



THE WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN LANDSCAPE REPORT

COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR GARDENS AND GROUNDS

2020

THE WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN

COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

MELANIA TRUMP - HONORARY CHAIR

The First Lady

DAVID VELA - COMMITTEE CHAIR

Acting Deputy Director, Operation, National Park Service

LESLIE GREEN BOWMAN

President and CEO, Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Inc.

LONNIE G. BUNCH

Secretary, Smithsonian Institution

WENDY A. COOPER

Curator Emerita of Furniture at the Winterthur Museum

KAYWIN FELDMAN

Director, The National Gallery of Art

TIMOTHY HARLETH

Director of the Executive Residence and Chief Usher

THAMMANOUNE KANNALIKHAM

White House Interior Designer

THOMAS LUEBKE

Secretary, US Commission of Fine Arts

RICHARD NYLANDER

Curator Emeritus, Historic New England

EARL A. (RUSTY) POWELL, III

Chairman, US Commission of Fine Arts

LYDIA TEDERICK

Curator, The White House

JOHN WILMERDING

Sarafim Professor of American Art, Emeritus, Princeton University

JOHN STANWICH - EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

National Park Service, Liaison to the White House

COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE GROUNDS

LESLIE GREEN BOWMAN
THAMMANOUNE KANNALIKHAM
RICHARD NYLANDER

EXTERNAL SUBCOMMITTEE ADVISORS

DALE HANEY	Superintendent of Grounds, the Executive Residence
JOHN STANWICH	National Park Service, Liaison to the White House
PERRY GUILLOT	Landscape Architect
DEAN NORTON	Director of Horticulture, Mount Vernon
GABRIELE RAUSSE	Director of Gardens and Grounds, Monticello
RICHARD OLSEN	Director, US National Arboretum
JIM ADAMS	Horticulture Manager, US Botanic Garden
PETER CRANE	President, Oak Spring Garden Foundation
JOSHUA MEYER	Director of Buildings, Gardens and Grounds, Tudor House
GAIL GRIFFIN	Director of Gardens and Grounds, Dumbarton Oaks (Retired)

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

PERRY GUILLOT	Perry Guillot Inc.
ERIC GROFT, FASLA	Oehme, van Sweden and Associates
LISA DELPLACE, FASLA	Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a report on a unique and complex site such as the White House Rose Garden in a considerably short time frame requires the efforts of many individuals and organizations. The final document would not have included such a wide scope of research or data if it had not been for the help and support of several people.

Throughout the project, the director and staff at Oak Spring Garden Foundation, including Sir Peter Crane, Tony Willis, Kimberley Fisher, Nancy Collins and Jim Morris have given considerable time and knowledge concerning Bunny Mellon's life and career, as well as providing access to her extensive archives at the Oak Spring Library. Andy Jackson also contributed valuable comments on Mrs. Mellon's design aesthetic, as revealed to him in her private correspondence.


David Krause, the archivist at the Office of the National Park Service, Liaison to the White House, managed to track down several elusive reports needed in order to gain a better understanding of the history and development of the White House Grounds and Rose Garden. His expertise was extensive and his help was invaluable. Peggy Cornett at Monticello was also able to shed light on President Jefferson's writings on roses.

Contributions, comments and feedback came from members of the External Subcommittee at various draft stages, including a round table discussion in November 2019. Dialogues with several specialist consultants provided expert analysis in the interdisciplinary fields necessary for understanding the Rose Garden's existing conditions. They include James Urban FASLA (soils), George Sexton (lighting), Daniel Lynch (irrigation), John Danzer (furniture), David Nardi, Kelly Cole and Keith Thompson (civil engineering).

Thaïsa Way, Landscape Architectural Historian at the University of Washington and Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collections, provided a discerning eye and helpful critique at several junctures, for which the report benefitted immeasurably. Within OvS, inspiration, assistance and continued support came from several colleagues, including Principals Lisa Delplace FASLA, Eric Groft FASLA, Project Manager Lili Herrera, as well as Justin Maglione, Jungsub Lee and James Joyce.

Rachel Heslop with
Benton Williams

Oehme, van Sweden and Associates
January 24, 2020 (revised July 26, 2020)



‘...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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
FOREWORD	xi
MISSION STATEMENT	xii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Management Summary	1
Historical Overview	2
Methodology	6
Study Boundaries	8
CHAPTER TWO: SITE HISTORY	12
Introduction	12
Washington, D.C.: pre-1600 to 1814	13
The Executive Residence: 1815 to 1865	18
Roses Under Cover: 1866 to 1902	22
Roses take Center Stage: 1903 to Present Day	24
Bunny Mellon's 1962 Design	37
Historic Timeline	46
CHAPTER THREE: INVENTORY	53
Existing Conditions	53
Topography	54
Site Survey of Existing Conditions	55
Sun Exposure	57
Circulation - White House Grounds	58
Circulation - Rose Garden	59
Hydrology	60
Irrigation	61
Spatial Relationships and Views	62
Electrical and Lighting	63
Hardscape	64
Site Furnishings	66
Commemorative Features	68
Planting and Soils	70

Site Survey of Existing Planting	71
Soils	73
Trees	74
Shrubs	76
Roses	78
East and West Planting Beds	92
Summary of Landscape Characteristics	94
 CHAPTER FOUR: SITE ANALYSIS	 98
Defining Significance	98
Statement of Significance	108
Evaluation of Historic Integrity	109
 CHAPTER FIVE: TREATMENT	 112
Character-Defining Features	115
Past Preservation Plans	117
Historic Plan - 1913	118
Historic Plan - 1957	119
Historic Plan - 1962	120
Design Guidelines for President's Park	121
Treatment Recommendations	123
Design Foreword	135
Alternative I - Treatment List	136
Alternative I - Treatment Plan	137
Alternative I - Sections	138
Alternative I - Watercolor Rendering	139
Alternative II - Treatment List	140
Alternative II - Treatment Plan	141
Alternative II - Watercolor Rendering	143
Alternative II - Revised Masterplan	145
Alternative II - Revised Masterplan Sections	146
Design Process	147
Final Design	167
 APPENDIX A: MAPS	 170
 APPENDIX B: PLANS	 174

APPENDIX C: WEST GARDEN PLANS	182
APPENDIX D: MELLON PLANTING PLANS	188
APPENDIX E: 1962 CONSTRUCTION	192
APPENDIX F: SOILS REPORT	198
APPENDIX G: HYDROLOGY REPORT	211
APPENDIX H: IRRIGATION REPORT	212
APPENDIX I: LIGHTING REPORT	213
APPENDIX J: TREE REPORT	216
APPENDIX K: TREATMENT STANDARDS	218
ADDENDUM: FURTHER DESIGN PROCESS	220
BIBLIOGRAPHY	226



FOREWORD



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

The White House gardens are an exceptional example of the ways in which nature defines our Nation's heritage. While providing first families with comfort, privacy, and beauty, the grounds at the People's House offer the public a cultivated environment that is exceptionally American.

The Rose Garden, especially, has become an iconic space for the American public and first families alike. From state dinners to press conferences to bill signings and weddings, the Rose Garden has been the site for many of the most memorable scenes in the history of the American Presidency. It has, in fact, become the centerpiece of the White House horticultural story. The Rose Garden has continually represented the best of American landscape architecture, evolving as the ideas and practices of American horticulture and design have evolved throughout the 20th and 21st centuries.

The current design, introduced during the Kennedy Administration by Rachel Lambert Mellon and landscape architect Perry Wheeler, has provided the pre-eminent stage for over six decades of Presidential events. To protect this singular and historic space for future administrations, we are embarking on a comprehensive renovation of the Rose Garden that will preserve its distinctive character and fulfill the dynamic needs of the modern Presidency.

The redesign has been developed to increase both the beauty and functionality of the Rose Garden. As the use of the Garden as a ceremonial space has expanded, so has the need for maintenance and structural changes. The new design will incorporate essential infrastructure and technological upgrades. However, we will ensure that we balance modern needs with the preservation of the landscape. New plantings and lighting will enhance traditional landscape elements, and the updated design will blend the past with the present in complete harmony. Protecting the historic integrity of the White House landscape is a considerable responsibility, and we will fulfill our duty as custodians of the public trust.

It is my hope that enthusiasm and reverence for the White House Rose Garden will continue to grow. The development and design of the renovated garden are spectacular, and I am very grateful to all of those participating in this historic endeavor. This unique project is a collective effort, and we all look forward to the completion of such a monumental mission.

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.

The White House Rose Garden Landscape Report promotes design solutions that are steeped in scholarship and intellect, and are 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.



Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

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 (see plan on p. 11). While past presidents such as Truman and Eisenhower held occasional press briefings and events in the Garden, President Kennedy was the first to fully use the Garden as an official space. Subsequent presidents have used the Garden as a backdrop for speeches, events, and announcements. The Rose Garden encapsulates the many roles 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 for official functions. Presidents past and present have all recognized and understood the power and significance of the Rose Garden.

While we know it today as the Rose Garden, it 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 unclear. 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.¹ For continuity’s sake, this Report will refer to the Rose Garden throughout, unless specified otherwise.

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 garden design and its functions 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.

Since 1962, time has taken its toll on the Rose Garden. 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 Park, 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 can be viewed as a layered landscape, with each alteration revealing the historic imprints of the Residence's occupants. Artifacts discovered during the construction of the nearby 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.172), grounds in the city dedicated for the president's personal use have been present. Nearly 83 acres were bought by the Federal Government in 1792, and construction of the President's House was largely completed by 1800. 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. 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 needs and wishes.

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 redesigned 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. On completion of the restoration, the Garden was rebuilt in a matter of weeks without any discernable changes from its appearance before the work began.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower's years in the White House meant change to the Garden's layout, reducing the number of flowering plants (including

roses), and removing hedges to enlarge the existing small lawn area, following a design by James Howe of the National Park Service.

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 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 Rose Garden sought a balance of both presidential ceremony and as a secluded private retreat. The Garden was used by President Kennedy consistently during his time in residence.

Structurally, elements within the Rose Garden have been altered or updated since the Garden’s 1962 installation. The largest addition to the Garden was a bluestone 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



Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

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 Rose 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 lends itself to this continually rotating series of functions, with seasonal annual plants added three times a year. Additional plants are also installed 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. Roses even adorn columns and pilasters on the exterior of the White House, carved by skilled Scottish stonemasons during the building's construction at the end of the eighteenth century. 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 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 scope of this Report is to construct a comprehensive plan for the future management and treatment of the Rose Garden, including presentation of a conceptual master plan. While the Garden is 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 concept plan. The first part will explore the historical background of the site, and those who contributed to the Garden's development. 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 historic 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 be provided 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 Committee for the Preservation of The White House Grounds.

An early preservation report was published by the Olmsted Brothers firm in 1935, and this document continues to serve as a benchmark for the long-term management and treatment of the White House Grounds. While many issues raised in the report are still pertinent today, times and requirements have changed, and an updated strategy is necessary. This process of renewal began in the 1980s, and 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 group meetings to determine the purpose and significance of the different areas and features of President's Park and presented the resulting *Design Guidelines: The White House and President's Park* in 1997 and the *Comprehensive Design Plan* in 2000, along with further supporting studies. To complement these reports, the NPS soon afterwards published Dr. Susan Boyle's 2001 Cultural Landscape Report (CLR), *The White House & President's Park, Washington, D.C.*

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. The current Report is the first to focus on the Rose Garden's history and existing conditions in their entirety and will follow the format detailed by the NPS. This Report will not address the Rose Garden in relation to other features on the White House Grounds, unless they directly impact an aspect or feature within the Garden. No recent history or analysis of any other areas around the grounds is included in this Report.

The 2001 report does not address the secondary phase of a CLR: a preservation strategy for long-term management and treatment of the


grounds. The latter part of this Report provides the basis for the important secondary phase of a CLR, in proposing a preservation strategy for the Garden. Due to time constraints, this Report is not as extensive as a CLR and Treatment, which takes years to assemble. While it follows the layout of the NPS guidelines for treatment, time was not available to gather and analyze every avenue of relevant data. A further report detailing treatment record would ideally cover the appropriately taken treatment strategies and include a fuller management and maintenance plan.


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. But, due to the aforementioned time pressure, 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, D.C. 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 Terrace Colonnade to the north. The eastern border is defined by the Hoover Patio 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 Grounds, including contemporary letters, maps, plans, drawings, memoirs (both written and oral), photographs and newspapers. While it has been possible to consult some of the larger archives (including the Library of Congress), time constraints dictated that other relevant archives were not fully taken advantage of; these include the National Archives, the NPS, the White House Curator Office Records and the numerous presidential libraries across the country. 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, but this has gradually changed over the last twenty years.

The first part of the 2001 CLR examined in detail the development of President's Park in conjunction with historical, social, and physical contexts. As such, the study and analysis of the overall site is not repeated here (though sections are referenced), the focus of this Report concentrating specifically on the Rose Garden, the first history to do so. The earlier historical development of the White House Grounds is therefore included in this chapter as a summary for when, how and why the existing Rose Garden was built.


At times, design proposals were put forward for White House expansion or development of the grounds that would have directly impacted the location or design of the Rose Garden. In 1889 for instance, First Lady Caroline Harrison investigated expanding the White House with the addition of grandiose wings built on the South Grounds that would have wiped out the landscape east and west of the main Residence. The design never got beyond the planning stage, as Mrs. Harrison's death prevented the project going ahead. Later, the site of the Rose Garden was considered

for President Franklin Roosevelt's swimming pool (before being built in the West Terrace). These examples are just some of the many 'what if' plans that could have influenced the development of the Rose Garden landscape. Nevertheless, many of these are covered by the 2001 CLR, and time restrictions have dictated that emphasis is placed on what was constructed or directly affected the evolution of the landscape.

WASHINGTON, D.C.: 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, D.C. to nearly 10,000 years BCE (Lewis 2015, p. 2). Small items uncovered on the White House Grounds include quartzite points and pottery fragments (Humphrey and Chambers 1984; Pousson and Hoepfner 1995), confirming ancient human presence on the site.

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 providing fertile ground for fishing and farming (Pousson and Hoepfner 1995, p 5).



A 1624 map of Virginia by John Smith (detail), after his exploration of the Chesapeake Bay between 1607-1609. Jamestown and the future site of Washington, D.C. are marked with circles.

European exploration began with Captain Smith's expedition up the Bay in 1607-1609, where he made contact with and mapped the various tribes in Virginia (previous page and figure 1, p. 170). 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 in fur.

By the time the nascent nation was in search of a new capital city in the 1780s, several small towns were flourishing along the banks of the Potomac River (right and figure 2, p. 170). Georgetown was founded in 1751, being the farthest point up the Potomac River where 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.




Library of Congress

An 1874 facsimile map of Washington, D.C. with landholdings prior to L'Enfant's 1791 survey overlaid on top. The site of the future White House is marked with a circle.

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 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.




Detail of Thomas Jefferson's 1791 sketch plan for the location of the President's use.

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 (left and figure 3, p. 171). 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 for the new capital city, in collaboration with Andrew Ellicott (1754 -1820), a local surveyor.

The plans produced (figures 4 and 5, pp. 172-173) 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).




Topographic map of the Executive Mansion, c.1797 reproduced in the 1935 Olmsted Report

L'Enfant proposed to design the President's House 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 Tiber Creek (a small tributary that runs into the Potomac River, see topographic map on left).

By December 1791, planning was sufficiently complete for L'Enfant to lay the foundations. 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 (see right) to announce a competition for the design of the President's House, 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 emigrated from Ireland in 1785 and subsequently settled in Charleston, South Carolina.




Announcement of the competition for the new President's House design in the Gazette of the United States, March 24, 1792.

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 occupied the Residence for only 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 (Boyle 2001, p. 21).

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 (opposite, and figure 6, p. 174) 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



Detail of the sketch for the White House Grounds by Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Latrobe and Robert Mills, c. 1802-1805.


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 public access to the Residence and privacy was a concern from the beginning of the White House'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 close to the Residence were to be kept more private, for the use of the first family exclusively. Beyond the South Drive, the public were able to regularly gain access to the South Grounds. This uneasy balance between public and private would fluctuate between presidencies until President Grover Cleveland (in office 1885 - 1889; 1893 - 1897) closed the South Grounds totally in 1893, save for special events.

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 (see 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 planting list of trees and shrubs for the 'President's Garden', given to President Madison on March 31, 1809. It includes 'roses' at the bottom of the list.

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 its reconstruction (such as the porticos on the north and south façades). 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

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*.



Detail of a watercolor by Anthony St. John Baker done in approximately 1827, depicting President Adams' arborum to the south west of the White House.


trees (Boyle 2001, p. 48). He established a tree nursery during his residency to the southwest of the Residence (see left), and a flower/kitchen garden to the southeast, but the existing pictorial evidence suggests 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 not 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 funds 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 by 1850 (figure 8, p. 176). Both the flower garden and kitchen garden were tucked away to the sides of the Residence, and from what little description exists, they were likely 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 (next page), which dates to 1846. It does not show the entire West Terrace, but it gives a good idea of the planting at the time, consisting of deciduous trees and some evergreens. To the left,



Library of Congress


The earliest known daguerrotype of the White House, taken in 1846 by John Plumbe. The evergreen Magnolia trees supposedly planted by President Jackson do not appear in this wintertime image.

a free-standing trellis supports vine growth, but no further ornamental planting appears visible. Also unseen are the Southern Magnolia trees believed to be planted by President Jackson.

No known overall plan for the White House Grounds is known after 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 White House Grounds was commissioned. Andrew Jackson Downing (1815 - 1852) was the landscape architect charged with drawing up the design, which he presented in 1851 (below, and figure 7, p. 175). The plan however does not include significant detail of the design for the White House Grounds. 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).



National Archives and Records Administration

Detail of Andrew Jackson Downing's 1851 plan for the President's House grounds.

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 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 expansion of the old orangery near the Treasury building, but this only survived for four years as the Treasury building expansion moved westwards. This construction altered the old flower garden's layout, and it eventually disappeared. The old orangery was rebuilt at the southwestern 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 was linked to the State Dining Room on the main floor of the Residence via a glazed passage. This allowed the Conservatory to become part of the president's suite of reception rooms, though initially it was used as a private retreat until later presidencies.

During President Abraham Lincoln's time in office (1809 - 1865, in office 1861 - 1865), 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 parts of the 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).



Library of Congress

Mathew Brady's 1862 photograph of the South Grounds, showing soldiers standing on Thomas Jefferson's ha-ha wall.

Few changes occurred to the grounds during Lincoln's time, as the Civil War was all-consuming (figure 9, p. 176). Nevertheless, the gardens surrounding the south side of the Residence were clearly well maintained. A Washington, D.C. 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, D.C., favorite flowers to either display in vases or wear as hair decorations included camellias and roses. Unlike the larger display conservatory above it (see below), 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 sole greenhouse was unable to meet demand.



Library of Congress



An 1889 photograph of the Conservatory's interior.


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).

By 1900, the Conservatory and greenhouses were at their largest extent, incorporating nine structures in addition to the main Conservatory (figures 11 and 17, pp. 178, 182; see also image on following page). 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 right). 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

These photographs were taken from the nearby State, War and Navy Department building (now the Eisenhower Executive Office Building).





Detail of an 1899 basement plan of the White House's greenhouses. The Rose House at the bottom left of the plan is on the site of the current Rose Garden, with the West Terrace columns visible along the bottom of the plan.

between the years 1894 and 1900 (see photos on previous page - in 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 McMillan), 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 Plan did not specifically mention the White House Grounds, but President

First Lady Edith Roosevelt's portrait, by Théobald Chartran, 1902. The First Lady poses on a bench in what would become her Colonial Garden. The artist has repositioned the South Portico of the White House so that it would appear in the portrait.




The 1903 Olmsted Brothers' plan (detail) designed by Charles McKim, William Rutherford Mead, and Alexander White, showing their proposed improvements for the grounds immediately south of the White House.

Roosevelt attended the opening of the exhibition, and soon thereafter, 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, with a smaller conservatory being planned for the area between the new West Wing and the South Drive. Mrs. Roosevelt was reluctant to carry out this plan, despite her desire to keep a conservatory on the grounds. 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 off-site at a nearby location, while the larger steel and iron structures would be dismantled carefully and reassembled elsewhere on the White House Grounds. Though agreed upon by Mrs. Roosevelt, none of the greenhouses were ever 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



The images above show the area in front of the West Terrace as the Rose House is being removed, in 1902, and then in 1905, two years after First Lady Edith Roosevelt's Colonial Garden had been built.

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. 178) would have been more than twice the size of the current gardens (ibid., p. 186). They 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 Portico.

The west garden, as constructed (similarly in the east garden) bears little resemblance to McKim's plan (figure 18, p.183), 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 native 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.

There were certainly enough roses produced both in the gardens and the off-site greenhouses for Mrs. Roosevelt's successor to enjoy their beauty. 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), first 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



Library of Congress



Library of Congress

Images by Harris and Ewing Inc. showing two views of First Lady Ellen Wilson's rose garden, built in 1913.

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 garden was a definitive departure from the old, replacing the paisley patterned beds with more formal symmetrical ones, composed of long elongated beds and dividing hedges (figure 19, p. 184). 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 President Wilson 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 laundry yard, with a central arch and a statue of Pan set within it (the origins of



A photograph of President Woodrow Wilson's 'outdoor office' in the rose garden, taken by Harris and Ewing Inc.

this choice is unknown, see Boyle 2001, p. 192). At the eastern end, a semi-circular bench, painted white, was installed in a semi-circular opening. Soon after the garden was finished, President Wilson set up a large canvas tent over this bench (above), 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.




First Lady Lou Hoover's patio underneath the Jackson Magnolias, built in 1929.

President Herbert Hoover (1874 - 1964, in office 1929 - 1933) was primarily preoccupied with the Great Depression, though during their time in the White House, First Lady Lou Henry Hoover (1874 - 1944) installed a small bluestone patio 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 by shrub hedges 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 separated after First Lady Ellen Wilson's redesign in 1913 and all subsequent iterations.

Mrs. Hoover's Patio 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.'



The appearance of the Garden as shown in the 1935 Olmsted Brothers Plan.

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 Boyle 2001, pp. 198-199).

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 15 and 16, pp. 180-181). The remit would also include grading work south of the newly constructed West Wing, which had been rebuilt at the end of 1934. The new West Wing relocated the President's Office from the center of the south façade to the southeastern corner, creating a closer connection between the Office and the Rose Garden. The existing screen lattice at the western end of the Garden, that had once hidden laundry lines, was now replaced by the President's Office and West Wing Terrace, linked to the Garden by a set of stairs.

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, the report concludes:

‘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).

The 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 13 and 14 for before and after plans, p. 179). 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 the proposed plans with regards to road circulation and removing trees from the views 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 the Olmsted Brothers.

A subsequent report for *Proposed Landscape Improvements for the Executive Mansion Grounds* was presented to President Roosevelt in 1944 by the Federal Works Agency and Public Buildings Service, with assistance from White House architect Lorenzo S. Winslow and Public Building Service landscape architect Spencer E. Sanders². It reiterated much of what was written in the Olmsted Report, and concluded that the west garden should be developed ‘to reflect the architectural design which stems from the early Post-Colonial period. The best similar gardens of that era were formal in character, though of simple design, and were structurally related to the building for which they helped to form the setting’ (Fleming and Reynolds 1944, p. [6]).

² With thanks to David Krause , Archivist at the Office of the National Park Service, Liaison to the White House for providing access to this report at late notice.



S.E. Sanders and Lorenzo Winslow's 1944 proposal for improvements to the Presidential Gardens.

Sanders and Winslow's design for the west and east gardens (see above) simplified the existing garden with the removal of flower beds from seven down to four, widening the central lawn area and adding a semi-circular pool underneath the Jackson Magnolias at the termination of the central axis from the West Wing. Two flowering trees frame the pool at either side and add color to the landscape. No mention of roses exist on either the plan or in the accompanying narrative for the west garden. They are instead included as part of a boxwood and rose parterre garden immediately east of the South Portico.

No work within the Rose Garden is noted as being completed during the remaining months of Roosevelt's presidency. The report was discussed during a Congressional appropriations hearing in January 1946 in conjunction with President Harry Truman's (1884 - 1972, in office 1945 - 1953) plans to expand the West Wing southwards, but nothing came of the proposals.

At the end of 1949, President Harry Truman 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



President Harry Truman walking in the Rose Garden with Secretary of War, Fred Vinson in 1945.



President Dwight D. Eisenhower giving a press conference in the Rose Garden in 1959.

fallen into a state of disrepair over the years and so it was gutted and a new steel frame shell was incorporated into the building's fabric. The grounds surrounding the White House suffered immensely while the work was carried out, becoming a construction site. Once the restoration had been completed in 1952, records state that the Rose 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. 185). 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 to design a plan (figure 21, p. 186) that cleared away the partition hedges and removed 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



President John F. Kennedy addresses American Field Service students in the Rose Garden in July 1961, before the Garden was redesigned.



John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum

President Kennedy speaks to the Civil Air Patrol cadets on May 7, 1962, shortly after the new Rose Garden was installed.

events was still an issue (see images on previous page).

That summer, President Kennedy turned to his family friend, Rachel (“Bunny”) Lambert 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 her friend Perry Wheeler, a Washington, D.C.-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. 187; see also Appendix E on pp. 192-197 for a photographic timeline of construction). The first event was held at the start of May (see p. 37 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. Kennedy did however hold numerous events in the Garden for a variety of purposes throughout 1962 and 1963. 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. 51).

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 grown too large, shading out the plants below. Mrs. Mellon suggested removing two of the crabapples in each bed and pruning them back into shape (though this was not carried out), along with new plantings of lilies and roses (Mellon, private correspondence, see below).

By 1989 the grass at the eastern end of the garden had become worn and was constantly being replaced. Contrary to Mrs. Mellon's designed path underneath the Jackson Magnolias (so as not to disturb or distract the president working in the Oval




Bunny Mellon's letter to First Lady Nancy Reagan, dated June 14, 1981. Her proposed improvements included removing two crabapples from each parterre border, and adding more gray plants along with lilies and white roses.

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 somewhat downplayed the importance of the terrace at the eastern end, as it became 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 renovation was completed 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 and first lady has had in the development of the White House 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



Bunny Mellon's watercolor of her proposed design,
January 1962.

Oak Spring Garden Foundation




for The President's Garden

BUNNY MELLON'S 1962 DESIGN

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 recalled how 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), she was particularly influenced by the work of the major European horticultural authorities, including Jean de La Quintinie (1626 - 1688), Jacques Boyceau (c. 1565 - 1637), Claude Mollet (c. 1564 - c. 1649), 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 in following their horticultural techniques, particularly with regards to shaping and pruning.

Closer to home, she went to school in Virginia, and 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 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).

Shipman's 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). These European and 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 that 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).



Rachel ("Bunny") Lambert Mellon



Perry Wheeler

Mellon was supported in the design process by the Washington, D.C.-based landscape architect Perry Wheeler (1913 - 1989). As a practicing professional, he doubtless helped with the more technical aspects, and provided critical suggestions that could enhance Mellon's vision. The finished design adheres closely to the brief set by the President. Of the surviving preliminary drawings (following page) held at Oak Spring, Mellon's estate in Upperville, VA, there are remarkably few changes from initial thoughts to the installed garden, reflecting Mellon's initial intention.

The designs further expanded the size of the central lawn area to accommodate larger crowds, as specified by President Kennedy, and were bordered with two elongated parterre planting beds. '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 Mellon delineated for the parterres provides strong visual direction along its length. It also reflects Mellon's own aesthetic, 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, 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 (see plans on following page).




Bunny Mellon's Garden Room
Oak Spring, Upperville VA



King's Leap, Bunny Mellon's house
in Antigua




Bunny Mellon's Library
Oak Spring, Upperville VA



Oak Spring Garden Foundation

Study Plan for West Garden: Executive Mansion Grounds (detail). November 17, 1961




Oak Spring Garden Foundation

Development and Planting Plan: West Garden - Executive Mansion (detail). March 12, 1962

The diamonds, as installed, created with a gray perennial (santolina or dusty miller) no longer joined together at the longer tip. Instead they would be separated by a running diagonal line of boxwood shrubs (see plan on following page). 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 x soulangeana* (Saucer Magnolia) trees. Mellon wrote later 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 continued, '...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 would remain at the White House until his retirement in 2008.




Irvin Williams

In addition to emphasis on the 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.

Additionally, 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 of the two long beds, in the center of a diamond constructed of boxwood and perennials.

Roses were a focus of Mellon's design, and plans for their inclusion existed from the start of her 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 (see Appendix D on p. 188), echoing First Lady Mrs. Roosevelt's 1903 plan to extend the flowering season through a greater part of the year.

Nevertheless, no definitive plant list of roses appears to have survived from when the garden was originally planted under Mellon, 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 May 28 planting plan (figure 24, p. 189), but other roses planted have been reconstructed from



Proposed Plan for President Kennedy (detail). January 24, 1962. By Rachel "Bunny" Mellon. Oak Spring Garden Foundation


a later source (Kramer 1973), in which Mrs. Mellon writes a commentary on the Rose Garden's design. The roses used (see pp. 81-85 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 wrote '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).

Mrs. Mellon chose perennials that she believed would reflect Kennedy's wishes. Perennials used during President Kennedy's tenure include



The President's Garden. [January 24], 1962. Rachel "Bunny" Mellon. Oak Spring Garden Foundation



Santolina chamaecyparissus (Lavender Cotton), *Alchemilla mollis* (Lady's Mantle), *Aquilegia canadensis* (Columbine), *Achillea* 'Coronation Gold' (Yarrow), and *Sedum sieboldii* (Stonecrop) among others.

Of Mellon's January 1962 design (previous pages), President Kennedy asked that she amend only two design elements. The first was the removal of the tent at the eastern end - a simple change to remedy. The second change was more vital. Mellon's January 1962 plan (p. 42 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 unsuitable - 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. The solution was a perfect compromise (image 3 above). One set of five wide steps was to lead from the Garden to the West Wing Terrace. The second step however was wider than the others, enough for President Kennedy to use as a platform. Above this wider step, three further steps led up to the Terrace. First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy later wrote 'He had asked Bunny to make [the steps] so that they




John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum

President Kennedy speaks during the ceremony bestowing honorary citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill, represented by his son Randolph Churchill in 1963

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 numerous 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 Mrs. Mellon. In photographs from the event, the President is standing on the platform step exactly as he has envisioned.



A letter from President Kennedy to Bunny Mellon sent shortly after the Rose Garden's completion.

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 intimacy of the Rose Garden was to him (see image on p. 103).

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 sheet. 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.'

HISTORIC TIMELINE

1600

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.

1700



1607-1609


First European explorers arrive in the area, including John Smith in 1607-1609, who sailed up and mapped the Chesapeake Bay (above).

*White House Grounds Stewards
and Designers*


*United States
Presidents*

Foundation of the United States of America
1776

*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



1800
President John Adams and his family move in to the newly finished Residence, designed by James Hoban (above). Construction of the President’s House had started in 1792.

White House Grounds Stewards and Designers


United States Presidents



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 sunken 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.



HISTORIC TIMELINE

The White House and its Grounds




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



1837
Many changes to the south side of the Executive Residence are made during Andrew Jackson's presidency. The south lawn was thoroughly graded and footpaths installed. The Latrobe/Jefferson road is leveled and the Jefferson ha-ha wall remains in place.

1850




1851
Andrew Jackson Downing produces a masterplan for the center of Washington, D.C., including the National Mall, the United States Capitol and the White House Grounds. One clear design intent is the strong visual sight line he envisaged from the White House southwards towards Tiber Creek and the Washington Monument, construction of which had just started.




1865
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



United States
Presidents



The Rose Garden

1814
An 1815 watercolor by George Heriot (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 the precedent for treating the grounds of the White House as a kind of arboretum of American trees and plants. The 1826 watercolor of the President's House and its grounds from the southwest by Anthony St. John Baker (below) shows Adams' fenced-in tree nursery at the bottom left.



1846
The earliest known daguerreotype of the White House is taken by John Plumbe (below). No evidence of the Jackson Magnolia grandifolia trees are visible.

Planting to the southwest of the Residence consists of a variety of evergreen and deciduous trees and bushes, with trellises placed at intervals for climbing vines.



1857
The first greenhouse and conservatory (built in the late 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



1902
Chales Follen McKim of McKim, Mead & White is called in by President Roosevelt to renovate and update the White House and Grounds, with help from Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. As part of his plans, McKim removes all the greenhouses and in their place designs two formal gardens for each side of the South Portico (above).The East and West Terraces are restored, and the first version of the West Wing is built, though the gardens are not constructed as he envisaged.




1929
First Lady Lou Hoover installs a small bluestone patio underneath the Jackson Magnolias.



1858


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



1877


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) creates a Colonial Garden on either side of the South Portico after all the greenhouses and conservatories are knocked down and removed (below). The parterres were laid out as two large four-petaled flowers and contained roses in the central circles. Vegetation is composed of evergreen shrubs along with an assortment of ornamental and native flowers.



1913


First Lady Ellen Wilson (first wife of President Woodrow Wilson) asks George Burnap to help her create what becomes 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



National Park Service / Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site

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

The Report lays out a masterplan design (left) 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.



National Archives and Records Administration



National Archives and Records Administration

1949-1952
President Harry Truman starts an extensive restoration project for the original Residence, after a 1948 report concludes the building has become unstable. Consequently the grounds become a building site for duration of the work (see also below left).



White House Historical Association

1965
Bunny Mellon finishes the East Garden, which is dedicated to First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy. The Kennedys asked her to design the East Garden after the success of the Rose Garden, but it was delayed after President Kennedy's assassination. First Lady Lady Bird Johnson organized for it to be finished.

National Park Service, Grounds Jurisdiction
1933-present

Rachel ("Bunny") Mellon, Landscape Designer
1961-1981

Dale Haney, Grounds Superintendent
1972-present (Superintendent from 2008)

Franklin D. Roosevelt
1933-1945

Harry S. Truman
1945-1953

Dwight D. Eisenhower
1953-1961

John F. Kennedy
1961-1963

Lyndon B. Johnson
1963-1969


Richard Nixon
1969-1974

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

The Garden is reinstalled in 1952 with its previous layout, but on a simpler plan with fewer plant varieties (below); roses and azaleas predominate.




Harry S. Truman Presidential Library & Museum



National Archives and Records Administration

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


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




National Archives and Records Administration

1962
President John F. Kennedy wants to redesign the Rose Garden for official functions and events. He asks a family friend, Rachel ("Bunny") Lambert Mellon 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.



Oak Spring Garden Foundation



Oak Spring Garden Foundation



Oak Spring Garden Foundation



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 Gerald 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 Evren of Turkey. The Rose Garden allows for greater flexibility in numbers of people the President can invite to events.



1999
Said 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, the first time the Garden has been used for a wedding. There have been a further two weddings held in the Garden.



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
President George H. W. Bush signs the Civil Rights Commission Reauthorization Act in the Rose Garden.



2001
Along with lighthearted events, the Rose Garden has often been the scene for more somber 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.



CHAPTER THREE: INVENTORY

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Textual and pictorial records for the White House Grounds are plentiful. They provide evidence of how the Rose Garden appeared physically in the past and how it was used by previous 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. The 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 inspections.

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, a site survey of existing conditions was provided on August 28, 2019 by the Office of the Chief Usher of the White House. Existing features and characteristics are documented on this survey, including topography, drain locations, electrical power points, tree and vegetation location and hardscape details. This information provides a platform for further in-depth documentation of topography, slope analysis, planting plans, hydrology, irrigation, sun/shade exposure, spatial relationships and circulation. All of these factors will inform future design decisions and treatment recommendations.

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.

Current existing conditions derived from the survey titled 'Site Plan' received August 28, 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 illustrate 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 *Magnolia grandiflora* trees (Southern Magnolias) provide shade year round and will require shade tolerant species grown underneath them.




SUMMER
JUNE 21; 9:00 AM



SUMMER
JUNE 21; 3:00 PM



WINTER
DECEMBER 21; 9:00 AM







WINTER
DECEMBER 21; 3:00 PM

CIRCULATION - WHITE HOUSE GROUNDS

Circulation was observed on site and information was passed on by White House Gardens and Grounds Staff.

KEY

-  Vehicular Circulation
-  HMAX Helicopter Landing Pad
-  Rose Garden




CIRCULATION - ROSE GARDEN

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



Official White House Photo

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




PBS News Hour

B Presidents often encounter the media on the South Drive as they prepare 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 as Appendix G on p. 211.




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 by Lynch & Associates is included as Appendix H on p. 212.

KEY

-  Sprinkler 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 was installed in 2006 during George W. Bush's Presidency. See Appendix I on p. 213 for the full report.

KEY


- | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|---------------|
|  | Outlets |  | Up Lighting |
|  | Flood Lights |  | Down Lighting |
|  | Electrical Boxes | | |



 Electrical Boxes



 Flood Lights




 Up 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.



A WEST
TERRACE
STEPS

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

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




B 2 FEET X 3 FEET
BLUESTONE
BISECT PAVING

UNKNOWN
Between 1965 - 1974
(based on NPS
archive plans)



C TENNESSEE CRAB
ORCHARD SANDSTONE

1933-45 (ROOSEVELT)
Ramped upward to
Oval Office



D STEEL EDGING

1962 (KENNEDY)
Steel edging original to
Bunny Mellon design



E PENNSYLVANIA
BLUESTONE
RANDOM
RECTANGULAR
PAVING

1962 (KENNEDY)
Terrace original to
Bunny Mellon design

1989 (G.H.W. BUSH)
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



F STONE PAVERS

1962 (KENNEDY)
Stone pavers original to
design



G HOOVER
PATIO

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

2018 (TRUMP)
Relaid keeping original
stone



H SANDSTONE
SOUTH
PORTICO
TERRACE

1992 (CLINTON) Exterior
restoration

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



I ASPHALT DRIVE

1987 (REAGAN)
Resurfaced

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

2002 (G.W.BUSH)
Repaved asphalt road
surfaces, installed 80
locking stanchions for
safety




J OVAL OFFICE
SIDEWALK


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

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, aided with the expertise of John Danzer, a historical outdoor furniture specialist. Past site furnishings could also be remade. Below is a brief inventory of the main furnishing components within the Rose Garden at present.



A OVAL OFFICE TABLE AND CHAIRS
Designed by Brown Jordan
(current - not always in situ)



B CAST IRON BENCH WITH FLORAL DESIGN
(current)



C CAST IRON BENCH WITH FLORAL DESIGN
(current)



D CAST IRON BENCH WITH FLORAL DESIGN
(current)



Historic - 1914



Historic - 1979



Historic - 1980

E EASTERN TERRACE SEATING



Current - 2017
Designed by Meadowcraft
(originally used as outdoor pool furniture)



Historic - 1929


F HOOVER PATIO SEATING



Current - 2019

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 reinstigated the practice in the late 1870s. The Rose Garden and surrounding area 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.



Cehrine, van Sweden and Associates

A TIME CAPSULE

1992 (BUSH)



Cehrine, van Sweden and Associates

B KENNEDY MAGNOLIA
Magnolia x soulangeana

1962 (KENNEDY)

Southeast tree



Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

1962 (KENNEDY)

Southwest tree



Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

1962 (KENNEDY)

Northwest tree

B KENNEDY MAGNOLIAS
Magnolia x soulangeana

B KENNEDY MAGNOLIAS
Magnolia x soulangeana



White House Historical Association

1962 (KENNEDY)

Northeast tree



Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

1962 (KENNEDY)

B KENNEDY MAGNOLIA
Magnolia x soulangeana

B KENNEDY PLAQUE



White House Historical Association

C. 1829-1837
(JACKSON)




Associated Press

C. 1829-1837
(JACKSON)

C JACKSON MAGNOLIAS
Magnolia grandiflora

C JACKSON PLAQUE



White House Historical Association

1964 (JOHNSON)



Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

1964 (JOHNSON)

D JOHNSON WILLOW OAK
Quercus phellos

D JOHNSON PLAQUE


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 then 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 began 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 the changing tastes and preferences for particular types of roses.

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. 198.




15 Boring sampling by James Urban on site.



1 Penetrometer Reading by James Urban on site.

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. The 2017 Report on the Jackson Magnolia tree is included as Appendix J on p. 216.



KEY

- # YEAR COMMON NAME (PRESIDENT)
Botanical Name
 YEAR REMOVED OR REPLACED COMMON NAME (PRESIDENT)
Botanical Name



1



3



5

- 1 1829-37? SOUTHERN MAGNOLIA (JACKSON)
Magnolia grandiflora
- 2 1829-37? SOUTHERN MAGNOLIA (JACKSON)
Magnolia grandiflora
- 3 1935 SOUTHERN MAGNOLIA (FDR)
Magnolia grandiflora
- 4 1957 SOUTHERN MAGNOLIA (EISENHOWER)
Magnolia grandiflora
- 5 1962 WASHINGTON HAWTHORN (JFK)
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'
- 6 1962 JAPANESE FLOWERING CRABAPPLE (JFK)
Malus floribunda
- 7 1962 SAUCER MAGNOLIA (JFK)
Magnolia x soulangeana
- 8 1962 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (JFK)
Malus 'Katherine'
2003 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (G.W.BUSH)
Malus 'Katherine'
2019 SPRING SNOW CRABAPPLE (TRUMP)
Malus 'Spring Snow'
- 9 1962 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (JFK)
Malus 'Katherine'
2003 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (G.W.BUSH)
Malus 'Katherine'
2010 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (OBAMA)
Malus 'Katherine'
2019 SPRING SNOW CRABAPPLE (TRUMP)
Malus 'Spring Snow'
- 10 1962 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (JFK)
Malus 'Katherine'
2003 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (G.W.BUSH)
Malus 'Katherine'
2016 KATHERINE CRABAPPLE (OBAMA)
Malus 'Katherine'
2019 SPRING SNOW CRABAPPLE (TRUMP)
Malus 'Spring Snow'
- 11 1964 WILLOW OAK (LBJ)
Quercus phellos



Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

5




Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

8


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.



KEY


- #** YEAR (PRESIDENT) COMMON NAME
Botanical Name
YEAR REMOVED OR REPLACED COMMON NAME
Botanical Name



8



9



10

Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

- 1 1953 (EISENHOWER) CHINESE WISTERIA
Wisteria sinensis
2018 (TRUMP) REMOVED
- 2 1978 (CARTER) SIEBOLD CAMELLIA
Camellia japonica 'Tricolor Sieboldii'
- 3 1962 (JFK) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
1991 HOLLY OSMANTHUS (CLINTON)
Osmanthus heterophyllus
- 4 1962 (JFK) ENGLISH HOLLY
Ilex aquifolium
- 5 1962 (JFK) 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 (JFK) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
1995 (CLINTON) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
- 8 1962 (JFK) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
- 9 1962 (JFK) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
2014 (CLINTON) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
2017? (OBAMA) YEW
- 10 1962 (JFK) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens 'Suffruticosa'
2000 (G.W.BUSH) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens 'Suffruticosa'
- 11 1962 (JFK) 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
- 15 1962 (JFK) GREEN PILLOW BOXWOOD
Buxus microphylla 'Green Pillow'
1981 (REAGAN) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens 'Suffruticosa'
2000 (G.W.BUSH) JUSTIN BROUWERS BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens 'Justin Brouwers'
- 16 1962 (JFK) GREEN PILLOW BOXWOOD
Buxus microphylla 'Green Pillow'
2002 (G.W.BUSH) JUSTIN BROUWERS BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens 'Justin Brouwers'
2010 (OBAMA) JUSTIN BROUWERS BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens 'Justin Brouwers'
- 17 1962 (JFK) KOREANSPICE VIBURNUM
Viburnum carlesii
- 18 1962 (JFK) GREEN PILLOW BOXWOOD
Buxus microphylla 'Green Pillow'
2004 (G.W.BUSH) KINGSVILLE BOXWOOD
Buxus microphylla 'Kingsville Dwarf'
- 19 1962 (JFK) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens 'Suffruticosa'
2004 (G.W.BUSH) TRUE DWARF BOXWOOD
Buxus sempervirens 'Suffruticosa'
- 20 1962 (JFK) KOREANSPICE VIBURNUM
Viburnum carlesii
2009 (OBAMA) REMOVED
- 21 1945 (FDR) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
1994 (CLINTON) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
- 22 1982 (REAGAN) HOLLY OSMANTHUS
Osmanthus heterophyllus
- 23 1962 (JFK) EAST PALATKA HOLLY
Ilex x attenuata 'East Palatka'
1981 (REAGAN) REMOVED
- 24 1962 (JFK) FRUITLAND ELAEAGNUS
Elaeagnus pungens 'Fruitlandii'

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).



American Rose Society
President Ronald Reagan signing Proclamation 5574, November 20, 1986

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 noted, 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).



Harvard University Portrait Collection. Gift of the Harvard College Class of 1880

Portrait of Theodore Roosevelt (detail), by Joseph Rodefer DeCamp, 1908

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.

A decade later, 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 for roses. The following list (listing associated president, cultivar, and brief description) illustrates how color, rose type, and origins have changed and evolved over the years roses have been grown at the White House.



Official White House Photo by Joyce N. Boghosian

The Rose Garden, May 2019



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)
1952 (TRUMAN)

***Rosa* 'Kaiserin Auguste Viktoria'**

Bred in Germany, 1891
White hybrid tea rose. Grows 4ft -7ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1907 (ROOSEVELT)

***Rosa* 'Killarney'**

Bred in UK, 1898

Light pink hybrid tea. Grows 4ft.-5ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1907 (ROOSEVELT)
1922 (HARDING)

***Rosa* 'Duchess de Brabant'**

Bred in France, 1857

Pink tea rose. Grows 3ft.-8 ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1922 (HARDING)

***Rosa* 'Lady Hillington'**

Bred in UK, 1910

Apricot tea rose. Grows 3ft.-6ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1922 (HARDING)

***Rosa* 'Antoine Rivoire'**

Bred in France, 1895

Light pink hybrid tea rose. Grows up to 3ft. 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.



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* 'Ophelia'**

Bred in France, before 1912

Pale pink hybrid tea rose. Grows 2ft.-4ft. 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.



1932 (HOOVER)

Rosa 'My Maryland'

Bred in USA, 1908

Salmon pink hybrid tea rose. Blooms in flushes throughout the season. No longer available.



1933 (ROOSEVELT)

Rosa 'Mrs. F.D. Roosevelt'

Bred in USA, 1933

Golden yellow hybrid tea. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1935 (ROOSEVELT)

Rosa 'Texas Centennial'

Bred in USA, 1935

Pink red hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-4ft. 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.



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 'Mrs. P.S. DuPont'

Bred in France, 1929

Yellow hybrid tea. Grows 2ft.-3ft. 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 'Etoile de Hollande'

Bred in Holland, 1919.

Crimson hybrid tea rose. Grows 2ft.-3ft. 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 'Diamond Jubilee'

Bred in USA, 1947

Light yellow hybrid tea rose. Grows 3ft.-4ft. 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 'Independence'

Bred in Germany, 1951

Orange red floribunda. 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)

Rosa 'Improved Lafayette'

Bred in USA, 1935

Dark red floribunda. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1952 (TRUMAN)

Rosa 'Mrs. R.M. Finch'

Bred in Australia, 1923

Rose pink polyantha. Grows 2ft.-3ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1952 (TRUMAN)

Rosa 'Vogue'

Bred in USA, 1951

Coral red floribunda. Grows 3ft.-4ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1952 (TRUMAN)

Rosa 'Fashion'

Bred in USA, 1947

Coral pink floribunda. Grows 2ft.-3ft. Blooms in flushes throughout the season.



1952 (TRUMAN)

Rosa 'Red Pinocchio'

Bred in USA, 1947

Dark red floribunda. Grows 3ft.-4ft. 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.



1961 (EISENHOWER)

Rosa 'Helen Traubel'

Bred in USA, before 1951

Bright pink species. Grows 3ft.-4ft. 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.



1962 (KENNEDY)

Rosa 'Speaker Sam'

Bred in USA, 1962

Yellow with red hybrid tea rose. Blooms in flushes throughout the season. No longer available.



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 '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 'Nevada'
Bred in Spain, 1927
White/pink shrub rose.
Grows 7ft.-13ft. Prolific,
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.



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 'White Bouquet'

Bred in USA, 1956

White floribunda. 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.



1979 (CARTER)
1984, 1988 (REAGAN)
1992 (G.H.W. BUSH)
1996, 2000 (CLINTON)
2004, 2008 (G.W. BUSH)
2012, 2016 (OBAMA)

Rosa 'Pat Nixon'
Bred in France, 1972
Dark red floribunda.
Blooms in flushes
throughout the season.



1984, 1988 (REAGAN)
1992 (G.H.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'Sea Foam'

Bred in USA, before 1963
Creamy white climber.
Grows 6ft.-10ft. Blooms
in flushes throughout the
season.



1984, 1988 (REAGAN)
2008 (G.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'Nancy Reagan'

Bred in USA, 1967

Pale orange-red hybrid
tea rose. Blooms in
flushes throughout the
season.



1984, 1988 (REAGAN)
1992 (G.H.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'White Lightnin''

Bred in USA, before 1979

White grandiflora. Blooms
in flushes throughout the
season.



1962 (KENNEDY)?
1992 (G.H.W. BUSH)
1996, 2000 (CLINTON)
2004, 2008 (G.W. BUSH)
2012, 2016 (OBAMA)

Rosa 'Iceberg'
Bred in Germany, 1958
White floribunda. Grows
3ft.-5ft. Prolific blooms
in flushes throughout the
season.



2004, 2008 (G.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'Erfurt'

Bred in Germany, 1939

Pink/white hybrid musk.
Grows 3ft.-8ft. Blooms in
flushes throughout the
season.



2004, 2008 (G.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'Francesca'

Bred in UK, 1928

Apricot hybrid musk.
Grows 3ft.-4ft. Blooms in
flushes throughout the
season.



2004, 2008 (G.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'Danaë'

Bred in UK, 1913

Light yellow/white hybrid
musk. Grows 5ft.-
6ft. Continuous bloom
throughout the season.



2008 (G.W. BUSH)
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 (G.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'Ronald Reagan'

Bred in USA, 2002

Red hybrid tea rose. Grows
3ft -4ft. Continual blooms
throughout the season.



2008 (G.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'Laura Bush'

Bred in USA, 2007

Orange-coral red
floribunda. Grows 2ft.-
3ft. Blooms in flushes
throughout the season.



2008 (G.W. BUSH)

Rosa 'Barbara Bush'

Bred in USA, before 1990

Salmon-pink/cream hybrid
tea rose. Grows 3ft.-
4ft. Blooms in flushes
throughout the season.



2008 (G.W. BUSH)
2012, 2016 (OBAMA)

Rosa 'Opening Night'

Bred in USA, before 1997

Dark red hybrid tea rose.
Grows 4ft.-6ft. 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.

SOURCES

PRESIDENT	SOURCE
Cleveland	The Washington Post, November 5, 1899
McKinley	[Bingham] <i>Annual Report Upon the Improvement and Care of Public Buildings and Grounds</i> , p. 5246
Roosevelt	The Washington Post, May 12, 1907, p. SM5
Wilson	Redmond, <i>The White House Garden</i> , 1947
Harding	The Washington Post, May 9, 1922, p. 2
Hoover	Gamble, <i>American Rose Annual</i> , 1953
Roosevelt	Gamble, <i>American Rose Annual</i> , 1953
Truman	National Park Service Planting Plan (figure 20), 1952 Gamble, <i>American Rose Annual</i> , 1953 The Washington Post, March 23, 1962
Kennedy	Bunny Mellon Planting Plan, March 17, 1962 Kramer, <i>The White House Gardens</i> , 1973
Johnson	Kramer, <i>The White House Gardens</i> , 1973
Nixon	Kramer, <i>The White House Gardens</i> , 1973
Carter	NPS, <i>White House Grounds and Gardens</i> , 1979
Reagan	NPS, <i>White House Grounds and Gardens</i> , 1984, 1988
G.H.W. Bush	NPS, <i>White House Grounds and Gardens</i> , 1992
Clinton	NPS, <i>White House Grounds and Gardens</i> , 1996, 2000
G.W. Bush	NPS, <i>White House Grounds and Gardens</i> , 2004, 2008
Obama	NPS, <i>White House Grounds and Gardens</i> , 2012, 2016

For full titles, see bibliography.

Images of roses and accompanying text are from www.helpmefind.com/roses (accessed online) and Beales, *Classic Roses*, 1985



Scottish double rose decoration above the window of the North Door of the White House.

‘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 floribunda* 'White Bouquet' (1979)
- TEA ROSE *Rosa* 'Nancy Reagan' (1984, 1988, 2008)
- ROSE *Rosa floribunda* 'Pat Nixon' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
- ROSE *Rosa grandiflora* 'White Lightning' (1984, 1988, 1992)
- SHRUB ROSE *Rosa* 'Sea Foam' (1984, 1988, 1992)
- ROSE *Rosa* 'Rosalynn Carter' (1979)
- ROSE *Rosa floribunda* 'Iceburg' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
- ROSE *Rosa* 'John F. Kennedy' (1992, 1996, 2000)
- ANTIQUE ROSES *Rosa* 'Erfurt', 'Francesca', 'Danaë' (2008)
- ROSE *Rosa* 'Barbara Bush' (2008)
- ROSE *Rosa* 'Ronald Reagan' (2008)
- ROSE *Rosa* 'Pope John Paul II' (2008, 2012, 2016)
- ROSE *Rosa* 'Laura Bush' (2008)
- ROSE *Rosa* 'Opening Night' (2008, 2012, 2016)
- ROSE *Rosa* 'Love's Promise' (2012, 2016)

PERENNIALS

CATNIP *Nepeta cataria* (1979)
CATNIP *Nepeta mussinii* (1984, 1988)
CATNIP *Nepeta mussinii* 'Blue Wonder' (1992)
PLAINTAIN LILY *Hosta sieboldiana* 'Elegans' (1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008)
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)
DUSTY MILLER *Senecio viravira* (1992, 1996, 2000, 2008, 2012, 2016)
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* 'Accord Yellow w/Red Blotch' (1996, 2000)
PANSY *Viola x wittrockiana* 'Accord Clear White' (1996, 2000)
PANSY *Viola x wittrockiana* 'Crown Clear White' (2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
PANSY *Viola x wittrockiana* 'Universal White' (1992)
PANSY *Viola x wittrockiana* 'Crown Yellow' (2008, 2012, 2016)
HUNTINGTON ARTEMISIA *Artemisia* 'Huntington' (1996, 2000, 2008, 2012, 2016)


SEASONAL PLANTINGS

SUMMER

AGERATUM *Ageratum* 'North Sea' (1979)
BLUE SALVIA *Salvia farancea* '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* 'Sincerlty' (1979-2016)
GARDEN GERANIUM *Pelargonium x hortorum* 'Wendy Anne' (1992, 1996)
GARDEN GERANIUM *Pelargonium x hortorum* 'Patriot Salmon' (1992-2016)
MARIGOLD *Tagetes* 'Lemon Drop' (1979)
MARIGOLD *Tagetes* 'First Lady' (1979)
FANCY-LEAVED CALADIUM *Caladium x hortulanum* 'Candidum' (1984-2016)
FANCY-LEAVED CALADIUM *Caladium x hortulanum* 'Frieda Hemple' (1984, 1988)
FANCY-LEAVED CALADIUM *Caladium x hortulanum* (1979)
IMPATIENS *Impatiens walleriana* 'Elfin White' (1979)
IMPATIENS *Impatiens walleriana* 'Super Elfin White' (1984, 1988)
IMPATIENS *Impatiens walleriana* 'Accent White' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2008, 2012, 2016)
IMPATIENS *Impatiens walleriana* 'Futura Salmon' (1979)
HELIOTROPE *Heliotropium arborescens* (1979, 1984, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
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 semperflorens* 'Viva' (1979)
WAX BEGONIA *Begonia x semperflorens-cultorum* 'Pizzazz White' (1992)
WAX BEGONIA *Begonia x semperflorens-cultorum* 'Ambassador White' (1996)
WAX BEGONIA *Begonia x semperflorens-cultorum* 'Party White' (2000, 2004)
RICHMONDENSIS BEGONIA *Begonia* 'Richmondensis' (1992, 1996, 2000)
PETUNIA *Petunia x hybrida* 'Mercury' (1988)
FLOSS FLOWER *Ageratum Houstonianum* 'Blue Blazer' (1996, 2000, 2004, 2008)

FOXGLOVE *Digitalis purpurea* 'Alba' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
DELPHINIUM *Delphinium x elatum* 'Blue Bird' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
DELPHINIUM *Delphinium x elatum* 'Galahad' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
HOLLYHOCK *Alcea rosea* (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
GARDEN LILY *Lilium hybrida* 'Casa Blanca' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
ZINNIA *Zinnia* 'Benary's Giant Mix' (2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
SPIDER FLOWER *Cleome* 'Helen Campbell' (2004, 2008, 2012, 2106)

BORDER DETAILS (CONTINUED)



SPRING

GRAPE HYACINTH *Muscari botryoides* (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008)
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)
BLUSHING BEAUTY TULIP *Tulipa* 'Blushing Beauty' (2008, 2012, 2016)
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* 'President Kennedy' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004)
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)
GREIGII TULIP *Tulipa greigii* 'Oriental Splendor' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 2000)
LILY-FLOWERED TULIP *Tulipa* 'Queen of Sheba' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 2008, 2012, 2016)
LILY-FLOWERED TULIP *Tulipa* 'White Triumphator' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992)
LILY-FLOWERED TULIP *Tulipa* 'Elegant Lady' (1979)
LILY-FLOWERED TULIP *Tulipa* 'Aladdin' (2008, 2012, 2016)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Bond Street' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Ivory Glory' (1979-2016)

SPRING (CONTINUED)


COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Mrs J.T. Scheepers' (1984-2016)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Maureen' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Sunkist' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'American Flag' (1992)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Mt. Everest' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Halcro' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Smiling Queen' (1992, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Temple of Beauty' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
DARWIN TULIP *Tulipa* 'Aristocrat' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
DARWIN TULIP *Tulipa* 'Eclipse' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2004, 2012, 2016)
DARWIN TULIP *Tulipa* 'Florence Nightingale' (1979, 1984, 1988)
DARWIN TULIP *Tulipa* 'Flying Dutchman' (1979-2016)
DARWIN TULIP *Tulipa* 'Glacier' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 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* 'Sweet Harmony' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
DARWIN TULIP *Tulipa* 'White Jewel' (1984-2016)
DARWIN TULIP *Tulipa* 'Zwanenburg' (1979-2016)
PARROT TULIP *Tulipa* 'Black Parrot' (1979-2016)
PARROT TULIP *Tulipa* 'Blue Parrot' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
PARROT TULIP *Tulipa* 'Red Parrot' (1979)
PARROT TULIP *Tulipa* 'Fantasy' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
PARROT TULIP *Tulipa* 'Orange Favorite' (1979-2016)
LADY'S MANTLE *Alchemilla speciosa* (1979)
TRIUMPH TULIP *Tulipa* 'Yellow Flight' (2008, 2012, 2016)

FALL

DUSTY MILLER *Centaurea cineraria* (1979)
BLUE SALVIA *Salvia farancea* 'Blue Bedder' (1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008)
PITCHER'S SAGE *Salvia pitcheri* (1979)
LATE GIANT SALVIA *Salvia guaranitica* 'Late Giant' (1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
LADY'S MANTLE *Alchemilla speciosa* (1979, 1984, 1988)
TALL BUTTON MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Broze Dot' (1984, 1988, 1992)
GIANT HARVEST MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Indian Summer' (1984, 1988, 1992)
TUBULAR PEDDLE MUM *Chrysanthemum grandiflorum* 'Joanette' (1984-2016)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Penguin' (1984, 1988)
GARDEN MUM *Dendranthema x grandiflorum* 'Autumn Fire' (1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
GIANT HARVEST MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Pumpkin' (1979-2016)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Rollcall' (1979, 1984, 1988)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Tolina' (1992, 1996, 2000)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Ironsides' (1979)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Golden Promise' (1979)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Freedom' (1979)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Zonta' (1979)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Triumph' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Hot Salsa' (2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Buckeye' (1992, 1996)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Sandy' (1992, 1996, 2000)
DECORATIVE MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Spicy Cheryl' (2008, 2012, 2016)
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 GranD.C.hild' (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* 'Stadium Queen' (1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
GARDEN MUM *Dendranthema x grandiflorum* 'Alexis' (2004)
GARDEN MUM *Dendranthema x grandiflorum* 'Grace' (2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)

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)

PLANTAIN LILY *Hosta sieboldiana* 'Elegans' (1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)

ROSE *Rosa* 'Peace' (1979)

EPIMEDIUM *Epimedium grandiflorum* 'Album' (1992, 1996, 2000)

PLANTAIN LILY *Hosta ventricosa* 'Aureo-maculata' (1992, 1996, 2000)

LIRIOPE *Liriope spicata* 'Big Blue' (2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)

TOPIARY ROSE *Rosa hybrida* (2004)

CRIMSON BOUQUET ROSE *Rosa grandiflora* 'Crimson Bouquet' (2008, 2012)

SEASONAL PLANTINGS

SPRING

GRAPE HYACINTH *Muscari botryoides* (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000)
FLOWERING ONION *Allium giganteum* (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000)
ORNAMENTAL ONION *Allium* 'Purple Sensation' (2016)
CROWN IMPERIAL *Fritillaria imperialis* 'Rubra' (1979-2016)
KAUFMANNIANA TULIP *Tulipa kaufmanniana* 'Shakespeare' (1984-2016)
FOSTERIANA TULIP *Tulipa fosteriana* 'Red Emperor' (1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP *Tulipa* 'Golden Oxford' (1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP *Tulipa* 'Oxford' (1979-2012)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP *Tulipa* 'Ivory Floradale' (1992, 1996, 2000, 2008, 2012, 2016)
DARWIN HYBRID TULIP *Tulipa* 'Golden Parade' (1979)
BLUSHING BEAUTY TULIP *Tulipa* 'Blushing Beauty' (2008, 2012, 2016)
COTTAGE TULIP *Tulipa* 'Bond Street' (1979, 1984, 1988)
DARWIN TULIP *Tulipa* 'White Jewel' (1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000)
GREIGII TULIP *Tulipa greigii* 'Red Riding Hood' (1984-2016)
LILY-FLOWERED TULIP *Tulipa* 'White Triumphator' (1979, 1992, 1996, 2000)
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* 'Crown White' (2008, 2012, 2016)
PANSY *Viola x wittrockiana* 'White Blue' (2004)
PANSY *Viola x wittrockiana* 'Universal White' (1992)
PANSY *Viola x wittrockiana* 'Accord Clear White' (1996, 2000)

SUMMER

GARDEN GERANIUMS *Pelargonium x hortorum* 'Sincerity' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1996, 2000)
IMPATIENS *Impatiens walleriana* (mixed red and white) (1984, 1988)
IMPATIENS *Impatiens walleriana* 'Accent White' (1996, 2000)
IMPATIENS *Impatiens walleriana* 'Accent Red' (1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2016)
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)
SCARLET SAGE *Salvia splendens* 'Flare' (2004)
NEW GUINEA IMPATIENS *Impatiens x* 'New Guinea' (1996, 2000, 2004)
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

TALL BUTTON MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Bronze Dot' (1984, 1988, 1992)
HARVEST GIANT MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Indian Summer' (1984, 1988, 1992)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Pumpkin' (1979, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Freedom' (1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Zonta' (1979, 1992, 1996)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Sandy' (1979, 1992, 1996, 2000)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Sunny Denise' (2000)
CUSHION MUM *Chrysanthemum x morifolium* 'Viking' (2000)
GARDEN MUM *Chrysanthemum* 'Minnautumn' (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* 'Stadium Queen' (1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016)
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

The following table summarizes the existing features that define the spatial character of the Rose Garden landscape, as viewed in relation to President's Park and beyond.

<i>Characteristics/Features</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Condition</i>	<i>Description</i>
Spatial Organization			
Garden and building placement	Contributing 1805, 1903, 1962	Good	The historic spacial organization is reinforced by the White House, West Terrace, and West Wing
Land Use			
Presidential/official functions and private residential garden	Contributing	Good	The Garden has been a private refuge since 1903, and a more public garden since 1962
Topography - Page 54			
Relatively flat area with open views out	Contributing	Good	The Garden retains its historic character of a relatively flat area.
Circulation - Pages 58-59;64-65			
Bluestone Paving	Contributing 2004?	Fair	Paths function but lawn areas at entrances wear out quickly and get muddy
Tennessee Crab Orchard Sandstone Paving	Contributing 1933-45	Poor	Stone is failing and shows signs of water damage and a potential tripping hazard
Colonnade Paving	Contributing c. 1805	Fair	Paving is showing signs of water damage and pavers edging the garden side have been poorly installed or maintained.
West Terrace Steps	Contributing 1962	Good	Steps replaced in-kind in 2006
Stone Paver Meandering Path	Non-Contributing 1962	Fair	Path no longer makes sense with the additon of the 1989 Bluestone path
Asphalt	Non-Contributing 2002	Good	South Drive has been repaved frequently

<i>Characteristics/Features</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Condition</i>	<i>Description/Comment</i>
Hardscape Elements - Page 64-65			
Steel Edging	Non-Contributing 1962	Fair	Functional but may be damming drainage along the beds
Pennsylvania Bluestone	Contributing 2004	Fair	Uneven and spalling stone
Flagstone Patio (Hoover)	Contributing 1929	Fair	Provides a shaded wooded area to sit, shape of terrace is lack luster
Sandstone at South Portico	Contributing 2002	Good	
Planting Beds	Contributing 1962	Fair	Mixed planting make this area a challenge to maintain
Eastern terrace for more intimate outdoor meetings	Contributing 2004	Fair	Original 1962 Terrace was removed in 1989 and again in 2004 as a dry laid terrace due to issues with drainage and cracking
Open Lawn for large functions	Contributing 1962	Fair	Issues with surface wetness and wear and tear due to heavy usage in concentrated areas
Views - Page 62			
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			
Site Furnishings - Page 66-67			
Oval Office White Metal Table and Chairs (2)	Non-contributing		
Black Floral design Cast Iron Bench (2)	Non-contributing		

Characteristics/Features	Status	Condition	Description
White Metal Arm Chair (4), Small White Metal Side Tables (2) and Mini Metal Tables (2)	Non-contributing		
White Metal U back Chairs (4) and White Metal Round Table	Non-contributing		
White Wooden Bench	Non-contributing		
White Floral design Cast Iron Bench	Non-contributing		
White Floral design Cast Iron Chairs (4) and White Cast Iron Table (1)	Non-contributing		
Commemorative Features - Pages 68-69			
Time Capsule	Non-Contributing 1992	Good	Commemorates the 200th anniversary of the White House cornerstone ceremony
<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> -#1 (Southern Magnolia)	Contributing 1829-37?	Good	Providing shade for the terrace
<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> -#2 (Southern Magnolia)	Contributing 1829-37?	Poor	Tree in decay, only important as a historic relic at the end of its day
<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> -#3 (Southern Magnolia)	Contributing 1935	Good	Providing shade and screening
<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> -#4 (Southern Magnolia)	Contributing 1857	Fair	Providing shade and some screening from drive
4 <i>Magnolia x soulangeana</i> (Saucer Magnolia)	Contributing 1962	(2) Good (2) Fair	Trees on to the west are doing better than those to the east of the garden
Vegetation - Pages 74-93			
4 <i>Malus</i> 'Spring Snow'	Contributing 2019	Good	Original 'Katherine' crabapples have been replaced twice, if not three times, most recently in 2019 with a new cultivar.
<i>Crataegus viridis</i> 'Winter King' (Hawthorne)	Contributing 2011	Good	Good tree but only one of its kind in the garden. Hawthornes were used in the original design

Characteristics/Features	Status	Condition	Description
<i>Malus floribunda</i> (Japanese Flowering Crabapple)	Contributing 1962	Good	Part of the original installation
<i>Osmanthus heterophyllus</i> (Holly Osmanthus)	Contributing 1962	Good	Original hedge remains along north edge of garden
<i>Buxus sempervirens</i> -various cultivars (Boxwood)	Contributing 1962	Poor	Part of the 1962 garden but many are overgrown or not in peak health
Roses - various cultivars	Contributing 1962 onwards	Fair	See pp. 78-86 for history of roses in the garden
All other vegetation	Non-contributing	Fair	Shrubs are generally in good condition. Annuals are replaced frequently

CHAPTER FOUR: SITE ANALYSIS

This chapter evaluates the historical significance and integrity of the Rose Garden, including an 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, archaeology, 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 of the landscape 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 as a defining character 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. The President commissioned a new garden in 1961 for the express purpose of holding ceremonial events and public press



President Harry Truman with Princess Elizabeth of Great Britain in the Rose Garden, November 1951. Note the confined space of the platform and unclear audience sight lines.

briefings in it. The new Rose Garden allowed for a larger central area that could accommodate more people against the backdrop of a visually attractive garden.

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. 33). 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 - which acted as 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. The



John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum


President Kennedy and Prime Minister Ahmed Ben Bella of Algeria walking in the Rose Garden, October 1962

advent of television in the second half of the century would have likely been a contributing factor for President Kennedy when reimagining what was once a private garden to become a visually attractive 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 as an extension of



A letter President Kennedy sent to Bunny Mellon shortly after the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962.

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 from 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



Ronald Reagan Presidential Library and Museum

President Ronald Reagan and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher running after Lucky in the Rose Garden, February 1985

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 Masterplan) - 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. 28).

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 tenure 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 defined boundary that discourages and limits subsequent changes to the landscape either side 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, D.C. 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. Mrs. 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, designed by leading landscape architects and designers of the day.

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 at the behest of presidents and first ladies.

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 change, as the changing needs and styles of presidents evolve.



John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum
President Kennedy and Bunny Mellon at Cape Cod, Massachusetts in 1961/1962.

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, the nomination 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 1960 nomination concentrates nearly exclusively on the White House building, many of the historical contributing factors it listed 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 several times over the twentieth century, consistently representing design trends and reflecting national appreciation for early American garden styles. Its most enduring 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 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 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, attention has been paid to replicating in-kind the materials originally used to uphold the original

design intent where possible. This allows for the spatial relationships, visual rhythms of the planting, and the overall framework of the 1962 garden to remain broadly 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, though there is a large mixture of materials used. However, materials have in general remained in the same location, including the steps, the Eastern Terrace, and the Hoover 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. This is all in keeping with the life of gardens, in which a design is retained while plant materials must be renewed.

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 or relaid since initial installation. 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 moderately maintained and suggests fair to medium integrity in workmanship.

FEELING

The landscape of the Rose Garden retains a strong feeling of historic integrity. The Garden experience has changed little since its installation in 1962, and has been maintained to a fair standard in the intervening years. The function and purpose, as well as aesthetic character, have remained consistent with the original intent, serving as both an official ceremonial space for the president, and as 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 the 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 defined and refined outdoor 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 recognizable 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.

CHAPTER FIVE: TREATMENT

This chapter addresses specific guidance and treatment recommendations for the Rose Garden. Treatment in this context refers to proposed work that will achieve a specific historic preservation goal. The historical narrative, review of existing conditions, and subsequent site analysis will provide the foundations for suggested treatments offered for consideration to the Committee for the Preservation of the White House (CPWH), as well as guiding future maintenance, management, and interpretation of the Rose Garden.

As long-term management and stewardship strategies are described, it is critical to carefully define the treatment considerations of the Garden, both as a whole and in its distinct parts. As with all historic gardens it is important to balance preservation of significant elements and design while allowing for changes both in the plant materials and use of the garden. In conjunction with these points, maintenance and sustainability are key factors when making any treatment recommendations. Other factors considered include legislature and management (such as NPS policy and guidelines), resources (such as historical significance and existing conditions) and operational factors (such as health and safety, other White House security concerns, and day-to-day maintenance requirements).

As stated in the Introduction, this Report is not an official CLR. While it follows NPS guidelines for treatment, it is not constrained by them. Time restrictions were a significant barrier to completing a full and in-depth treatment evaluation and served to limit the scope of recommendations. This chapter serves as a foundation to build a complete treatment and management plan in the future.

However, the tight time frame given to writing this Report has not hindered some important areas being identified that shape recommended proposals. Specific treatments are suggested for each of the distinct features of the Rose Garden as they define its unique historical character. These include spatial organization, topography, vegetation, circulation, and site furnishings/structures. Each area is evaluated against the Rose Garden's periods of significance and an appropriate level of treatment recommended.

The NPS divides levels of treatment into four distinct categories: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Each category encompasses differing levels of physical intervention to reach the desired

treatment outcome, with more intervention being required as treatment progresses from preservation to restoration. As these levels advance, greater documentation and justification is required for constructing permanent elements in the landscape.

Originally written to refer to the treatment of historic properties, these definitions can also be applied to the treatment and preservation of historic landscapes. The treatments can be summarily defined as follows:

Preservation

The act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of a historic property. Includes initial stabilization work, where necessary, as well as ongoing preservation maintenance and repair of historic materials and features.

Rehabilitation

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

Restoration

The act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by removing features from other periods in its history and reconstructing missing features from the restoration period.

Reconstruction

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

(Excerpted from *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, 1995. A fuller summary of the treatment guidelines is included as Appendix K on p. 218.)

In order to propose a strategy and plan for the Rose Garden based on the above, the site's primary treatment intent should be established. This determines a unifying direction for treatment considerations and

decisions. The periods of significance as defined in the previous chapter have demonstrated which time periods are most relevant to the landscape, and these periods provide a frame of reference for whether features within the garden should be preserved, rehabilitated, restored or reconstructed. As concluded, three periods of significance emerged in the evolution of the Rose Garden: 1801 to 1903 (development of the landscape), 1903 to 1962 (designers and first ladies), and 1962 until the present day (Kennedy and Mellon's design).


All three periods informed the Rose Garden's development, though particular emphasis is given to the last stage, President John F. Kennedy and Bunny Mellon's 1962 design. Many of the features from this era remain in the Rose Garden, and it is to this time period that recommendations concerning treatment (including removal) are evaluated against.

Consequently, the overall management philosophy for the Rose Garden is to manage landscape characteristics and features that evoke the character of the 1962 design with a rehabilitation treatment. This philosophy balances the integrity of the period of significance with the contemporary requirements and sustainable land management practices required by today's standards and allow for flexibility in future use. Rehabilitation is the only treatment which allows for contemporary use to dictate additions to, or alteration of, the landscape.

Before rehabilitation treatments are proposed, guidance will first focus on the features in the Rose Garden that have been identified as character-defining and essential to retain and preserve (see plan on following page). As demonstrated earlier in this Report, not all features within the Rose Garden hold the same level of significance and historical integrity. As such, some features within the Rose Garden have different treatment strategies recommended than the primary intent of rehabilitation.

Based on consultation with relevant parties, including those on the CPWH external sub-committee, and through evaluation of the information revealed in the site history and analysis of existing conditions, a number of features are designated as character-defining features and thus integral to the Garden's historic significance. The majority are from Mellon's 1962 design, and the remainder are from earlier points in the landscape's history. The Jackson Magnolia trees date to the nineteenth century, and have become

CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES



Legend:

- A** The Center Line from the West Wing to the Eastern Terrace
- B** Steps leading from the Rose Garden up to the West Wing
- C** Four *Magnolia x soulangeana* (Saucer Magnolia) trees - Kennedy
- D** Two *Magnolia grandiflora* (Southern Magnolia) trees - Jackson
- E** Eastern Terrace
- F** Main Lawn
- G** Hoover Patio
- H** Lyndon B. Johnson commemorative *Quercus phellos* (Willow Oak)

part of White House history and folklore. Despite the decreasing health of one of them (see Appendix J on p. 216), they remain integral to preserve in any future treatment proposals.

Surrounding the Jackson Magnolia trees is the patio installed by Lou Henry Hoover in 1929. Though not as immediately recognizable as other defining features in the landscape, its function and use as a private area away from the more public area of the Rose Garden remains important, and it is still regularly used.

An important defining feature that pre-dates 1962 is the center line that bisects the main area of the Rose Garden. This line was first introduced in the 1913 garden designed by First Lady Ellen Wilson and George Burnap, and was an axis that Bunny Mellon later retained. It occurs, with slight amendments (including when the West Wing was rebuilt in 1934), in all of the successive garden design changes under subsequent presidents, both realized and unbuilt. The line provides symmetry and formality, dividing the main portion of the Garden into north and south mirrors of one another, and culminates at the eastern end with a terrace and seating. The layout and appearance of the Eastern Terrace has changed at points during the twentieth century, but all changes have recognized the necessity of a visual termination of the center line axis in front of the Jackson Magnolias.

At the western end of the center line, steps installed in 1962 to President Kennedy's specifications lead up to West Wing. Their design and construction was of paramount importance to the President and the image he wanted to project to the watching world (see pp. 44). The steps have been replaced in the intervening years, but care has been paid to replace them in-kind and remain the focus of the west end of the Rose Garden.

Other defining features in the landscape include the commemorative trees dedicated to President Lyndon B. Johnson and President John F. Kennedy (see p. 68). The Kennedy Magnolias are original to the 1962 Mellon design, and were an integral feature of her design of the overall Rose Garden. The trees were subsequently given commemorative status after President Kennedy's death. The Johnson Willow Oak, a commemorative tree just south of the main Rose Garden, post-dates the 1962 Rose Garden design, being installed in 1964. As it forms part of the White House's long history of associating presidents with trees on the Grounds, and is in good health,

it can be considered to enhance the historic nature of the landscape and does nothing to detract from it.

PAST PRESERVATION PLANS

Previous chapters within this Report highlight the dynamic nature of landscape characteristics changing over time, and these changes are acknowledged as part of the Rose Garden's historical significance. Nevertheless, the Rose Garden today is the most recent tier in a layered landscape of earlier gardens and landscapes on the site, with earlier iterations well-documented in the historical record, especially from 1903 onwards. Still, few indications or features of the Rose Garden's past design and character exist today. Elements of past designs that have distinctive design features are illustrated on pp. 118-120. Whether introducing these visual links to the Rose Garden's past is a key treatment consideration in future recommendations.


The White House Grounds (and the larger President's Park) have been subject to previous master plans, treatments, and design guidelines during the twentieth century, starting with the Olmsted Report in October 1935. Revolutionary for its time, the report looked at the entirety of President's Park, with an aim to provide long-term planning and management that reduced the uncoordinated development of the Grounds up to this point. The report summarizes its goal in the opening paragraph:

'The White House Grounds, in spite of certain defects such as are discussed in this report, are characterized by many long-established landscape qualities of great dignity and appropriateness. It is of the utmost importance to perpetuate these qualities; and, in so far as they are affected by changes which are necessary or desirable for other reasons, to strengthen and perfect them instead of obscuring or weakening them' (1935, p. 1).

This statement remained the guiding influence for treatment of the grounds throughout the twentieth century, and still effectively remains true today. The Olmsted Report was written before standard treatment practices were implemented across the NPS for historic landscapes, but shares many similar preservation goals, and many of Olmsted's recommendations remain pertinent in the present day. Many of the preservation goals were

HISTORIC PLAN - 1913

The historic plan is overlaid on top of a plan of the existing conditions.




Distinctive design feature:

- A** Center line running west to east
- B** Semi-circular seating area at the termination of the center line

Note: This plan is also reproduced in Appendix C on p. 184

HISTORIC PLAN - 1957

The historic plan is overlaid on top of a plan of the existing conditions.



Distinctive design features:

- A** Wide borders around the central lawn area
- B** Center line running from west to east
- C** Center line from the Palm Room door running to the South Drive
- D** Planting beds south of the main Rose Garden

Note: This plan is also reproduced in Appendix C on p. 186

The historic plan is overlaid on top of a plan of the existing conditions.



- A** Central stone steps with larger platform step (amended from design above)
- B** *Magnolia x soulangeana* (Saucer Magnolia) trees
- C** Planting beds with diamond parterre boxwood

120

echoed and reiterated in the 1944 report, though this later report was not so extensive in its recommendations.

As the Olmsted Report stated, flexibility regarding changes to the landscape are inevitable as needs and requirements evolve. The rapidly increasing demands on the White House and Grounds continued to be recognized during the second half of the twentieth century, and a new report focusing on *Design Guidelines* was published in 1997. Building on the earlier plans, the 1997 Report provided appropriate design ideas and fitting palettes for any work proposed within President's Park. Included below, the following guidelines were not envisaged to be rigid, regulatory rules that dictate future design decisions. Instead, they serve together in an advisory capacity as a guiding philosophy from which to initiate new concepts and designs.

DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR PRESIDENT'S PARK

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, D.C. All components of President's Park are designed historic landscapes, and the Secretary of the Interior's <i>Standards for Historic Preservation</i> 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, D.C.
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.	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

(Taken from the 1997 White House *Design Guidelines*, pp. 10-12.)

These design guidelines were subsequently amalgamated into the *Comprehensive Design Plan* published in 2000, which was much broader in scope after over ten years of research and planning process analysis. The overall aim of that Plan was to provide a framework for future management of President's Park, and shares many similarities with current NPS treatment guidelines. Though expanded, it echoes an almost identical vision as the Olmsted Report:

'The vision for the future management of the White House and President's Park is to continue to celebrate the rich traditions of the past while

adopting technological advances to meet the needs of the future. Through comprehensive planning, the White House will continue to serve the president and the executive branch of government. Public access to the White House, which is symbolic of access to the government of our country, will remain available for all citizens. As a unit of the national park system, President's Park will continue to set preeminent standards for resource protection and design excellence, and its management and use will exemplify the highest ideals of interagency cooperation and public service' (2000, p. 79).

Despite the thoroughness of the Plan, it should be noted that many of the Plan's recommendations were not realized due to funding constraints among other issues.

The most recent report to address possible treatments and recommendations was a *Foundation Document* published by the NPS in September 2014. The document summarizes guidance for planning and management decisions with respect to the most important attributes of President's Park. The Rose Garden is not mentioned in isolation, but many of the planning needs raised in the document would apply to the Garden's future treatment. However, the extent of the document is such that it is not possible to fully integrate NPS recommendations into this Report. Nevertheless, issues raised within it that potentially impact proposed treatment recommendations are respected and adhered to as much as possible.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the unique location and historical importance of the landscape, two treatment alternatives are provided in the following pages for the CPWH's consideration (illustrated on pp. 136-143). The two alternatives, while similar, offer slightly different levels of treatment and furnishes the CPWH with options for preservation and rehabilitation of the landscape. Suggestions for restoration are, on occasion, included in the recommended treatments for the Garden. These instances are clearly specified. At no point was reconstruction treatment considered as the most appropriate or necessary treatment for any work in the Rose Garden.

Treatment recommendations are organized by landscape characteristic under the headings of Land Use; Topography; Circulation; Site Structures and

Features; Vegetation; and Views and Vistas. Within these characteristics, specific treatments are given for both treatment alternatives. Plans are included to illustrate recommended treatment objectives. Following these recommendations, the two alternative plans are presented incorporating the proposals for each landscape characteristic.

LAND USE

The Rose Garden continues to provide a space for the president and the first family to use for official and private purposes. Some aspects of the Rose Garden will be improved to meet current and future demands on the landscape. Overarching spatial organization and land patterns will be retained, as it is a significant defining aspect of the Garden's historical integrity. Additional uses for the garden might include educational and interpretive features, but these would not impact the overall integrity of the landscape. Consequently, treatment for both alternatives offered is preservation.

TOPOGRAPHY

The overall appearance of the Rose Garden landscape will be unchanged visually, as it too contributes to the historic integrity of the landscape. After analyzing the existing conditions and consulting with current maintenance staff, an unobtrusive two percent slope will be installed along either side of the center line in the central lawn area. This treatment will protect the turf by improving drainage, a key requirement for preservation. The slope will not impact the platform or temporary seating required for the frequent Rose Garden events, nor will it be discernable to users and visitors. As with Land Use, preservation will be the recommended treatment.

CIRCULATION

All existing paths, roads and walkways have been documented in Chapter Three with their year of installation and current condition. Analysis of current circulation concluded that the existing circulation system will be retained and either preserved or rehabilitated where necessary.

Approximately eight separate paving materials appear throughout the Garden at present. The varied selection of materials used suggests no strategy concerning materials has been implemented and will be addressed. Unifying the paving material will provide continuity, symmetry, formality and a simple foundation for future maintenance and eventual replacement in-kind if necessary.

Though the path running south from the Palm Room to the South Drive was not part of Mellon's 1962 design, the route will be retained as it serves modern-day circulation requirements and does not impede on the integrity of the Rose Garden. This path along the center line from the Palm Room door first appeared in First Lady Ellen Wilson and George Burnap's 1913 design, and was again replicated in James Howe's 1957 suggested design. The path furthermore adds to the overall structure and formality of the landscape. The paving material will be chosen to adhere to the singular, unifying paving material referenced above. The two north-south pathways just east of the West Terrace Steps will be retained, and relaid with the same paving material as elsewhere in the Rose Garden.

The first treatment alternative (Alternative I, pp. 136-139) preserves all circulation routes exactly as they currently exist within the Garden. The second treatment alternative (Alternative II, pp. 140-143) recommends the addition of one further route. The proposal revives the design of a wide formal border around the central lawn area planned by James Howe in the 1957 NPS proposal (though not executed). The high volume of events held on the lawn results in its continual upheaval and the surrounding planting beds, and this is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. Compounding this level of disturbance are the usage demands of the Residence, the Press, and other relevant agencies. The addition of this border would have numerous positive treatment objectives:

- To enhance circulation around the central lawn area without damaging the turf;
- To protect the surrounding vegetation by providing a barrier between the lawn and the planting beds. This protection would be enhanced with the installation of raised edging between the border and the vegetation;
- Discreet and detailed drainage set within the paving will allow for additional drainage points, improving the Garden's overall drainage capabilities;
- The new border would provide an opportunity to address the continual issue of access and maintenance of utility cables, such as lighting and power circuits. Underground raceways built under the paving would allow for utility conduits to be run unseen around the Garden. Regular maintenance of these, or future changes in technology necessitating cable replacement will only require uplifting a number of pavers, rather than partial excavation of the Garden, which generates lasting damage each time cabling requires maintenance;



- The border proposed by Howe in 1957 was eight foot wide at the north and south, twelve foot wide at the western end and nine foot wide at the eastern end. Alternative II reduces these dimensions to four foot wide at the north and south, six foot wide at the western end and four foot wide at the eastern end.
- Though reduced in size from the 1957 plan, the borders will still retain appropriate width to promote and provide access for disabled people and those with mobility limitations to the entire Rose Garden.

Though this would be a new addition to the Rose Garden, the border's construction would still be categorized as a rehabilitation treatment. The new border would not 'radically change, obscure, or destroy character-defining spatial organization and land patterns or features and materials' (Birnbaum and Peters 1996, p. 53). The design is also reflective of Howe's 1957 design, which was only partially implemented by President Eisenhower. It is respectful to the location, and would be constructed with compatible materials that visually connect with the historic integrity of the rest of Rose Garden.

SITE STRUCTURES AND FEATURES

The Hoover Patio underneath the Jackson Magnolias has remained in place since 1929, and was not amended in any way by Bunny Mellon's 1962 design. The original paving is still in situ, though it has been re-laid, most recently in 2018. Treatment will follow preservation guidelines, although minor improvements related to accessibility are possible under Alternative II. The Eastern Terrace will be replaced in-kind, albeit with some material improvements in order to comply with the circulation treatment objective (see illustrations opposite). Alternative I leaves the terrace paving in its current layout, and treatment would not include anything beyond preservation, including its in-kind replacement. Alternative II follows the same treatment as Alternative I, but the paving area would be enlarged slightly and its overall shape changed to resemble Burnap and Mrs. Wilson's 1913 semi-circular seating area. As with Alternative I, any new paving stone would match the existing composition, design, color and texture of the historic materials.

As mentioned in brief under circulation treatments, a stone border and edging would be introduced under Alternative II to separate the parterre planting beds from the central lawn. The design of the edging would draw



inspiration from existing stone steps and columns on the grounds, as well as other historically appropriate sources in the area (see illustrations on pp. 140). In addition to providing protection for the vegetation, the edging would raise the level of the planting beds by eight inches. This in turn will aid drainage in the planting beds, and furthermore elevate them to visually accentuate the colorful vegetation within them. An indirect benefit of installing the edging would be further opportunities arising to run utility conduits hidden behind the edging.

Furnishings in the Rose Garden have been updated at several points throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries and do not contribute to the historical integrity of the Garden. A proposal for installing historically appropriate furniture relevant to the Rose Garden and the White House will be recommended, aided by the expertise of a historic furniture expert. In the second treatment alternative, a sectional semi-octagonal bench reminiscent of the bench installed by First Lady Ellen Wilson in 1913 has been placed where it stood between 1913 and 1962.

American designed and constructed decorative planters would also be placed in the Garden and announce the entryway from the South Lawn, allowing for seasonal rotations that vary in color and texture. As the proposed furniture and site furnishings are not permanent installations, their inclusion is easily reversed temporarily for events, or more permanently as changing demands dictate. Care will be taken to ensure that size and weight of these removable furnishings are key considerations in the design and choice of materials used.

VEGETATION

A full record of the vegetation (historic and current) is documented in Chapter Three. Existing vegetation that post-dates the period of significance and does not benefit park management will be removed and replaced. Other vegetation such as the small trees planted between the main Rose Garden and the Hoover Patio that do not contribute to the historic integrity of the landscape will also either be removed or replaced.

The Osmanthus hedge running along the north edge of the Rose Garden between the north planting bed and the West Colonnade is the only shrub remaining from the 1962 installation. It had also been proposed by James Howe in his 1957 plan. Originally mirrored on the south planting bed


and situated elsewhere in the Garden, the species has gradually been replaced, most notably by a Yew hedge along the south border of the Rose Garden. Though not necessarily a character defining feature, the Osmanthus is felt to be historically appropriate, and will be reintroduced where possible. The health of the remaining Osmanthus will be monitored and replaced in-kind if its long-term viability is in doubt.

The commemorative trees within the landscape (the Andrew Jackson Magnolias, the four Kennedy Magnolias and the Johnson Willow Oak) will be preserved and protected with the utmost level of care during any construction work, as they retain character defining features of the Rose Garden. The advice given in the 2017 report (Appendix J on p. 216) was followed soon after the report was issued, and the trees continue to be monitored.


The ten flowering Crabapples within the two parterre planting beds have been replaced numerous times since their initial installation in 1962. The most recent replacement occurred in 2019, with the original cultivar 'Katherine' being replaced by the cultivar 'Spring Snow.' While the inclusion of Crabapples in the Garden dates to 1962, the current trees do not necessarily themselves contribute to the Rose Garden's list of character defining features.

In Alternative I, all ten trees remain in the planting beds, though they would be installed to symmetrically align with the columns and windows of the West Terrace Colonnade (see top illustration on following page). Whether the trees would remain as Crabapples or would be replaced by other small flowering trees suitable for the space would be addressed, and this decision would consider environmental concerns such as species or cultivars with good disease and pest resistance.

Alternative II also maintains the flowering trees in the two parterre planting beds, but reduces the number in each bed to three trees (see lower illustration on following page). Historic precedence exists for this amendment, as Bunny Mellon suggested this herself in a letter written to First Lady Nancy Reagan in 1981 (see p. 35). She believed it would allow more light to filter down to the planting beds below and produce more space for planting underneath. Like the flowering trees for Alternative I, these six trees would be symmetrically aligned to the surrounding columns



Alternative I - Flowering tree and boxwood parterre layout



Alternative II - Flowering tree and boxwood parterre layout

and windows. Similarly, environmental and maintenance concerns would be prioritized when specifying species and cultivar of flowering tree.

The boxwood diamond parterres planted beneath the flowering trees would remain in place for both alternatives (see illustrations opposite). However, their design would be influenced by the number of flowering trees utilized and would change accordingly. In Alternative I, the diamond parterres are laid out almost identically to the as-planted design in 1962. The removal of two trees from each planting bed in Alternative II leads to the boxwood planting design responding to the larger distances between the trees.

Over the last ten years, boxwood blight has affected several historical gardens in the greater Washington area, including Dumbarton Oaks and Tudor Place, leading to large amounts of damage in the appearance of these gardens. While it has not been found in the Rose Garden at this point, it is prudent to understand the causes and possible treatment alternatives for using it in future recommendations. Historically, boxwood captures not only the original traditional landscape design associated with the White House's eighteenth century construction period, but also Bunny Mellon's later recognition of the species as essential to the historical significance of the landscape. Consequently, identifying possible cultivars of boxwood that have shown excellent resistance to boxwood blight in ongoing trials will be researched and proposed over replacing it with a different species.

The vegetation treatment will aim to rehabilitate the character of the 1962 design in plant material such as the boxwood, as well as with regards to mass and alignment of perennials and annuals, using modern environmentally appropriate plant selections. The choice of plant material will reflect Bunny Mellon's original intention to offer a mixture of perennial and seasonal annual plants to maximize color throughout the year. In the intervening years since 1962, this balance has deteriorated to the extent that plants are being replaced on a constant basis in order to provide as much color as possible using almost exclusively annuals. The ensuing disturbance caused to the roots of the trees and shrubs as the annuals are replaced impedes the long-term health of the plants. With this in mind, both Alternative I and Alternative II propose re-designing the plant placements within the parterre planting beds. The rear portion of the beds would contain shrub roses and rose-compatible perennials. Roses that perform well in the region will be introduced, and might also include historical cultivars that have an association with the White House.

Perennials that thrive under tree canopies will be installed in the diamond areas underneath the flowering trees. The front of the beds will be reserved for rotations of annuals, providing seasonal interest that can be replaced and replanted easily when the need demands without disturbing the more permanent vegetation.

A maintenance manual with relevant methods and techniques for ongoing daily, seasonal and cyclical care will ideally be included in a future record of treatment. No example of historical maintenance practices have been found in the historical record and are therefore not necessary to consider.

Alternatives I and II also both introduce planting beds south of the main Rose Garden area. First used by First Lady Edith Roosevelt in her 1903 Colonial Garden, American plants will be included in the planting palette. As well as being environmentally appropriate and sustainable, the selection of plants has the potential to raise environmental awareness by providing a possible educational outlet to implement sustainability teachings in the landscape.

The final area of vegetation to be looked at in the landscape is the condition of the turf. As an ongoing issue for many years, the NPS ranked turf management as a high priority planning need in their 2014 *Foundation Document*. Constant use and heavy traffic, in addition to challenging environmental climate conditions leaves the turf in a continuous cycle of disturbance and damage. The unobtrusive two percent slope proposed along the center line of the main Rose Garden would alleviate the drainage issues the lawn is currently suffering from. Alongside this, collaboration with NPS staff and other experts (such as at the National Mall and Memorial Parks) in turf species selection will be consulted to determine the most appropriate and environmentally sustainable species.

The surface area of the Rose Garden covered by lawn would remain broadly similar to the area covered at present. In Alternative I, the main rectangular lawn would be identical, save for the addition of a further 315 feet at the eastern end, with diagonal corners reminiscent of Bunny Mellon's original 1962 design (though these were not installed). The lawn area surrounding the Hoover Patio would remain undisturbed. Alternative II slightly reduces the central lawn area with the proposal for a four foot wide circulation border, and removes the lawn coverage surrounding the

Hoover Patio. This area would instead be planted with shade tolerant ground cover plants, which do not compete with the trees for nutrients as much as turf does and will require less intensive maintenance.

VIEWS AND VISTAS

Key historic views include the Rose Garden southwards to the Washington Monument and from the West Terrace Steps eastwards along the Rose Garden center line. Both will be retained and improved. The view into the Rose Garden from the West Colonnade currently is not exactly symmetrical. This will be amended, with the columns and windows of the West Colonnade lining up symmetrically with the flowering trees within the two parterre planting beds (see plans on p. 130). Possible future treatment could include a viewshed management plan encompassing the entire President's Park, as the Rose Garden is part of a larger landscape extending beyond the boundaries of this Report.

The proposed planting bed just south of the main Rose Garden appears in both alternative treatment plans. As well as their environmental and educational possibilities, the beds would also serve to visually link the Rose Garden with the surrounding South Grounds, introducing less symmetrically laid out planting in keeping with the more naturalistic appearance of the South Grounds. Entrance to the Rose Garden from the South Drive would be enhanced and announced by the addition of planter boxes or raised urns with seasonal annuals.

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The Rose Garden is uniquely situated at the heart of the White House Grounds. Site jurisdiction is shared between numerous agencies and federally chartered organizations that are responsible for the Garden's day-to-day administration, maintenance and security. Each facet of potential design intervention will fully comply with accessibility requirements, health and safety, and any other relevant concerns as required by each department. Where possible, the most appropriate solutions to these concerns will meet rehabilitation treatment guidelines to protect the Garden's character-defining features.

TREATMENT PLANS

A single overall site preservation plan is not included in this Report. Instead, the plans and summaries in the preceding pages serve to lay

out areas/characteristics and their treatment recommendations, including those elements believed to be character-defining features that embody the historic integrity of the Rose Garden. The two following treatment alternatives offered to the CPWH share many of the goals set at the start of the project planning process and include:

- Address drainage issues with improved grading;
- Simplify and unify the hardscape materials used for pedestrian circulation;
- Address planting combinations to ease constant replacement issues by segregating and balancing annual, perennial and evergreen vegetation;
- Reinstate historically and environmentally appropriate rose cultivars as a dominant horticultural feature;
- Enhance site furnishings to integrate with the historical character of the landscape;
- Recommend current sustainability practices that respect the history of the Garden while easing the need for water, fertilizers, and herbicides;
- Simplify the infrastructure related to lighting, electricity, and other necessary utilities.

Beyond these points, the two treatment plans differ, and each alternative has an accompanying list highlighting changes and proposals over the following pages.

DESIGN FOREWORD

The pages that follow provide a testament to the incredible collaboration between Oehme, van Sweden & Associates and Perry Guillot, Inc.

Without the incredible team work from these two firms, as well as the National Park Service, the Executive Residence, the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, and countless other partners and advisors, this project would not have taken shape.

Everyone's passion towards restoring this national treasure truly speaks to the enduring values of our country. Indeed, the White House and the Rose Garden have always been a symbol of continuity in the face of great trials. Despite the difficulties we face, I hope that this effort will be seen as a continuation of looking towards a brighter tomorrow.

I am so pleased that the team's efforts will help preserve this space for generations to come.


Timothy Harleth
Chief Usher
Executive Residence

ALTERNATIVE I - TREATMENT LIST

Alternative I preserves much of Bunny Mellon's design, and closely resembles what was originally installed in 1962. Characteristics of Alternative I include the following:

- Preserve and enhance the overall Bunny Mellon designed landscape;
- Preserve and protect the character defining features of the 1962 design;
- Regrade the central lawn area to two percent which will ease drainage;
- Retain the flowering trees in the parterre planting beds but aligning them with the symmetry and formality of the West Colonnade's columns and windows;
- Revise the geometry of the parterre planting beds to separate the annuals and perennials, thus reducing tree root disturbance;
- Amend the layout of the central lawn area at the eastern end to reintroduce an early Bunny Mellon planned diagonal installation (though not executed);
- Install historically appropriate site furnishings including furniture and planters;
- Introduce a further formal border south of the main Rose Garden to visually link the Garden with the South Grounds;
- Unify the limestone paving throughout the Rose Garden.

This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.




ALTERNATIVE I - SECTIONS

This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.



A SECTION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1' - 0"



B SECTION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1' - 0"



Scale: 1/8" = 1' - 0"
0 4 8 16

ALTERNATIVE I - WATERCOLOR RENDERING



Jungsub Lee and Oehme, van Sweden & Associates

ALTERNATIVE II - TREATMENT LIST

Alternative II preserves and rehabilitates much of Bunny Mellon's design, and closely resembles what was originally installed in 1962. However, while many of the recommendations are the same or similar to those proposed in Alternative I, there are also slight additions or amendments:

- Preserve the character defining features of the 1962 design;
- Regrade the central lawn area to two percent which will ease drainage;
- Revise the geometry of the parterre planting beds to separate the annuals and perennials, reducing tree and shrub root disturbance;
- Removal of two flowering trees, leaving three trees in each bed. This would allow room for tree growth, and increase light for roses, perennials and annuals growing below;
- Install the six flowering trees to align with the symmetry of the West Colonnade columns and windows;
- Install historically appropriate site furnishings;
- Unify the limestone paving throughout the Rose Garden;
- Preserve the Hoover Patio at the eastern end of the site, but enlarge the surface area to facilitate increasing back-of-house requirements. Materials would match existing patio, which would be carefully relaid;
- Planting surrounding the Jackson Magnolias would consist of climate appropriate shade tolerant ground cover plants rather than lawn;
- Creating a flower border south of the main Rose Garden that highlights American plants, providing a transition from the formal Rose Garden to the more naturalistic landscape of the South Grounds;
- Addition of a 4' wide border (6' wide at the west end) encircling the central lawn area to facilitate circulation and provide space for coordinated concealed utilities. The border would be edged with a raised edging, the design of which would be inspired by those found throughout the District of Columbia (examples below);



Oehme, van Sweden & Associates:
Private residence,
Georgetown



Outside the United States
Capitol:
Washington, D.C.



Outside the United States
Capitol:
Washington, D.C.




Outside the Supreme Court
of the United States:
Washington, D.C.


ALTERNATIVE II - TREATMENT PLAN

This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.






A SECTION
SCALE: 1/4"= 1' - 0"



B SECTION
SCALE: 1/4"= 1' - 0"




ALTERNATIVE II - WATERCOLOR RENDERING



Jungsub Lee and Oehme, van Sweden & Associates


ALTERNATIVE II - REVISED MASTERPLAN

This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.




ALTERNATIVE II - REVISED MASTERPLAN SECTIONS


This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.



A SECTION
SCALE: 1/4"= 1' - 0"



B SECTION
SCALE: 1/4"= 1' - 0"



DESIGN PROCESS

The office of OvS presented two alternatives for the Rose Garden to the Committee for the Preservation of the White House (CPWH) on December 9, 2019, after an introductory site history narrative and summary of existing conditions were given. Initial feedback was received after the presentation, and more substantial recommendations were suggested once Committee members reviewed the alternatives in greater detail.

In subsequent discussion, the Committee expressed preference for implementing Alternative II. All subsequent design development from this design is believed to meet the necessary treatment requirements, while also becoming a new long-term perpetuation of the landscape's historic character. As a concept design, aspects of Alternative II were amended in subsequent designs to respond to developing site considerations that were not covered in this Report.

In late January the final draft of the Landscape Report, including the design plans presented to the Committee, was issued to stakeholders. In early February, Perry Guillot, an advisor on the External Subcommittee, conveyed his concerns that the Rose Garden's parterres be more reflective of the original 'as built' 1962 Bunny Mellon design.

OvS responded to this request in their Concept Masterplan - Alternative III presented to the First Lady on February 12, 2020. At the same time, Perry Guillot presented further design developments which also emphasized the historical importance of the 1962 Mellon parterre plan, and included the introduction of a unified paving template, and on the Garden's east cross axis a new design element – the diamond pattern Palm Room Walk and four pairs of boxwood shrubs.

The following page lists the design drawing titles submitted for this work.

Plan	Date Presented
Oehme, Van Sweden	
Alternative I - Treatment Plan	December 9, 2019
Alternative II - Treatment Plan	December 9, 2019
Final Landscape Report with plans	January 23, 2020
Conceptual Masterplan - Alt. III	February 12, 2020
Perry Guillot Inc.	
Rose Garden Design Plan	February 12, 2020
Rose Garden Paving Plan	February 12, 2020
Rose Garden Masterplan	February 12, 2020
Palm Room Walk North View	February 12, 2020
Palm Room Walk South View	February 12, 2020
Joint Collaboration	
Consensus Masterplan	March 23, 2020
Overall Site Plan	May 29, 2020
Final Design	July 21, 2020

These plans trace the evolution and culmination of the collaborative design process from December 2019 to July 2020. It concludes on p. 167 with the design to be built in August 2020, as vetted by the CPWH. After careful consideration, it was decided that the Hoover Terrace and surrounding area (see p. 167) would not be included in the August 2020 work.

If resources are available, an additional chapter documenting the treatment record will be made available to the Committee. This will be prepared in consultation with the NPS to ensure the proposed treatment will be implemented and maintained over time. The record will include as-built work, on-going maintenance development, sustainable land management practices, and future research recommendations, ideally with contributions from experts in landscape preservation, horticulture, ecology and landscape maintenance.

The guidelines offered in this Report, and in subsequent treatment recommendations, will help the Rose Garden's custodians protect its rich historic integrity and character, through uniting the past with the present and providing a framework for the future.

Design Process: Conceptual Masterplan - presented to the First Lady by Oehme, van Sweden on February 12, 2020.

This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.



Office of Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

OEHME, VAN SWEDEN | OVS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS | OVSLA.COM
800 G Street SE
Washington DC 20003
202 546 7575 PHONE
202 546 1035 FAX



THE WHITE HOUSE
ROSE GARDEN
1600 PENNSYLVANIA, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

Note: The base plan is derived from CAD drawing titled "Site Plan" received August 28, 2019 from the office of the Chief Usher of the White House; additions by OVS based on site reconnaissance on 10/30/2019 and 10/02/2019.

CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN ALT III
FEBRUARY 12, 2020



WEST COLONNADE




ENTRANCE HALL




GARDEN ROOM

ELEMENT OF DIAMOND PATTERN PAVING
EVIDENT THROUGHOUT HALLWAYS & CORRIDORS.



THE WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN
PROPOSED PAVING PLAN

ONE-EIGHTH INCH EQUALS ONE FOOT SCALE
FEBRUARY 12, 2020
OFFICE OF PERRY GUILLOT INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT



Design Process: Perspective Illustrating The Rose Garden View of West Wing with Added Perimeter Limestone Walk - presented by Perry Guillot Inc. to the First Lady on February 12, 2020.



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

Design Process: Perspective Illustrating The White House Rose Garden North View to the Palm Room & West Colonnade - Presented by Perry Guillot Inc. to the First Lady on February 12, 2020.



WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN NORTH VIEW TO THE PALM ROOM & WEST COLONNADE



Office of Perry Guillot Inc.


PROPOSED LIMESTONE EAST WALK LOOKING NORTH




Office of Perry Guillot Inc.

PROPOSED EAST WALK LOOKING SOUTH

OFFICE OF PERRY GUILLOT INC



Design Process: Watercolor Rendering based on March 12, 2020 Plan - Presented to the CPWH Grounds by Perry Guillot Inc. and Oehme, van Sweden on March 23, 2020.



Design Process: Perspective Illustrating Proposed Limestone East Walk Looking North - Revised rendering, presented to the CPWH Grounds by Perry Guillot Inc. and Oehme, van Sweden on March 23, 2020.



Office of Perry Guillot Inc.


PROPOSED LIMESTONE EAST WALK LOOKING NORTH


Design Process: Perspective Illustrating Proposed Limestone East Walk Looking South - Revised rendering, presented to the CPWH Grounds by Perry Guillot Inc. and Oehme, van Sweden on March 23, 2020.



Office of Perry Guillot Inc.

PROPOSED LIMESTONE EAST WALK LOOKING SOUTH






R O S E G A R D E N P L A N T I N G D E T A I L

3 / 8 " = 1 ' - 0 "


PROJECT	WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN
SHEET	PLANTING DETAIL
SCALE	3 / 16 " = 1 '
DATE	MARCH 18 2020



T H E R O S E G A R D E N P L A N T I N G S C H E M A T I C


3 / 8 " = 1 ' - 0 "

M A R C H 1 8 , 2 0 2 0



ARCHIVE PHOTOS SHOWING SUBSTANTIAL SIZE
OF THE BOXWOOD PARTERRES.

ESSENTIAL THAT THE PARTERRES HAVE A STRONG
PRESENCE NOW THAT GARDEN BEDS ARE TO BE
PLANTED IN A MORE EDITED SCHEME, ALSO WITH
NO CRABAPPLES.



SAMPLE
'GREEN VELVET' BOXWOOD

IMPORTANT THAT PARTERRE
IS PLANTED DAY ONE WITH 20"
MINIMUM SIZE PLANTS.



+ (26) (52) HYBRID TEA ROSE 'JFK'



(26) (52) COMPANION WHITE ROSE TO BE DECIDED



'JFK' 3-4' MATURE SIZE



'JFK' POTTED NURSERY STOCK CURRENTLY AVAILABLE NOW




MODEL FOR
'WHITE HOUSE ROSE'
4-5' SHRUB MATURE SIZE (15) (30)

IT IS THOUGHT THAT THIS ROSE WOULD REPLICATE THE DESIGN EMPHASIS OF THE ORIGINAL PLANTED 10 CRABAPPLE TREES.

'JFK' ROSE & COMPANION WHITE ROSE

'THE WHITE HOUSE ROSE'



AREA FOR SPRING BULBS & SUMMER ANNUALS



(32) (64) HYBRID TEA ROSE 'PEACE'



(9) (18) COMPANION LIGHT PINK ROSE TO BE DECIDED



'PEACE' 4' MATURE SIZE




'PEACE' POTTED NURSERY STOCK CURRENTLY AVAILABLE NOW

'PEACE' ROSE' & COMPANION LIGHT PINK ROSE

Design Process: Overall Site Plan - issued as part of the 100% CD Package by Perry Guillot Inc. and Oehme, van Sweden on May 29, 2020.

This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.



Project:
**The White House
Rose Garden**
1600 PENNSYLVANIA
AVENUE N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

Team:
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:
PERRY GUILLOT INC
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
www.perryguillot.com 202.249.2429
Perry Guillot
1865 North Sea Road
Southampton, NY 11968
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:
OEHME, VAN SWEDEN | OvS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS OVSLA.COM
Oehme, van Sweden
Lisa Delplace and Eric Grotz
800 O Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

GENERAL CONTRACTOR:
MARKER
Marker Construction
Ryan Busch
226 SE 12th Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

ENGINEERING:
Wiley Wilson
Wiley Wilson
Dave Ward and Kelly Cole
127 Nationwide Drive
Lynchburg, VA 24502

ELECTRICAL:
M.C. DEAN
BUILDING INTELLIGENCE
M.C. Dean
John Hall
1765 Greensboro Station Pl.
Tyrone, VA 22102

SOILS:
Urban Trees + Soils
James Urban
915 Creek Drive
Annapolis, Maryland 21043

IRRIGATION:
Lynch & Associates, LTD.
Dan Lynch
236 Severn Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401

LIGHTING DESIGNER:
George Sexton Associates
George Sexton Associates
George Sexton
2121 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Suite 220 Washington, DC 20007


SPECIFICATION WRITER:
Heller & Metzger, PC
Architectural Coordination and Construction Management
Heller and Metzger, PC
Anne Stenger
1899 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington DC 20006

**NPS LIAISON TO
THE WHITE HOUSE:**
National Park Service
John Stanwick &
Nicholas Wagman
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240
Ph: 202-680-2114

FINAL DESIGN

Presented to the First Lady by Perry Guillot Inc. and Oehme, van Sweden, July 21, 2020.
This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.

UNCLASSIFIED // FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY



Office of Oehme, van Sweden and Associates

UNCLASSIFIED // FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Project:
**The White House
Rose Garden**
1600 PENNSYLVANIA
AVENUE N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

Team:
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:
PERRY GUILLOT INC
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
www.perryguillotinc.com 410.253.2525
Perry Guillot Landscape Architecture
Perry Guillot
1865 North Sea Road
Southampton, NY 11968

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:
OEHME, VAN SWEDEN | OvS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS OVS&A.COM
Oehme, van Sweden
Lisa Deplaise and Eric Graft
800 G Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

GENERAL CONTRACTOR:
MARKER
Marker Construction
Ryan Busch
226 SE 12th Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

ENGINEERING:
Wiley Wilson
Wiley Wilson
Dave Nardi and Kelly Cole
127 Nationwide Drive
Lynchburg, VA 24502

ELECTRICAL:
M.C. DEAN
BUILDING INTELLIGENCE
M.C. Dean
John Hall
1765 Greensboro Station Pl.
Tysons, VA 22102

SOILS:
Urban Trees + Soils
James Urban
915 Creek Drive
Annapolis, Maryland 21043

IRRIGATION:
Lynch & Associates, LTD.
Dan Lynch
236 Severn Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401

LIGHTING DESIGNER:
George Sexton Associates
George Sexton Associates
George Sexton
2121 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Suite 220 Washington, DC 20007

SPECIFICATION WRITER:
Heller & Metzger, PC
Heller and Metzger, PC
Anne Stenger
1899 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington DC 20006

NPS LIAISON TO THE WHITE HOUSE:
National Park Service
John Stanwich &
Nicholas Wagman
1949 G Street NW
Washington, DC 20240
Ph: 202-680-2114

PROJECT # PRPA - 19013
DRAWING # 2020 - 01

DATE 5/29/2020
SCALE AS SHOWN
DRAWN BY BHW, JL
CHECKED BY LH, EG

Revisions:
No. Date
06/19/2020 FOR HOUSE REVIEW
07/24/2020 REVISION

FOR CONSTRUCTION

OVERALL SITE PLAN
L1

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A: MAPS



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. Faehtz 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 4 (and detail): **Plan of the City Intended for the Permanent Seat of the Government of the United States.** 1791. Pierre Charles L'Enfant. Copy done in 1887 by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey. Library of Congress, Geography and Maps Division.



Figure 5 (and detail): *Plan of the City of Washington in the Territory of Columbia*, Andrew Ellicott, Engraved by James Thackara and John Vallance, Philadelphia, 1792. Library of Congress, Geography and Maps Division.

APPENDIX B: PLANS




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* Olmsted Brothers, October 1935. National Park Service, Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site.




Figure 16: *Executive Mansion Grounds: General Plans for Improvements*. Olmsted Brothers, October 1935. 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 for reference.





Figure 17: Basement Plan of Executive Mansion and Conservatories. Under the Direction of Col. Theo. A. Bingham, US Army. 1899. 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





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

Figure 21: General Plan, West Garden - Executive Mansion. Drawn by J. Howe. August 22, 1957. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79



ROSE GARDEN

YEAR: 1962

PRESIDENT: JOHN F. KENNEDY

FIRST LADY: JACQUELINE KENNEDY

DESIGNER: RACHEL MELLON/
PERRY WHEELER

Figure 22: *Development and Planting Plan, West Garden - Executive Mansion*. Rachel Mellon and Perry Wheeler. 1962. National Archives, Cartographic and Architectural Records, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79

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, D.C.. May 28, 1962. Oak Spring Garden Foundation




Figure 25: Planting Layout, West Garden - Executive Mansion, Washington, D.C.. No date. Oak Spring Garden Foundation




Figure 26: Planting Layout, West Garden - Executive Mansion, Washington, D.C.. March 4, 1963. Oak Spring Garden Foundation




Figure 27: Illustrated endpapers in Kramer, *The White House Gardens: A History and Pictorial Record*. 1973.

APPENDIX E: 1962 CONSTRUCTION

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.



July 21, 1961



March 22, 1962



March 22, 1962



March 30, 1962



March 30, 1962



March 30, 1962



April 2, 1962



April 2, 1962



April 2, 1962



April 2, 1962



April 4, 1962



April 4, 1962



April 4, 1962



April 4, 1962



April 4, 1962



April 10, 1962



April 10, 1962



April 10, 1962



April 17, 1962



April 17, 1962



April 17, 1962



April 17, 1962



April 17, 1962



May 18, 1962



May 18, 1962



May 18, 1962



May 18, 1962



June 20, 1962



June 20, 1962



June 20, 1962



July 13, 1962



July 13, 1962



July 13, 1962



July 8, 1962



July 8, 1962

APPENDIX F: SOILS REPORT

Urban Trees + Soils

James Urban, FASLA, ISA

November 11, 2019

Eric D. Graft, 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 proposed 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 localized 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.



915 Creek Drive Annapolis, Maryland 21403

jimtree123@gmail.com

410 693 9053

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 are 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 than 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 than 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:

Plantings 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 box wood stem 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James Urban", followed by a period.

James Urban, FASLA, ISA


Attachments:
Soil Testing and Profile Locations
Soil Profile Descriptions
Soil Testing Results

Soil Testing and Profile Locations


SOILS

Soil borings were taken and a penetrometer was used on site to determine the existing conditions of the soil. Soil information provided by James Urban.

KEY

 Penetrometer Sample Location

 Boring Sample Location

**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.

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.

Moisture code

Dry	DR
Damp	DP
Moist	MO
Wet	WT
Saturated	SA

Density code

Loose	LS
Soft	SF
Firm	FM
Hard	HD
Refusal	R

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.

Moisture code

Dry	DR
Damp	DP
Moist	MO
Wet	WT
Saturated	SA

Density code

Loose	LS
Soft	SF
Firm	FM
Hard	HD
Refusal	R

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:

Moisture code


Dry	DR
Damp	DP
Moist	MO
Wet	WT
Saturated	SA

Density code

Loose	LS
Soft	SF
Firm	FM
Hard	HD
Refusal	R

Soil Testing Results 1 of 5

Soil test location 13 A (North Bed upper soil layer)

Waypoint 
ANALYTICAL

7621 Whitepine Road, Richmond, VA 23237
Main 804-743-9401 • Fax 804-271-6446
www.waypointanalytical.com

"Every acre...Every year"

SOIL ANALYSIS

Client : James Urban/UT&S 915 Creek Dr Annapolis MD 21403	Grower : James Urban- Urban Trees and Soils	Report No: 19-290-1007 Cust No: 10924 Date Printed: 10/21/2019 Date Received: 10/17/2019 PO: Page : 3 of 5
--	--	---

Lab No: 21392 Field:

Test	Method	Results	SOIL TEST RATINGS					Calculated Cation Exchange Capacity
			Very Low	Low	Medium	Optimum	Very High	
Soil pH	1:1	6.7						10.8 meq/100g
Buffer pH								%Saturation
Phosphorus (P)	M3	145 ppm						%sat meq
Potassium (K)	M3	78 ppm						K 1.9 0.2
Calcium (Ca)	M3	1678 ppm						Ca 77.7 8.4
Magnesium (Mg)	M3	188 ppm						Mg 14.5 1.6
Sulfur (S)	M3	13 ppm						H 4.6 0.5
Boron (B)	M3	0.6 ppm						Na 1.3 0.1
Copper (Cu)	M3	7.0 ppm						K/Mg Ratio: 0.13
Iron (Fe)	M3	207 ppm						Ca/Mg Ratio: 5.36
Manganese (Mn)	M3	28 ppm						
Zinc (Zn)	M3	20.7 ppm						%Sand %Silt %Clay
Sodium (Na)	M3	33 ppm						51.5 32.6 15.8
Soluble Salts								Textural Class
Organic Matter	LOI	3.8% ENR 111						Loam
Nitrate Nitrogen								

SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES

Crop : Shrubs Yield Goal : 0 Rec Units: LB/1000 SF

(lbs)	LIME (tons)	N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	Mg	S	B	Cu	Mn	Zn	Fe
0		2.5	0	5.0	0	0.37	0	0	0	0	0

Crop : Rec Units:


Comments :

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.

Soil Testing Results 2 of 5

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

Waypoint
ANALYTICAL 

7621 Whitepine Road, Richmond, VA 23237
Main 804-743-9401 • Fax 804-271-6446
www.waypointanalytical.com

"Every acre...Every year"

SOIL ANALYSIS

Client : James Urban/UT&S 915 Creek Dr Annapolis MD 21403	Grower : James Urban- Urban Trees and Soils	Report No: 19-290-1007 Cust No: 10924 Date Printed: 10/21/2019 Date Received: 10/17/2019 PO: Page: 4 of 5
--	--	--

Lab No: 21393 Field:

Test	Method	Results	SOIL TEST RATINGS					Calculated Cation Exchange Capacity		
			Very Low	Low	Medium	Optimum	Very High	%Sat	meq	
Soil pH	1:1	7.0						9.7 meq/100g		
Buffer pH								%Saturation		
Phosphorus (P)	M3	250 ppm						K	1.0	0.1
Potassium (K)	M3	37 ppm						Ca	82.1	8.0
Calcium (Ca)	M3	1592 ppm						Mg	15.2	1.5
Magnesium (Mg)	M3	177 ppm						H	0.0	0.0
Sulfur (S)	M3	17 ppm						Na	2.2	0.2
Boron (B)	M3	0.6 ppm						K/Mg Ratio: 0.06		
Copper (Cu)	M3	7.4 ppm						Ca/Mg Ratio: 5.40		
Iron (Fe)	M3	221 ppm						%Sand %Silt %Clay		
Manganese (Mn)	M3	50 ppm						49.5 34.6 15.8		
Zinc (Zn)	M3	33.6 ppm						Textural Class		
Sodium (Na)	M3	49 ppm						Loam		
Soluble Salts										
Organic Matter	LOI	2.4% ENR 84								
Nitrate Nitrogen										

SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES

Crop : Shrubs Yield Goal : 0 Rec Units: LB/1000 SF

(lbs)	LIME (tons)	N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	Mg	S	B	Cu	Mn	Zn	Fe
0		2.5	0	6.0	0	0.27	0	0	0	0	0

Crop : Rec Units:


Comments :

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.

Soil Testing Results 3 of 5

Soil test location 15 A (East Bed Upper Soil Layer)

Waypoint 
ANALYTICAL

7621 Whitepine Road, Richmond, VA 23237
Main 804-743-9401 • Fax 804-271-6446
www.waypointanalytical.com

"Every acre...Every year"

SOIL ANALYSIS

Client : James Urban/UT&S 915 Creek Dr Annapolis MD 21403	Grower : James Urban- Urban Trees and Soils	Report No: 19-290-1007 Cust No: 10924 Date Printed: 10/21/2019 Date Received: 10/17/2019 PO: Page : 1 of 5
--	--	---

Lab No: 21389 Field:

Test	Method	Results	SOIL TEST RATINGS					Calculated Cation Exchange Capacity
			Very Low	Low	Medium	Optimum	Very High	
Soil pH	1:1	7.0						27.7 meq/100g
Buffer pH								%Saturation
Phosphorus (P)	M3	85 ppm						%sat meq
Potassium (K)	M3	100 ppm						K 0.9 0.3
Calcium (Ca)	M3	4943 ppm						Ca 89.2 24.7
Magnesium (Mg)	M3	303 ppm						Mg 9.1 2.5
Sulfur (S)	M3	23 ppm						H 0.0 0.0
Boron (B)	M3	0.9 ppm						Na 0.6 0.2
Copper (Cu)	M3	4.6 ppm						K/Mg Ratio: 0.10
Iron (Fe)	M3	300 ppm						Ca/Mg Ratio: 9.80
Manganese (Mn)	M3	19 ppm						
Zinc (Zn)	M3	20.7 ppm						%Sand %Silt %Clay
Sodium (Na)	M3	36 ppm						71.5 22.6 5.8
Soluble Salts								Textural Class
Organic Matter	LOI	11.0% ENR 150						Sandy Loam
Nitrate Nitrogen								

SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES

Crop : Shrubs Yield Goal : 0 Rec Units: LB/1000 SF

(lbs)	LIME (tons)	N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	Mg	S	B	Cu	Mn	Zn	Fe
0		2.5	0.5	5.0	0	0.11	0	0	0.05	0	0

Crop : Rec Units:

Comments :


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, Triplexsuper 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

12

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



7621 Whitepine Road, Richmond, VA 23237
Main 804-743-9401 • Fax 804-271-6446
www.waypointanalytical.com

"Every acre...Every year"

SOIL ANALYSIS

Report No: 19-290-1007
Cust No: 10924
Date Printed: 10/21/2019
Date Received: 10/17/2019
PO:
Page: 2 of 5

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

Grower :
James Urban- Urban Trees and Soils

Lab No: 21390

Field:

Test	Method	Results	SOIL TEST RATINGS					Calculated Cation Exchange Capacity
			Very Low	Low	Medium	Optimum	Very High	
Soil pH	1:1	6.8						11.5 meq/100g
Buffer pH								%Saturation
Phosphorus (P)	M3	139 ppm						%sat meq
Potassium (K)	M3	89 ppm						K 2.0 0.2
Calcium (Ca)	M3	1799 ppm						Ca 78.2 9.0
Magnesium (Mg)	M3	213 ppm						Mg 15.4 1.8
Sulfur (S)	M3	17 ppm						H 2.6 0.3
Boron (B)	M3	1.0 ppm						Na 1.7 0.2
Copper (Cu)	M3	4.8 ppm						K/Mg Ratio: 0.13
Iron (Fe)	M3	433 ppm						Ca/Mg Ratio: 5.08
Manganese (Mn)	M3	34 ppm						
Zinc (Zn)	M3	21.0 ppm						
Sodium (Na)	M3	44 ppm						
Soluble Salts								%Sand %Silt %Clay
Organic Matter	LOI	2.4% ENR 82						43.5 34.6 21.8
Nitrate Nitrogen								Textural Class
								Loam

SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES

Crop : Shrubs

Yield Goal : 0

Rec Units: LB/1000 SF

(lbs)	LIME (tons)	N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	Mg	S	B	Cu	Mn	Zn	Fe
0		2.5	0	5.0	0	0.27	0	0	0	0	0

Crop :

Rec Units:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--


Comments :

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.

Soil Testing Results 5 of 5

Soil test location 16 (Lawn)



Waypoint
ANALYTICAL

7621 Whitepine Road, Richmond, VA 23237
Main 804-743-9401 • Fax 804-271-6446
www.waypointanalytical.com

"Every acre...Every year"

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

Grower :
James Urban- Urban Trees and Soils

Report No: 19-290-1007
Cust No: 10924
Date Printed: 10/21/2019
Date Received : 10/17/2019
PO:
Page : 5 of 5

SOIL ANALYSIS

Lab No: 21394 **Field:**

Test	Method	Results	SOIL TEST RATINGS					Calculated Cation Exchange Capacity
			Very Low	Low	Medium	Optimum	Very High	
Soil pH	1:1	6.3						10.1 meq/100g
Buffer pH	SMP	6.82						%Saturation
Phosphorus (P)	M3	200 ppm						%sat meq
Potassium (K)	M3	140 ppm						K 3.6 0.4
Calcium (Ca)	M3	1373 ppm						Ca 68.0 6.9
Magnesium (Mg)	M3	191 ppm						Mg 15.8 1.6
Sulfur (S)	M3	13 ppm						H 10.9 1.1
Boron (B)	M3	0.9 ppm						Na 1.5 0.2
Copper (Cu)	M3	6.0 ppm						K/Mg Ratio: 0.23
Iron (Fe)	M3	387 ppm						Ca/Mg Ratio: 4.30
Manganese (Mn)	M3	26 ppm						%Sand %Silt %Clay
Zinc (Zn)	M3	15.0 ppm						45.5 36.6 17.8
Sodium (Na)	M3	36 ppm						Textural Class
Soluble Salts								Loam
Organic Matter	LOI	2.6% ENR 88						
Nitrate Nitrogen								

SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES

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

(lbs)	LIME (tons)	N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	Mg	S	B	Cu	Mn	Zn	Fe
30		4.0	0	0	0	0.51	0	0	0.10	0	0

Crop : **Rec Units:**

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comments :

Lawn
Limestone 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 3-4 applications to keep the lawn green and prevent fertilizer loss. You should not apply more than 0.7 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 can not be found, replace with fertilizer having similar N:P:K ratio. The best time to apply fertilizer for cool season grass (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.

APPENDIX G: HYDROLOGY REPORT



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.

APPENDIX H: IRRIGATION REPORT

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.



APPENDIX I: LIGHTING REPORT

2121 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Suite 220
Washington, DC
20007-2270

202.337.1903 phone
202.337.0047 fax

George Sexton Associates

Memorandum

Date: November 22, 2019
To: Lili Herrera, OvS
From: George Sexton and Tina Sarawgi, GSA
Subject: Existing Lighting Condition
Project name: West Garden
Project number: 19-068

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.



L I G H T I N G D E S I G N • M U S E U M D E S I G N

Memorandum
2 | Page
22 November 2019

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.



Memorandum
3 | Page
22 November 2019

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.

APPENDIX J: TREE REPORT

Evaluation of the Jackson magnolia (*Magnolia grandiflora*)

November 8, 2017

U.S. National Arboretum staff, Carole Bordelon (Magnolia curator), Christopher Carley (IPM specialist) and Kevin Tunison (Arborist) were requested by the White House to evaluate the condition of the Jackson magnolia.

The prominent Jackson magnolia located on the west side of the South Portico of the White House has been declining for well over a half century based on visual evidence and background information. We believe the tree originally had three leaders emanating from the base. These three co-dominate leaders developed extensive included bark between each of these trunks, creating weak attachments between each of the leaders. At some point before 1970, a large leader broke out from the other two leaders and was removed. This created very large cavity of exposed wood, which was quite susceptible to decay. The tree was unable to compartmentalize this decay and unable to seal off this extensive wound. Per the White House staff, the cavity was filled with cement long ago, and in 1981 the cement was removed when a pole and cable system was installed to support the remaining two leaders.

The outdated practice of filling cavities with cement was thought to provide strength to a weakened trunk. We understand today that filling cavities with cement has numerous drawbacks, including the physical abrasion between the cement and living wood, which allowed further decay. This decay has destroyed the heartwood, to the point where in 1981, a support system was installed.

The overall architecture and structure of the tree is greatly compromised and the tree is completely dependent on the artificial support. Without the extensive cabling system the tree would have fallen years ago. Presently, and very concerning, the cabling system is failing on the east trunk, as a cable has pulled through the very thin layer of wood that remains. It is difficult to predict when and how many more will fail. There are numerous defects throughout the east limb, including compression stress near the ground, the absence of heartwood and sapwood in the lower part of the tree, and, in addition, the cambium and bark layer is also rotting away, as it is possible to punch large holes in the remaining bark layer. Also, the upper canopy of the east leader is thin, and showing indications of decline. Further cabling and support of the east leader is not an option due to the fragile almost non-existent lower trunk. There is no longer a sound foundation, and the upper portion lacks sound wood for cabling. This half of the tree is considered a hazard.

The west leader, on the other hand could possibly be saved for a time, but will eventually succumb to the same fate. In addition, the high winds resulting from frequent helicopter landings, complicates the future of the limb, it may fail in an unpredictable way. If the west leader is to remain, all the cables need to be inspected and replaced or tightened as necessary. The removal of only the eastern leader would make the remaining support system more prominent, very visible for the South Portico. Removal of the entire tree would improve the aesthetics of the area which would include the removal of the support system. Additionally, removal of the entire tree would be beneficial to the second magnolia close by, allowing more light to reach the tree, and more space to grow.

If this was any ordinary tree, it would have been removed long ago. We understand this is a historic tree, and all measures have been used to save it to this point in time. While we cannot comment on the need to preserve the tree as long as it stands, we believe eventually, the tree will fail.

We would like to offer the facilities of the US National Arboretum, should there a desire to clone this particular plant, to save it for future generations. We would attempt to root cuttings, and create propagules through tissue culture. Our director, Richard Olsen, pointed out another option that may be viable is to remove the top and allow the stump to resprout. *Magnolia grandiflora* can sucker and sprout readily, so it is worth a shot before removal of the stump. Select the strongest of the resprouts, and it will grow very quickly.

APPENDIX K: TREATMENT STANDARDS

The following excerpt is taken from *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (1995, pp. 19, 49, 91 and 129). The standards listed originally referred to historic properties, but can additionally be applied to historic landscapes.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR THE TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Standards for Preservation

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Standards for Rehabilitation

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

-
10. New additions or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Standards for Restoration

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that reflects the property's restoration period.
2. Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
4. Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials.
7. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.
8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

9. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

10. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

Standards for Reconstruction


1. Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property.
2. Reconstruction of a landscape, building, structure, or object in its historic location will be preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to identify and evaluate those features and artifacts which are essential to an accurate reconstruction. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
3. Reconstruction will include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features, and spatial relationships.
4. Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will recreate the appearance on a non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.
5. A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.
6. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

(Excerpted from *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, 1995.)

ADDENDUM: FURTHER DESIGN PROCESS

The following pages document further design development processes that subsequently evolved after the initial report was finished at the end of January 2020.

Design Process: Rose Garden, Alternative I - presented to the Chief Usher's Office and two members of the CPWH Grounds by Oehme, van Sweden on February 2, 2020. This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.




OEHME, VAN SWEDEN | OVS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS OVS.LA.COM
800 G Street SE
Washington DC 20003
202 948 7155 PHONE
202 948 1835 FAX

THE WHITE HOUSE
Committee for the Preservation of The White House
Subcommittee for Gardens and Grounds

THE WHITE HOUSE
ROSE GARDEN
1600 PENNSYLVANIA, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

Sheet #	Title	Project #	Date	Scale	Drawn By	Checked By	Revisions
L-X-X	Rose Garden Alternative I	19047.00	2/4/2020	AS SHOWN	BHW	EG, LH	
#	of						

Design Process: Rose Garden, Alternative II - presented to the Chief Usher's Office and two members of the CPWH Grounds by Oehme, van Sweden on February 2, 2020. This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.



PROGRESS PRINT - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Note: The base plan is derived from CAD drawing titled "Site Plan" received August 28, 2019 from the office of the Chief Usher of the White House; additions by OvS based on site reconnaissance on 10/30/2019 and 10/02/2019.

Sheet # L-X-X # of	Title Rose Garden Alternative II		Revisions	
	Project # 15047.00	Date 2/4/2020	#	Date
Drawn By BHW	Checked By EG, LH	Scale AS SHOWN		
		Cad File		


THE WHITE HOUSE
ROSE GARDEN
1600 PENNSYLVANIA, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

Committee for the Preservation of The White House
Subcommittee for Gardens and Grounds

OEHME, VAN SWEDEN | OVS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS OVS.LA.COM
600 G Street SE
Washington, DC 20003
202.546.7555 PHONE
202.546.1835 FAX

Design Process: Rose Garden, Alternative III - presented to the Chief Usher's Office and two members of the CPWH Grounds by Oehme, van Sweden on February 2, 2020.

This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.




OEHME, VAN SWEDEN | OVS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS | OVSLA.COM
600 G Street SE
Washington, DC 20003
202.546.7555 PHONE
202.546.1835 FAX

Committee for the Preservation of The White House
Subcommittee for Gardens and Grounds

THE WHITE HOUSE
ROSE GARDEN
1600 PENNSYLVANIA, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

Title		Rose Garden Alternative III		Revisions	
Sheet #	Project #	Date	Scale	#	Date
L-X-X	15047.00	2/4/2020	AS SHOWN		
	Drawn By	Checked By	Coord File		
	BHW	EG, LH			
#					

This plan has been reduced to 40% of its actual size.



LIMESTONE EDGING AND BANDING
SCALE: 3"= 1' - 0"

PROGRESS PRINT - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Note: The base plan is derived from CAD drawing titled "Site Plan" received August 28, 2019 from the office of the Chief Usher of the White House; additions by OvS based on site reconnaissance on 10/30/2019 and 10/02/2019.

[illegible]

THE WHITE HOUSE
ROSE GARDEN
1600 PENNSYLVANIA, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001



Committee for the Preservation of The White House

DEHME, VAN SWEDEN | OVS
 ANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS OVS.LA.COM
 800 G Street SE
 Washington DC 20003
 202 546 7575 PHONE
 202 546 1035 FAX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLEN, Steve and Robert J. THOMPSON. 2019. 'Television in the United States.' *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Accessed online: www.britannica.com/art/television-in-the-united-states

BEALES, Peter. 1985. *Classic Roses: An Illustrated Encyclopaedia and Grower's Manual of Old Roses, Shrub Roses and Climbers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

BETTS, EDWIN M. and Hazlehurst Bolton PERKINS. Revised and enlarged by Peter J. HATCH. 2000. *Thomas Jefferson's Flower Garden at Monticello*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation

[BINGHAM, Theodore A.] U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers. 1900. *Annual Report Upon the Improvement and Care of Public Buildings and Grounds, Appendix HHH of the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1900*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 5227-5316

BOYLE, Susan Calafate, et al. 2001. *The White House and President's Park: Cultural Landscape Report, Site History, and Evaluation, 1791 - 1994*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

CORNETT, Peggy. 2004. 'Encounters with America's Premier Nursery and Botanic Garden.' *Twinleaf Journal*, pp. 1-12

DEITZ, Paula. 1982. 'The Private World of a Great Gardener.' *New York Times*, 3 June 1982. Accessed online: www.proquest.com

FENTON, Robert F. 1960. *The White House: National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings*. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service

FLEMING, Philip B. and W.E. Reynolds. [1944]. *Report to the President of the United States on the Proposed Landscape Improvements for the Executive Mansion Grounds*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Works Agency and Public Buildings Administration

GAMBLE, James Alexander. 1953. 'The White House Rose Garden.' *American Rose Annual*. Harrisburg, PA: The American Rose Society

GORDON, Meryl. 2017. 'How Bunny Mellon Re-invented the White House Rose Garden.' *Vanity Fair*. Accessed online: www.vanityfair.com/style/2017/09/how-bunny-mellon-invented-the-white-house-rose-garden

GRISWOLD, Mac Keith. 2008. 'First Lady Edith Kermit Carow Roosevelt's "Colonial Garden" at the White House.' *White House History 23: Journal of the White House Historical Association*, pp. 4-17

HOLDEN, Linda Jane. 2018. *The Gardens of Bunny Mellon*. New York: Vendome

HUMPHREY, Robert L. and Mary Elizabeth CHAMBERS. 1985. 'Ancient Washington: American Indian Cultures of the Potomac Valley.' *G.W. Washington Studies #6*. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University

JACOBS, James A. 2015. 'The President, the Press, and Proximity: the Creation of the White House Press Center.' *White House History 37: Journal of the White House Historical Association*, pp. 4-23

KENNEDY, Jacqueline Bouvier. [1966]. *The Rose Garden*. Large elephant cloth-bound folio scrapbook with manuscript, photographs and newspaper cuttings. Held at Oak Spring Garden Foundation

KENNEDY, Jacqueline Bouvier. *Textual Materials. Pamela Turnure Files. Subject Files: White House: Grounds. JBKOPP-SF034-001.* John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum

KENNEDY, John F. 1959. 'A Force that has Changed the Political Scene.' *TV Guide*. Accessed online: www.museum.tv/debateweb/html/equalizer/print/tvguide_jfkforce.htm

KRAMER, Frederick L with a commentary by Mrs. Paul MELLON. 1973. *The White House Gardens: A History and Pictorial Record*. New York: Great American Editions

LEWIS, Tom. 2015. *Washington: A History of our National City*. New York: Basic Books

LITTLE, Barbara, Erika Martin SEIBERT, Jan TOWNSEND, John H. Sprinkle and John KNOERL. 2000. *Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes, Planning, Treatment, and Management of Historic Landscapes*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

McDONALD, Travis. 2011. 'The East and West Wings of the White House: History in Architecture and Building.' *White House History 29: Journal of the White House Historical Association*, pp. 44-87

McDOWELL, Marta. 2016. *All the Presidents' Gardens: Madison's Cabbages to Kennedy's Roses - How the White House Grounds have Grown with America*. Portland, OR: Timber Press

McFARLAND, J. Horace (editor). 1920. *The 1920 Year-Book of Rose Progress*. Harrisburg, PA: American Rose Society

MELLON, Rachel Lambert. 1983. 'President Kennedy's Rose Garden.' *White House History 1: Journal of the White House Historical Association*, pp. 4-11

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. September 2014. *Foundation Document: The White House and President's Park, Washington, D.C.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. 2019. 'Native People of Washington, D.C.' Accessed online: www.nps.gov/articles/native-peoples-of-washington-D.C..htm

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. September 2014. *Foundation Document: The White House and President's Park, Washington, D.C.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. December 2001. *Administrative History 1791-1983 with Epilogue 1983-1997: The White House and President's Park, Washington, D.C.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. May 2000. *Comprehensive Design Plan for the White House and President's Park, Washington, D.C.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. December 1997. *Design Guidelines: The White House and President's Park, Washington, D.C.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. 1997. *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. Charles A. Birnbaum with Christine Capella Peters (editors). 1996. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [2016]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 2013 - 2016.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [2012]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 2009 - 2012.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [2008]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 2004 - 2008.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [2004]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 2000 - 2004.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [2000]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 1996 - 2000.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [1996]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 1992 - 1996.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [1992]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 1988 - 1992.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [1988]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 1984 - 1988.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [1984]. *The White House Grounds and Gardens 1980 - 1984.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [1981]. *The Executive Residence and Grounds.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [1979]. *Gardens of the White House Grounds.* Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [1978]. *Shrubs of the White House Grounds*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. [1977]. *Trees of the White House Grounds*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]. J. Timothy Keller and Genevieve P. Keller. N.D. *National Register Bulletin 18: How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service

OLMSTED BROTHERS, Landscape Architects. 1935. 'Report to the President of the United States on Improvements and Policy of Maintenance for the Executive Mansion Grounds.' On file at the Office of the Curator, the White House; the Executive Support Facility, White House Liaison, National Park Service; Olmsted Associates Papers, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress; and the Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site, Brookline, MA.

PAGE, Robert R., Cathy A. GILBERT and Susan A. DOLAN. 1998. *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships

PLISKA, Jonathan. 2016. *A Garden for the President: A History of the White House Grounds*. Washington, D.C.: White House Historical Association

POUSSON, John F. and Christine HOEPFNER. March 1995. *Archeological Evaluation: President's Park, Washington, D.C.* Denver Service Center: National Park Service, Eastern Applied Archaeology Center

REAGAN, Ronald. 1986. *Proclamation 5574 - Designation of the Rose as the National Floral Emblem of the United States of America*. Accessed online: www.reaganlibrary.gov/research/speeches/112086a

REDMOND, Robert. February 19, 1947 (revised). *The White House Garden*. On file at Executive Support Facility, White House Liaison, National Park Service

SEALE, William. 2008 (second edition). *The President's House, A History*. Washington, D.C.: White House Historical Association

SEALE, William. 2015. 'The West Garden: A Succession of Ideas.' *White House History 38: Journal of the White House Historical Association*, pp. 32-35

SEALE, William. 2015. 'President Kennedy's Garden: Rachel Lambert Mellon's Redesign of the White House Rose Garden.' *White House History 38: Journal of the White House Historical Association*, pp. 36 - 77

SMITH, Margaret Bayard (edited by Gaillard Hunt). 1906. *The First Forty Years of Washington Society, Portrayed by the Family Letters of Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith from the collection of her Grandson, J. Henley Smith*. New York: Scribner

TANKARD, Judith. 1996. *The Gardens of Ellen Biddle Shipman*. New York: Sagapress in association with the Library of American Landscape History

TEMPLE, Dottie and Stan FINEGOLD. 2002. *Flowers, White House Style*. New York: Simon & Schuster

TOMASI, Lucia Tongiorgi. 1997. *An Oak Spring Flora: Flower Illustration from the Fifteenth Century to the Present Time. A Selection of the Rare Books, Manuscripts and Works of Art in the Collection of Rachel Lambert Mellon*. Upperville, VA: Oak Spring Garden Library

WILLIAMS, Irvin M. Recorded interview with Pamela Turnure, March 19, 1965, John F. Kennedy Oral History Program

