening at an offsite facility is required. USSS reserves the right to turn away any vehicle at the White House for offsite screening for any reason at any time.

1.4 ACCESS PROCEDURES FOR SECURE AREAS LOCATED WITHIN PRESIDENT’S PARK

A. The Contractor shall be responsible for preparing and maintaining on a weekly basis three personnel access lists consisting of a Long Term Work Order (LTWO), Short Term Work Order (STWO), and a Drivers Long Term Work Order (DWO) as described below. The Contractor shall also be responsible for preparing and maintaining on a weekly basis a vehicle access list.

These procedures are subject to change and adjustment based on the needs and requirements of the Government and any such changes may be implemented by the Government with little or no advance notice to the Contractor. The Contractor shall remain responsible for compliance with these procedures and any subsequent changes or adjustments to these procedures at all times. Compliance with these procedures and any subsequent changes or adjustments to these procedures shall be performed and provided by the Contractor at no additional cost to the Government.

The information below is provided as a standard procedure for planning purposes of the Contractor. It should be noted that the review and approval times for individuals stated below refer to normal business work hours. A minimum of four (4) full business days is required from receipt by the designated NPS representative. The USSS-WAVES requires seventy-two (72) hours or three (3) business days from their receipt of the access request. In other words, submittal on a Friday for access on a Monday is not acceptable. If received on a Friday, access would not occur until Thursday. All access requests must be submitted by the Contractor to the appointed NPS representative.

B. Long Term Work Order (LTWO):

1. Access for individuals needing more than six (6) consecutive days on site or more than six (6) days in a sixty (60) day period.
2. Individuals need to be fingerprinted within the first two (2) weeks of the date they formally requested access to the site. Individuals previously on a STWO and identified as violating the Item B1 requirement must be immediately fingerprinted, after being requested on a LTWO.

3. Individuals cannot be fingerprinted until they have been requested on a LTWO. STWO individuals do not have the ability to be fingerprinted.

4. The Contractor shall submit additions to the LTWO each Monday to allow sufficient time for all entities to process the request by the following week. Only individuals not currently on the LTWO will need to be submitted on this list.

5. The Contractor shall submit the LTWO as specified in Item F below.

6. Each week (Thursday) USSS-WAVES will generate a list of all individuals that are currently on this work order with the names of those still needing fingerprinting highlighted in yellow.

7. See Item E below for LTWO scrubbing procedures.

C. Short Term Work Order (STWO):

1. Access for individuals for less than six (6) consecutive days or less than six (6) days in a sixty (60) day period.

2. STWO individuals are not required to be fingerprinted.

3. The Contractor shall submit the STWO as specified in Item F below.

4. When unforeseen events impact construction activities that affect the STWO, the Contractor shall email a list of workers who will need to be resubmitted for the following week’s STWO. The contents of this email is further specified in Item F below.

D. Drivers Long Term Work Order (DWO):

1. This Work Order is to be used for drivers from subcontracted trucking companies which cannot provide a regular/consistent driver’s name for the scheduled deliveries within the four (4) business days needed to authorize access to the White House (WH) complex and which can only provide a list of possible truck drivers. The driver shall also remain with the vehicle at all times while on the WH Complex. These drivers that meet the above requirements and continually deliver material throughout the project shall be submitted on this work order.

2. The USSS Special Project Captain and USSS-WAVES Supervisor will determine if and which driver trades meet the requirements to be excluded from the fingerprint requirement for long term work orders. These exceptions will be granted on a case-by-case basis.

3. USSS reserves the right to have a truck driver who is determined to be consistently and regularly accessing the WH Complex and/or background reflects a security concern to be fingerprinted.

4. The Contractor shall submit the DWO as specified in Item F below.

5. See Item E for the DWO scrubbing procedures.

E. Scrubbing the LTWO and DWO Lists:

1. Using the current access lists generated by WAVES, the Contractor shall submit the individuals that will be taken off the LTWO and DWO.
2. The Contractor shall scrub the LTWO and DWO on the last Thursday of each month.
3. The scrub email shall include a list of individuals that will be taken off the LTWO and DWO with their full name and date of birth.

F. Contractor’s Weekly Email – Submitted each Monday for work the following week: This weekly email on each Monday shall clearly identify the following and if there is no change, the email shall clearly state there is no change:

1. Current STWO – The Contractor shall “Resubmit” for individuals who are being resubmitted for a second week on the STWO and explain why access is needed again.
2. Additions to the LTWO.
3. Additions to the DWO.
5. Email to the Construction Management Representative (CMR) and the Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) designed by the Contracting Officer for this contract, and the USSS representative designated by the USSS.

1.5 PHOTOGRAPHY AND CELL PHONES

A. All cameras used on site, including cell phones, must have digital locating/GPS function disabled.

B. At the end of each day, all photos taken must be submitted to the US Secret Service for review. USSS will delete any photos not complying with security standards.

C. Only key personnel submitted and approved by the Contracting Officer shall be allowed to use a cell phone or camera at the work site. All other contractor’s or subcontractor’s phones and cameras must be collected and secured by the Contractor each day before the individual may enter the work site.

D. Video cameras and recording video footage is not permitted unless specifically needed to complete other contractual requirements such as training videos or pre-construction documentation.

END OF SECTION 01 11 00
ATTACHMENT D – CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION FORM

[INSERT CONTRACTOR’S NAME] (Contractor) agrees and certifies that any contract between the Contractor and the Trust for the National Mall, or any subcontract between the Contractor and a subcontractor, including any associated addendum, attachment, exhibit, modification, or change order thereto, whether executed in writing or not, must be consistent with the terms of the Partner Design and Construction Agreement (PDC Agreement) between the Trust for the National Mall, the Executive Residence at the White House, and the National Park Service, dated [INSERT].

The Contractor agrees and certifies that in the event of a conflict between the PDC Agreement, as it may be amended from time-to-time, and any contract or subcontract relating to the PDC Agreement to which the Contractor is a party, the terms of the PDC Agreement will control.

Nothing herein is intended to prohibit the Contractor from seeking payment from the Trust for the National Mall up to the Guaranteed Maximum Price in association with potential modifications to the PDC Agreement, consistent with law and the payment terms of its contract with Trust for the National Mall. The Trust for the National Mall will promptly provide the Contractor with copies of any modifications to the PDC Agreement.

The Contractor agrees and certifies that it has received a copy of the PDC Agreement, dated [INSERT], and that it has reviewed that PDC Agreement. The Contractor will provide certification of receipt of any modifications to the PDC Agreement provided by the Trust for the National Mall] upon request of the Trust for the National Mall.

_________________________________________  ___________________________
Name, Title  Date
[Partner Name]

_________________________________________  ___________________________
Name, Title  Date
[Contractor Name]
Good afternoon Ryan:

Regarding pricing & delivery we still have the following unknowns

1. BK Lighting – no delivery or pricing confirmation – BK’s has replied to supplier that delivery is 6-8 ARO and approved custom drawings.
2. Bilco – custom hand hole covers 6 weeks

Excavation Scope

Garden Square,
We will trench with excavator 310 lf 36" wide and 48" deep to install 8-2"/3-3" pvc conduits racked, and or direct burial cables. We will back fill racked conduits with sand and remove from site spoils and dispose of. We will back fill top section with existing spoils in lifts and compact.

South West and South East
We will air and or water jet and use excavator 145 lf to install racked conduits and or direct burial cable. We will back fill racked conduits with sand and remove from site spoils and dispose of. We will back fill top section with existing spoils in lifts and compact.

Branch feeders
We will air spade 1250 lf at various areas to install direct burial cable. We will back fill with existing and or bring in new soils and sand to back fill. all existing trees and or shrubs will be removed from work site except for 6 existing trees. Work will be performed on weekends and 2 weeks in aug

Locating of existing pathways by others

A staging area on site will be provided for all tools and equipment only single work shifts apply, no night work included.

Depending on delivery lead times we may have to develop options of completing some of the work post 8/15 namely lighting, HH covers and pop ups. We can place temporary covers in the interim. This approach may offer some margin with schedule if we run into problems with excavation too.

Our Updated ROM is $1.571M until we finalize pricing and delivery on the above items.

We have developed an additional cost saving measure with the excavator pending government and engineer approval:

Should it be acceptable to use all native soils as backfill, in lieu of sand, we can reduce the above rom cost by $194,000.

This would result in a final ROM of 1.377M.

This pricing regardless of sand option has excluded the below notes per our discussion last week

Drawing C2 – Notes 2, 3 and 4
Drawing C3 – Note 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 21
Drawing C5 – Note 9
Drawing C6 – Note 5, 7 and 9
Drawing C7 – Note 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10
Drawing C8 – Note 6 and 8
Price does not include pathways described during the 25 June meeting, as “pathways designated for USSS”

Please call me if you’d like to discuss further.