Meeting Summary
Sharon Park (SP), SI OFEO, brought the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m., stating that the objectives of the meeting were to review the proposed content for the Programmatic Agreement (PA) and to discuss public outreach and mitigation measures. SP announced that the next step in the Section 106 process will be to finalize the draft PA and distribute it electronically to the consulting parties for a two-week review period. The next consulting parties meeting is planned for September to coincide with CFA and NCPC submissions, but this is open to discussion if it is felt that an interim meeting is necessary. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will be made public on May 20, 2011.

Public Outreach Discussion
Amy Ballard (AB), SI OFEO, spoke next and discussed Section 106 public outreach efforts to date. AB stated that the Section 106 process has been ongoing since 2005 with over 30 consulting parties meetings. AB noted that, in previous consulting parties meetings, the ACHP had requested that SI do more public outreach as part of the Section 106 review process. In response, SI sent out an informational email to a broad group of organizations, including every state historical society, inviting them to present opinions concerning how the design and construction of the museum might affect historic resources. In response to this email, SI received five comments. (AB distributed a handout that
listed the organizations receiving the email notification and a handout with comments received to date.) AB added that all public comments will be posted to the NMAAHC EIS website (www.nmaahceis.com) as they are received. SP noted that many of the comments focus on the design of the museum rather than on impacts to historic resources.

SP asked if the consulting parties had additional groups that should be included in public outreach. Ken Walton (KW), NCPC, responded that he has heard from professors at Howard University. AB added that feedback can be sent to preservation@si.edu.

Drecc Wilson (DW), ASAALH and NTHP, commented that he has met with Fleur Paysour, NMAAHC Department of Media Relations and External Affairs, to discuss the issue of public outreach. The feedback DW has received from the groups he represents is that the museum has not taken public outreach to a national platform. He understands that the museum has offered a series of “spotlight” presentations, but feels that these relate to programming rather than design. DW strongly encouraged the museum to join with the National Building Museum to take the design concept to cities across the country and increase public awareness. SP noted that David Adjaye has done a “spotlight” presentation at the National Building Museum. SP added that the cost of taking this type of presentation on the road is not negligible and asked if DW thought the National Trust might be interested in partnering with SI to offer this type of outreach.

SP added that, from a Section 106 perspective, she doesn’t know why there hasn’t been a greater response from the public. SP asked Perry Wheelock (PW), NPS, about her experience with this issue. PW replied that it depends on the project, noting that the National Mall Plan received thousands of public comments. Andrew Lewis (AL), DC HPO, asked PW to what extent does NPS do public outreach at the national level. PW replied that NPS does a lot of electronic outreach. AL suggested that SI post signs on the site educating the public about the museum’s plans. Notifications could be posted at the refreshments building or on fencing. AL also suggested partnering with the African American museum in Baltimore (the Reginald F. Lewis Museum of Maryland African American History) on an exhibit or lecture. Dawud Abdur-Rahman (DAR), GSA, asked if the design team had made presentations to and requested feedback from the specific communities from which comments were desired. DAR added that the formal language used to ask for input coupled with the stature of the Smithsonian could be intimidating or give the sense that comments would not be valued. SP replied that the museum has made presentations all over the world. SP related that for people who are interested, there are many ways to find information on the project, but for the general public or the accidental tourist signage on the site would help.

PW commented that temporary wayside exhibits could be used on the site to present information on the design principles, archaeology, etc. NPS has used this method for the Washington Monument and other projects. Patsy Fletcher (PF), AAHGS, remarked that she has a list of additional organizations for public outreach. AB noted that the National Trust has agreed to send out information to their email distribution list.

SP asked Louise Brodnitz (LB), ACHP, to share some of her ideas for expanding Section 106 outreach. LB first commended SI for stepping up their efforts, noting that there is now access to additional Section 106 materials on the NMAAHC EIS website. SP added that the museum is working on adding hot links from the museum website to the EIS website. LB commented that the goal is to avoid the building going up and people getting taken by surprise. LB added that it is important to hear what the public has to say about mitigating effects because it is their Mall.
Discussion of Minimization and Proposed Mitigation

SP commented that the FEIS will be posted for the public on the NMAAHC EIS website. The full document includes a list of historic resources, a discussion impacts, and a description of minimization efforts. SP added that because the full NEPA document could potentially be overwhelming to the general public, SI has posted to the website a summary of the most commonly identified adverse effects and a summary of efforts to minimize impacts. SP added that both are the result of years of input from the consulting parties. (SP distributed a handout summarizing adverse effects, minimization, and proposed mitigation.)

SP noted that SI has been working very diligently with the DC HPO to identify mitigation that will go into the PA. So far, proposed mitigation includes:

- Undertake photo-documentation of the site before construction, using Historic American Building Survey standards and provide documentation for inclusion in the Library of Congress.
- Develop an exhibit for the public to be housed in the museum illustrating the archaeological finds of interest, the history of development of the museum on the site, and a history of the prevalent use of the site, such as for First Amendment demonstrations.
- Document found features on the site, such as the abandoned subterranean water intake tunnel and the Bulfinch Gatepost.
- Work with the NPS as they develop the landmark listing of the National Mall by providing historical documentation on the Smithsonian buildings.
- Expand the historic information on the Horatio Greenough sculpture of George Washington owned by SI, and include this information as part of the National Register of Historic Places multiple resource nomination on sculpture. In addition, consider laser scanning of the sculpture for full physical documentation.
- Undertake stewardship responsibilities for the Bulfinch Gatepost and ensure that preservation work is undertaken when needed and is consistent with the conservation methods established by the NPS for the other gateposts.

SP asked for comments on the proposed mitigation and mentioned that DW had brought up the idea of executing additional research on African American history related to the site. SP added that because the museum feels that providing contextual history related to the African American experience is their mission, additional research would not be appropriate mitigation. There have been discussions, however, about including an exhibit in the museum related to the site’s context. SP also noted that Cultural Tourism DC has produced an African American Heritage Trail – a walking tour that includes points of interest on the National Mall. Other resources include a book published by the NMAAHC on the Scurlock studio. (Many such resources were displayed on the meeting room tables.)

PF noted that Cultural Tourism’s African American Heritage Trail walking tour is very popular and the organization struggles to get funding for additional reprints of the booklet when they are necessary. PF suggested that mitigation may be to partner with Cultural Tourism DC to fund additional reprints.

AL reiterated that Section 106 is about avoiding adverse effects and that ultimately mitigation measures need to tie back to the resources being affected. In this case, these resources are the National Mall, the Washington Monument Grounds, and Federal Triangle. There needs to be a reasonable connection between the mitigation and the resource being adversely affected. AL suggested that SI guide people about this on the website when asking for comments and ideas for proposed mitigation.
PF commented that African American links to the Mall are being obliterated or smoothed over as a result of the project and therefore mitigation related to African American history is appropriate. SP reiterated that the museum’s mission is to relate the African American experience.

SP stated that HABS level photo documentation of the Washington Monument Grounds was completed the first week of April by Martin Stupich, a highly regarded photographer based out of Albuquerque. This was done to record the site in its preexisting state. SI commissioned a 360-degree panorama from the center of the Washington Monument Grounds as well as eight directional views. LB asked if the photographer took any views from offsite. SP replied that the photographer did not take any views that would be blocked by trees. SP added that the photographs will be archived at the Library of Congress.

DW questioned if HABS standards were the most appropriate in documenting the site. PW confirmed that HABS, HAER, and HALS standards were all aligned.

PW asked to clarify an issue in the proposed mitigation related to the National Register nomination for the National Mall. She clarified that the first step will be to update the National Mall Historic District nomination. Later, NPS will develop an approach to completing a new historic district nomination that will include non-NPS historic properties on or adjacent to the National Mall, such as the SI museums. SP agreed that the mitigation would be to partner with NPS on the SI nominations. AL suggested looking at the PA for the National Mall Plan for language on this issue.

PF stated that part of the history of the site was that it was once the location of African American housing. Judy Robinson (JR), Robinson & Associates, noted that she thought there was no evidence of that on the site. She offered to check the archaeology report prepared by the Louis Berger Group as part of the Tier I EIS.

Jane Passman (JP), SI OFEO, urged the group to take a look back at the archaeology report prepared by Berger. She noted that when the report was prepared the team made a significant effort to explore the history of the site related to the African American experience. JP confirmed that there were no artifacts found relating to habitation.

SP noted that SI is committed to documenting any archaeological finds uncovered during construction. She mentioned that they already discovered a nineteenth-century water tunnel. LB commented that archaeological documentation would be good mitigation.

SP stated that the DC HPO asked SI to expand the National Register Multiple Property Documentation on Memorials in Washington, D.C., to include additional information on the Horatio Greenough sculpture of George Washington. The piece was the first sculpture of Washington commissioned by Congress, but it was never intended for the Washington Monument Grounds. The sculpture is now owned by SI. SP also mentioned the possibility of documenting the sculpture by having it laser scanned. AL commented that the DC HPO realizes that the way this mitigation relates to the Washington Monument Grounds might be seen as a bit of a stretch, but argued that there is a reasonable connection. The goal is to draw more attention to the sculpture as a memorial to Washington and increase public awareness. Ultimately, the DC HPO would like to see the sculpture relocated to a different facility. SP replied that SI is completely willing to expand the information in the nomination, but is not amenable to moving the sculpture.

Hal Aber (HA), NMAH, commented that one of the museum’s curators has done extensive research on the sculpture. HA recommended that if the sculpture is going to be scanned, it needs to be done this
year as it will be protected in place during an upcoming museum construction project. When it is uncovered it will be exhibited with better light and updated interpretation.

DW commented that he didn’t think this mitigation has anything to do with the museum. SP clarified that the greatest impact related to the project is the loss of space from the Washington Monument Grounds and the loss of space for First Amendment demonstrations. The museum plans to have a section highlighting the demonstrations that have occurred on the site. AL reiterated that the Washington Monument is a commemorative work to the first president, and the Washington Monument Grounds are being adversely affected. The Greenough sculpture is also a commemorative work to the first president, and this is the connection that validates the proposed mitigation. AL added that if there is opposition to this, it can be discussed as the PA is still in draft form.

LB suggested that there needs to be more mitigation that addresses the loss of space for First Amendment demonstrations and the loss of historic views and vistas. LB asked if the museum will alter the sightline from the White House and suggested further documenting this view as mitigation. JP noted that the White House explored this and found that the museum would read as an extension of the existing buildings within the view and would not have a significant effect. LB noted that it seems as if this evaluation of effects was made unilaterally by the White House and not discussed as part of the Section 106 process. PW suggested that this issue, as well as night lighting, may need to be addressed again as part of the Tier II EIS.

SB noted that the major adverse impact of construction is to the Washington Monument Grounds and that there isn’t a way to mitigate the event – it is happening. The question is how to identify mitigation that is directly related to the Washington Monument. AL commented that the Washington Monument is meant to interpret the history of the first president and the same can be said of the Greenough statue. This is why the DC HPO feels that the mitigation related to the Greenough statue is appropriate. It will increase awareness of another monument to Washington. DAR asked where the sculpture is currently located. SP replied that it is in the NMAH. AL added that the DC HPO feels that it is an underutilized resource and that this will be a way to bring attention to it.

SP noted that another proposed mitigation is to commit to the protection and preservation of the Bullfinch Gatepost on the site. SI recognizes that the gatepost is part of a complex of resources and will coordinate with NPS to ensure that conservation treatments are consistent.

LB encouraged SI to seek input from the public for additional mitigation ideas. PF asked when SI will be taking comments from the public. AB replied that the comment period is ongoing. SP clarified that SI would like a two week turnaround on comments from the consulting parties on the draft PA after it has been distributed. PW asked that the National Council on Public History be added to the distribution list.

DW noted that the archaeological report has been submitted and approved by the DC HPO, but questioned if it was ever presented to the consulting parties. JR replied that Charlie LeeDecker from Berger made a comprehensive presentation on the report and its findings. DW noted that the cultural resources report has two sections – archaeology and historic context – and added that he and some of his colleagues feel that the historic context is significantly lacking. He quoted an excerpt from the Executive Summary of the Phase II Archaeological Investigation that reads in part: “Archival research indicates that no specific events related to slavery in the District or the construction of the Washington Monument or the canal can be located in the NMAAHC site.” He noted that such a statement is exemplary of the weakness of research that went into the report. Based on research done related to slavery in Richmond, his educated guess is that slaves may have been marched to slave pens along Tiber
Creek and that slaves congregating along Tiber Creek may have used it as a clandestine meeting place. DW added that the report does not capture the slave experience relative to Tiber Creek and the site. DW recommended that a section of the cultural resources report be rescinded and additional research is undertaken to determine if a slave trail ran parallel to Tiber Creek.

SB asked if there is more physical archaeology that needs to be done. SP replied that Level III archaeology will be done at the time of construction.

JR noted that the site prehistory was completed by Berger making it hard to comment on. JR suggested that the question could go back to Berger and they could be asked about sources, but her impression was that they did a thorough job.

SP asked DW if the curators at the Decatur House would have additional resources. DW replied that he would raise the question with them. DW added that it is a grey area as slaves did not operate in a documented world. PF added that it was only recently that the Decatur House has reinterpreted the site to look at this aspect of the site’s history. JR asked if there were other suggestions as to people to talk to or resources to use. PW noted that Berger has researched other African American sites for NPS including Rock Creek Parkway. SP added that SI will continue to keep trying to find more information on this.

Construction Update and Schedules
SP introduced Jud McIntire (JM), SI OFEO, to give an update on construction and the project schedule.

JM distributed a project schedule (see attached), noting that the PA will be signed by the end of the summer. Washington Gas will relocate a gas line starting in mid-May. It will be rerouted underneath the Constitution Avenue sidewalk.

LB commented that the PA will not be in place when the gas line is moved and asked if archaeological findings will be treated the same way as under the PA. SP replied that they would. SB recommended that the DC HPO archaeologist will be notified about this work.

LB noted that any action related to the undertaking cannot take place until Section 106 review is complete. SP stated that she thought SI had had preliminary conversations with NCPC about this and that an agreement had been made. KW stated that he will check. JM asked if there was a caveat related to public utilities. LB stated that she would check and get back to SP.

DW noted that the schedule included construction management at-risk services. JM replied that this is because the schedule is challenging. Construction management will be awarded in mid-May and brought on right away as part of the team.

LB asked if there were other construction activities starting before the signing of the PA. JM noted that SI is hoping to do early site work soon, including fencing and utility taps. LB asked what the expected date was for starting this work. JM replied that Washington Gas will begin work in mid-May.

LB asked if there will be additional structural assessments of the site. BS replied that there have been two or three geological reports completed. Supported excavation will seal the area and prevent water fluctuations, and there are no issues related to soil. BS stated that these reports are all available.

PW asked if effects to the streets were included in the cumulative impacts section of the EIS. Stephanie Dyer-Carroll (SDC), AECOM, responded that she will check.
JM noted that SI is very seriously considering geothermal, which may require work under 14th Street.

SP stated that SI has a draft PA, but it has not yet been circulated yet because it still needs to go through in-house review.

SB noted that evidence of African American use of the site may turn up over time and doesn’t fit into a closing date. She recommended that mitigation commits SI to a continued, open-ended research program. SP replied that SI will work with the DC HPO to figure out how to include that in the PA, however, most mitigation must be in place before construction is completed. SB commented that a program for research could be put in place before construction is finished. DW disagreed with this suggestion, stating that if additional information is uncovered during research, it could have a significant impact on mitigation. JR reiterated that if anyone has suggested resources for research to pass them along to Berger. SP asked DW if his ASAALH colleagues would have other resources that Berger may have missed. DW replied that he assumes they have a methodology or process to get on the trail of information.

**Upcoming Dates**
SP noted that it is anticipated that the next consulting parties meeting will be held prior to the next submittal to the agencies at the Design Development stage. This is likely to be in September or October. In the meantime, SI will share the draft PA and solicit feedback.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.