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1.1 DECISION

This Tier I Record of Decision (ROD) documents the Smithsonian Institution’s decision to implement the Preferred Alternative as described in the National Museum for African American History and Culture (NMAAHC) Tier I Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the purposes of developing a concept design for the NMAAHC. This decision emphasizes design principles that will be used by the Smithsonian to guide the development of concept designs for the NMAAHC. This decision results from careful consideration of the first of two tiers of environmental impact analysis undertaken with the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) as the Smithsonian’s Joint Lead, and the responsible Federal Agency, and the National Park Service (NPS) as a cooperating agency, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and NCPC’s Environmental and Historic Preservation Policies and Procedures.

The findings in the NMAAHC Tier I FEIS and decisions of this ROD are based in part upon an extensive Section 106 consultation process and an open and collaborative public engagement process. The Smithsonian Institution selected the Preferred Alternative based on its ability to satisfy the purpose and need of the NMAAHC.

1.2 BACKGROUND

The effort to build a museum centered on the history and achievements of African Americans dates back more than 90 years to the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the end of the Civil War.

In 1929, Congress passed legislation to create a national commission to build the memorial, but no seed money was included. Over the next four years, little was accomplished and the commission’s duties were transferred to the Interior Department. Nothing of further importance occurred until 1968 when, in the midst of the civil rights movement and the wake of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., legislative initiatives resumed. In 1986, Congress passed a Joint Resolution “to encourage and support” private efforts to build what was now thought of as both a memorial and a museum in Washington, D.C.

In 1988 and 1989, bills were introduced to create a "National African American Heritage Museum and Memorial" within the Smithsonian Institution. In 1991, a blue-ribbon commission appointed by the Smithsonian Institution recommended the creation of a national museum devoted to African Americans which collects, analyzes, researches, and organizes exhibitions on a scale and definition comparable to those of the major museums devoted to other aspects of
American life. The commission recommended that the museum be temporarily located in the Arts and Industries Building until a new, larger facility could be built, but controversy about funding and the appropriateness of the specified venue prevented passage of legislation.

In 2001, Representative John Lewis, Representative J.C. Watts, Jr., Senator Sam Brownback, and Senator Max Cleland led a new bipartisan coalition to establish a National Museum of African American History and Culture within the Smithsonian Institution. Renewed questions about funding and the feasibility of using the Arts and Industries Building resulted in the formation of the NMAAHC Plan for Action Presidential Commission (Commission) on December 28, 2001 by P.L. 107-106 to develop a feasible plan to move forward on the NMAAHC.

In April 2003, after a yearlong study and the convening of more than 50 national and local meetings, the Commission released its first report, *The Time Has Come, Report to the President and to the Congress*. This document included a siting study for several possible locations as well as a preliminary planning program that determined an area of 350,000 gsf represented a reasonable size for the museum and was neither too conservative nor unnecessarily generous.

In September, 2003, the Commission issued its *Final Site Report* which presented detailed analysis of the possible sites for the NMAAHC and the stated the Commission’s preference for the Capitol Grounds site and the Monument site as an alternative. In December 2003, Congress enacted The NMAAHC Act, Public Law (P.L.) 108-184, establishing a museum within the Smithsonian Institution to be known as the National Museum of African American History and Culture. The Act required the Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents to select a final site.

### 1.3 PURPOSE & NEED

The purpose of the proposed action is to fulfill the mandate of the National Museum of African American History and Culture Act (NMAAHC Act), P.L. 108-184, enacted by the Congress on December 16, 2003. The law states that such a museum:

> "would be dedicated to the collection, preservation, research, and exhibition of African American historical and cultural materials reflecting the breadth and depth of the experience of individuals of African descent living in the United States."

Section 2 of the NMAAHC Act set out the findings of Congress as to why such a museum was needed. The findings of Congress were based in large part on the conclusions of the Presidential Commission, known as the NMAAHC Plan for Action Presidential Commission, in its 2003 study, *The Time Has Come: Report to the President and Congress*. This Presidential Commission stated that:

> "the time has come to establish the National Museum of African American History and Culture because the museum is important not only for African Americans but for all Americans. It is the only institution that can provide a national meeting place for all Americans to learn about the history and culture of African Americans and their contributions to and relationship with every aspect of our national life. Further, the museum is the only national venue that can respond to the interests and needs of diverse racial constituencies who share a common commitment to a full and accurate telling of our country’s past as we prepare for our country’s future. And, even more importantly, it is the only national venue that can serve as an educational healing space to further racial reconciliation."
The site was selected as a result of a process detailed in Section 8 of the NMAAHC Act titled “Building for the National Museum of African American History and Culture.” This section of the Act directed the Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents to choose among four identified sites: the Monument site, the Arts and Industries Building, the Liberty Loan site, and the Banneker Overlook site. To facilitate the site selection process by the Board of Regents, the Smithsonian Institution produced a two-volume Site Evaluation Study. In addition, the Regents consulted with a variety of groups including those required by the NMAAHC Act and received public comments via the Institution’s internet web site and at a November 2005 Town Hall meeting. The Smithsonian Institution announced on January 30, 2006, that the Board of Regents had selected the Monument site. The official action recorded in the minutes of the Regents meeting was as follows:

\textit{VOTED that the Board of Regents, having fully considered its obligations under Public Law 108-184 and the recommendations it has received from statutory bodies, the Presidential Action Commission of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, and the Council of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, designates the Monument Site, bounded by 14th and 15th Streets, Constitution Avenue, and Madison Drive, for the purpose of building and operating the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture.}

The site selection decision was in the exclusive province of the Smithsonian Institution, which is not a "Federal Agency" within the meaning of NEPA or Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations. As a result, the Smithsonian Institution did not perform a formal NEPA analysis during the site selection process. Because the Smithsonian will submit the NMAAHC design for approval by NCPC, the Smithsonian has partnered with NCPC to conduct a NEPA analysis of the construction and operation of the NMAAHC on the selected site in accordance with NCPC’s Environmental and Historic Preservation Policies and Procedures.

1.4 PROPOSED ACTION

The ultimate proposed action is to construct and operate a permanent facility for the NMAAHC within the Smithsonian Institution on a five-acre parcel bounded by Constitution Avenue on the north, Madison Drive on the south, 14th Street NW on the east, and 15th Street NW on the west. In the near future, Smithsonian Institution will select a project architect. The Smithsonian Institution will use the decisions described in this ROD as instructions to the design architect in developing concept designs for the NMAAHC. The environmental effects of the concept designs will be evaluated in the Tier II NEPA study. Final decisions on the design of NMAAHC will not be made until the Tier II NEPA analysis is complete.

1.5 ALTERNATIVES

1.5.1 No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative is the continuation of the current management of the NMAAHC site as parkland with no changes. Under this alternative, the NMAAHC would not be built and essentially the status quo would be maintained. The existing land use for concessions and periodic demonstrations would continue, as would basic landscape maintenance. Nevertheless, under the No Build Alternative, there would be no new museum that would have the opportunity to expand the present level of cultural ethnic relevance to visitors to the museums on the Mall.

The overall environmental impact of the “No Build” Alternative would be no effect.
1.5.2 Build Alternatives

**Alternative 1 - Contextual Building Alignment**

The mass of Alternative 1 is aligned with the main mass of the National Museum of American History (NMAH) to the east and the centerline of the Department of Commerce (DOC) to the north. The height of Alternative 1 matches the main mass of the NMAH (75') which yields five floors (assuming a 15 foot floor to floor height) above grade. The above ground volume occupies only 219,000 gsf; to satisfy the program requirement, there are two basement levels providing an additional 196,000 gsf. The total size of Alternative 1 is 415,000 gsf. Alternative 1 would be consistent in scale with other Mall buildings and monumental in character.

**Alternative 2 - Washington Monument Orientation**

The north façade of Alternative 2 is aligned with the main mass of the NMAH to the east and the centerline of the DOC to the north. The west and south façades are primary and are orientated to the Washington Monument. As a result, a distinctive building form would be created that appropriately signifies the end (or beginning) of the row of buildings lining the Mall’s northern edge. The height of Alternative 2 matches the height of the DOC portico to the north (90') which yields six floors above grade. The above ground volume occupies only 180,000 gsf; to satisfy the program requirement, there are two basement levels providing an additional 196,000 gsf. The total size of Alternative 2 is 376,000 gsf. Alternative 2 would be consistent in scale with other Mall buildings, and monumental in character.

**Alternative 3 - Free Form**

Alternative 3 departs from the concept of contextual building alignment and establishes a distinct identity through a lack of conformity to setbacks. It does not reinforce a continuous northern Mall edge; rather, it proposes a free form building with a pavilion-like expression. It would follow in the tradition of Mall buildings that are anomalies, such as the Hirshhorn and the Castle. The height of Alternative 3 matches the height of the DOC to the north (105') which yields seven floors above grade. The above ground volume occupies only 210,000 gsf; to satisfy the program requirement, there are three basement levels providing an additional 67,000 gsf. The total size of Alternative 3 is 411,000 gsf.

**Alternative 4 - Terraced Roof**

Alternative 4 relates to the building setback lines and architectural features of the NMAH and DOC buildings to the east and north, and simultaneously relates to the Washington Monument and landscape features of the Monument grounds to the west and southwest. The gradual stepping down of the building from the intersection of Constitution Avenue and 14th Street (highest point) to 15th Street (lowest point) suggests a building “rising” out of the ground, with the potential for a “green”, or landscaped series of roof terraces that relate to the Monument grounds and defer to the Washington Monument. Similar to Alternative 3, the Free Form Alternative, this building type would be an anomaly on the Mall, in the tradition of the Hirshhorn and others. The upper limit height of Alternative 4 matches the height of the DOC portico to the north (90') which yields six partial floors above grade with an average height of 45'. The above ground volume occupies only 274,000 gsf; to satisfy the program requirement, there is only one basement level providing an additional 111,500 gsf. The total size of Alternative 4 is 385,500 gsf.

**Alternative 5 - Enframing**

Alternative 5 breaks the building line along the northern edge of the Mall. The allowable building envelope of the proposed action exceeds the building setback lines of the NMAH. To create a
more internalized outdoor public space, between two wings of the structure, the outer boundaries of the building envelope would push further in the north and south directions than the other alternatives. To minimize the impact of exceeding the established building façade lines, the building envelope would be designed to soften the apparent projections, potentially by curving the façade and eliminating the expressions of hard-edged corners. In addition, Alternative 5 would create a dual-height building, with distinctly varied heights for each of the two wings.

The height of the northern mass is 30’ and the height of the southern mass matches the height of the DOC portico to the north (90’) which yields six partial floors above grade. The combined above ground volume occupies only 236,000 gsf; to satisfy the program requirement, there are two basement levels providing an additional 174,500 gsf. The total size of Alternative 5 is 430,000 gsf.

Alternative 6- Low Profile

The mass of Alternative 6 is aligned with the main mass of the NMAH to the east and the east façade of the DOC to the north. The height of Alternative 6 is lower than adjacent buildings at 60’ and yields four floors above grade. The above ground volume occupies only 120,000 gsf with a floorplate of 30,000 square feet (the minimum functional floor area to meet the Purpose and Need.). To satisfy the program requirement, there are three basement levels providing an additional 230,000 gsf. The total size of Alternative 6 is 350,000 gsf. Alternative 6 would be smaller in scale than other Mall buildings, but monumental in character.

1.5.3 Preferred Alternative

Tier I FEIS concludes that the Build Alternatives have comparable effects on the majority of resources analyzed. The Tier I analysis also highlights the need to develop more concrete concept designs in order to fully assess the impact of the NMAAHC on cultural and visual/aesthetic resources. The Smithsonian Institution, therefore, has chosen to express its Preferred Alternative as a range of massing options with different heights, setbacks, and configurations defined by the Build Alternatives rather than eliminate particular alternatives from exploration during the concept development phase of the project.

The physical parameters of the Preferred Alternative are bounded by:
- the lowest Build Alternative (60’) and tallest Build Alternative (105’)
- a minimum 50’ building setback from the surrounding streets [shown from inside face of sidewalk]: 14th & 15th Streets, Madison Drive, and Constitution Avenue.
- a subsurface building volume that will not exceed 45’ in depth or the largest subsurface building volume in any of the Build Alternatives
- a building mass that ranges from orthogonal and contextual to free form and non-contextual.

1.5.4 Design Principles

In addition to the physical parameters described in the Preferred Alternative, the Smithsonian Institution has developed a set of design principles that are intended to help in setting priorities for key critical issues that must be considered by future design architects to minimize adverse effects on historic resources. The design principles are a refinement of the overarching principles that informed the development of the six Build Alternatives for the National Museum of African American History and Culture that are analyzed in the Tier I FEIS. The design principles reflect the analysis summarized in the overarching principles matrix and supporting documents (Attachment A) that are the result of discussions with the Section 106 Consulting Parties and others.
The Smithsonian Institution has determined, along with the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, that construction of any museum building, as defined in this undertaking’s authorizing legislation, on this site will have an adverse effect on certain historic resources. As such, the analysis of the site and the restriction or benefits of scale and massing established by the six Build Alternatives and any variations on, or combinations of, the Build Alternatives studied in the Tier I FEIS should be understood and considered by those developing concept designs for consideration by the Smithsonian Institution. The design of the NMAAHC is an opportunity to respond to the symbolic landscape and the prominent location of this site on the National Mall, the centerpiece of the monumental core of our nation’s capital. The site, a five-acre parcel of the approximately 72 acres of the Washington Monument grounds, is unique and has its own character-defining aspects.

A. General Composition of the National Mall:

The National Mall presents a unity of overall spatial design but is composed of distinct parts, including the Mall, the Washington Monument Grounds, and West Potomac Park. Though administratively separate, the Ellipse and White House Grounds are also part of this extended landscape composition. The museum site occupies a highly prominent and pivotal location next to both the continuous east-west axis of the National Mall from the U.S. Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and the north-south axis from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial.

- The design should respect the character and history of the monumental core as it has evolved through seminal plans, most notably the L’Enfant Plan and the McMillan Plan, but also including Victorian-era and mid-20th-century plans.
- The spatial organization of the National Mall is cross-axial and the design of the proposed museum should not detract from this central idea.
- Impacts on panoramic views that open and widen on the approach to the Washington Monument Grounds from the National Mall or the Ellipse should be minimized.
- The design of the museum must consider long views within the National Mall, as well as distant views from higher locations, such as Arlington Cemetery the Old Post Office Pavilion, from the air and from the Washington Monument itself.

B. Context of the Washington Monument Grounds:

The site is located on the Washington Monument Grounds. The setting of the tallest and most prominent structure in the monumental core, this 72-acre reservation is characterized by Olmstedian design principles, notably open lawns, curvilinear paths and roads, and selective groupings of trees.

- The design of the museum must be respectful of the prominence of the Washington Monument and its scale and design character.
- The design of the museum should be informed by the distinct characteristics of this historic environment, which include picturesque, irregular, and asymmetrical forms, and the topography of the grounds.
- The design of the museum and its site should be responsive to other structures and features on the Washington Monument Grounds, such as the Monument Lodge, the Bulfinch Gateposts, the curvilinear pathways, tree placement and landscape features.
- The design of the building should take into consideration the physical definition, character, and views of the Washington Monument Grounds as seen and experienced from within the reservation.
C. **Relationship to Adjacent Architectural and Urban Context:**

The site is located to the west of 14th Street, NW, which forms the western end of the Mall. Between the Mall and Constitution Avenue is a series of museum structures with an established pattern of height, setbacks, and site coverage; these help define the formal landscape of the Mall with its expansive panels of lawn flanked by double allees of trees. The composition of the National Mall landscape and the large museums is further framed by the monumental Federal Triangle to the north.

- The museum should not project beyond the existing screening of trees along the southern line of the row of museum structures.
- Given the context of the site, setbacks should respect the general character of the National Mall side of Constitution Avenue on the north, the tree buffer along 14th Street and should maximize views of the monument and grounds on the West.
- The height of the museum should be compatible with that of the predominant massing of the row of museum structures to the east.
- All sides of the building, including the roof, will be highly visible and should be treated as public facades. The appearance of service and support functions should be eliminated to the greatest extent possible by placing them below grade.
- Any requisite perimeter security should be designed and integrated into the facility from the earliest concept design and be compatible with the character of the new building and site.

### 1.5.5 Environmentally Preferred Alternative

The CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA require the Decision Document to specify the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable. (40 CFR 1505.2(b)). This alternative has generally been interpreted to be the alternative that will promote National Environmental Policy as expressed in NEPA Section 101(b) (CEQ’s “Forty Most-Asked Questions”). This generally means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment and also means the alternative that best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources.

The No Action Alternative maintains the status quo and therefore does not impact the existing environment. It is the environmentally preferred alternative. However, it does not meet the purpose and need for the action; therefore, a further discussion of the comparative impacts of options within the Preferred Alternative, which meets purpose and need, is provided below.

The Preferred Alternative will ensure a minimum setback from adjacent roadways and limits to building heights, subsurface depth, and subsurface volume. The impacts for the options encompassed by the physical parameters are both similar and not significant for all resource areas except cultural and visual resources. In addition, the design principles include an intent to ensure the preservation and protection of the important historic, cultural, and natural resources to the extent practicable as determined through a Section 106 consultation process; to provide for visitor access and use without degradation of the environment or risk to health or safety; and to use sustainable design and practices to enhance and preserve renewable resources. Resultant designs, by adhering to the design principles and the physical parameters within the Preferred Alternative, will ensure that the building will be constructed in a manner that is respectful of, and is compatible with, the historic and architectural values of historical buildings in the vicinity of the National Mall and Washington Monument grounds. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative will be in accordance with applicable Federal, state, and local environmental protection laws. Although the Preferred Alternative will have impacts related to historic, cultural and visual
resources, the Smithsonian will analyze these impacts in Tier II as concepts designs are crystallized. The Section 106 consultation process will further ensure that appropriate minimization and mitigation measures are implemented.

1.6 IMPACTS

1.6.1 Impact as a result of the No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, the NMAAHC would not be built and essentially the status quo would be maintained. The existing land use for concessions and periodic demonstrations would continue, as would basic landscape maintenance. Under this alternative, there would be no new museum that would have the opportunity to expand the present level of cultural ethnic relevance to visitors to the museums on the Mall.

1.6.2 Impacts as a result of the Preferred Alternative

Cultural Resources

Under the Preferred Alternative, there would be short-term effects that would be temporary in nature and long-term effects that would be permanent to the cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). In the short term, adverse effects would be associated with activity and disruption of the NMAAHC site due to construction. The long-term effects resulting from the construction and operation of the NMAAHC will relate to the loss or alteration of character-defining features that contribute to the historic significance of features located within the Washington Monument grounds and historic resources in proximity to the NMAAHC site. Any new above-grade structure on the NMAAHC site will significantly alter the character-defining features of multiple historic resources contained within the APE. The effects on historic resources range from “no effect” to “significant effect.”

Construction of the Preferred Alternative would remove an open portion of the Washington Monument grounds, altering the historic boundaries of the grounds and altering the spatial organization of the grounds by diminishing the prominence of Washington Monument as a central organizing feature. Significant effects would also occur to buildings and structures located within the Washington Monument grounds, including the Monument Lodge and Bulfinch Gateposts as well as the Federal Triangle along Constitution Avenue. Vegetation and land use on the NMAAHC site would also be significantly affected.

The construction of the NMAAHC also carries potential beneficial effects to provide new vantage points and visual experiences of the National Mall, Washington Monument grounds, and other historic resources. In addition, interpretive content of the NMAAHC carries the potential to pull together and focus educational attention on nearby historical African American resources such as the Lincoln Memorial, site of Marian Anderson’s concert, and Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” speech within the larger context of American history.

Significant effects would occur to views and vistas from key threshold panoramas experienced by pedestrians approaching the Washington Monument grounds. These panoramas include: the panorama from 14th Street and Constitution Avenue looking toward the Washington Monument and the panorama from 17th Street and Constitution looking toward the Washington Monument. Additional significant effects would occur to multidirectional views within the Washington Monument to buildings such as the Monument Lodge and Bulfinch Gateposts and views from within the grounds and to surrounding historic buildings, such as the Federal Triangle. Lesser, minor effects would occur to viewsheds to and from the U.S. Auditors complex and the U.S. Department of Agriculture building, the panorama from the World War II Memorial looking toward the Washington Monument, and broad contextual views from the Old Post Office Tower, Arlington Cemetery and Arlington House, as well as from the Capitol and West Potomac Park.
Aesthetics & Visual Resources
Under the Preferred Alternative, there are short term impacts which would be temporary, and long-term impacts that would be permanent impacts to the visual environment. In the short-term the most negative visual impacts would be related to the activity and disruption associated with construction. The long-term impacts would be related to blocked, disrupted, or enhanced views both to and from the NMAAHC site; visual compatibility of the proposed action with its existing visual surroundings and other proposed actions; the loss or creation of unique visual or aesthetic elements; as well as the general quality of the affected visual environment.

The massing impacts on views and vistas and their urban design consequences, vary from “no effects” to “no significant, or minor effects to “significant effects” (including “major” and “minor” categories), depending on the vantage point. All significant effects in this analysis are considered adverse, given the fact that any building at this location will substantially alter the existing visual character and quality of the site. However, the significant adverse effects documented in this study range in intensity, and some lend themselves more readily to potential future mitigations and beneficial side-effects.

Attachment C contains the viewshed analysis of the range of alternatives analyzed in the Tier I FEIS.

Distribution & Movement of Groundwater
Impacts from the Preferred Alternative would not significantly alter the underlying geology, soils, or current groundwater conditions of the project area or affect the recharge capacity such that there would be a reduction in supply or lowering of groundwater levels. The Preferred Alternative would not cause other effects that significantly or irreversibly impair the use or quality of groundwater or create a human hazard on adjacent lands or within the larger geographic context of a town or county.

While impacts to geology, soils, or groundwater would be detectable, the mitigation required to offset adverse impacts would ensure the safety of surrounding structures.

Surface Water Resources
Impacts from the Preferred Alternative to water quality would not likely be detectable, and would be at or below water quality standard or criteria. Flooding or sewer overflows could occur near Constitution Avenue and 14th, 15th, and 17th Streets during periods of above average precipitation under either the No Build Alternative or any of the six proposed Build Alternatives. The current storm sewers and combined stormwater/sewer systems in the study area currently have the capacity to handle normal stormwater flows. During above-normal storm events, however, flooding is caused by insufficient capacity of the stormwater systems, which can be caused or exacerbated by excess debris or sediments clogging the system, disrupting flows through the system.

The NMAAHC site is not located within the current Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year or 500-year flood hazard area (Washington, D.C., Community-Panel Number 1100010020B; effective date November 15, 1985). Any structure built on this site would not significantly redirect flood flows or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from floods. In addition, placement of the structure would also not likely exacerbate flooding caused by increasing stormwater discharge.
Air Quality

Washington, D.C. is in moderate nonattainment for the criteria pollutant ozone under the 8-hour ozone standard, and in nonattainment for particulate matter (PM2.5). Washington, D.C. is in attainment for all other pollutants. The NMAAHC site is located at the convergence of two of Washington D.C.’s major transportation thoroughfares and is subject to the particulate, emissions, and resultant ozone of the vehicles and buses that travel in and around the site.

Under the Preferred Alternative, at no point would construction emissions or operation of the NMAAHC exceed de minimis levels for any pollutant. Additionally, emissions would not exceed the daily limits set forth in Washington, D.C.’s State Implementation Plan (SIP). As a result, there would be no additional impacts to air quality beyond the current or projected trends.

Noise

The project area is in a non-residential area surrounded by numerous museums, monuments, and buildings. The main source of noise in the area is vehicular traffic along 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, both of which are major thoroughfares within Washington, D.C. Under the Preferred Alternative, neither the construction nor the operation of the proposed NMAAHC would significantly increase the current ambient noise levels, given the abundance of noise that presently exists in the project area. Noise generated by construction would be temporary and noise from operations would be infrequent. Although the noise levels would exceed existing natural and man made noise levels, they would not exceed applicable noise regulations given that the NMAAHC site is located in a non-residential area.

Transportation

Under the Preferred Alternative, neither the construction nor the operation of the proposed NMAAHC would significantly alter roadway network and traffic beyond the current level of service, reduce vehicular parking beyond current capacity, reduce vehicular-pedestrian-bicycle safety, or produce excess demand on public transportation. The NMAAHC site is located at the convergence of two of Washington D.C.’s major transportation thoroughfares and adjacent to two Metro stops. Surveys on visitor use on museums on the Mall show that most people arrive via public transportation.

Land Use Planning & Policies

The five-acre public open space is property of the United States but it is maintained as a public recreational resource by the NPS. The NPS also regulates the land use, including large scale staging and demonstrations. The parcel is designated as a Major Federal Tract by the District of Columbia Office of Zoning and is considered to be part of the Reserve or Commemorative Area under the National Mall Plan by the NPS National Capital Region Office of Lands, Resources, and Planning. While the Commemorative Area designation is intended to discourage development and preserve the cross axis of the National Mall and Washington Monument reservation, Section 8 of the NMAAHC Act stipulates that the Commemorative Area designation will not apply with respect to the NMAAHC.

Under the Preferred Alternative, there would be a significant change in land use. The current land use would cease with construction during which time the site would not be used as a public open space or recreational resource. Following construction, the NMAAHC, including its outdoor programmed space would be available to the public, but not in the same scale or capacity as the site in its existing condition. The NMAAHC would continue to comply with all applicable local regulations in the area as would any future construction. The plot would remain designated as a Major Federal Tract by the D.C. Office of Zoning.
The Preferred Alternative provides a long term beneficial impact by ensuring that the land use of the site is preserved in perpetuity for prominent public use, continuing the symbolism of the site within the context of the National Mall, as described in the Cultural Resources section.

Visitor Use & Experience
The Smithsonian Institution, one of the most-visited museum complexes in the world, and the National Mall attract millions of visitors annually. As a result, the civic and transportation infrastructure is already in place to accommodate large numbers of visitors. According to 2004 Smithsonian Institution visitor polls, less than half of minority visitors feel that the current museum subject matter offerings are excellent or superior compared to 62 percent of the white population.

Under the Preferred Alternative, neither the construction nor the operation of the proposed NMAAHC would substantially alter long term visitorship. Based on the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) as a point of reference for a museum with a similar focus on a specific culture, there would be an initial surge in visitation to the Mall, but after several years visitorship would level out and resume a state of natural fluctuation.

The Preferred Alternative would provide a beneficial impact improving visitor enjoyment by providing a museum with new subject matter that could increase the feeling of personal relevance to minority visitors. In addition, the NMAAHC would likely provide additional opportunities for synergy between other cultural attractions and special events that cater to minority interests. Although the NMAAHC site would no longer accommodate large scale public demonstrations, the program of the facility would provide for public gathering space.

Communities & Businesses
The region of influence comprises the area in which the predominant socioeconomic effects of the NMAAHC would take place and includes Washington, D.C. as well as the inner counties and cities in Maryland and Virginia. Although NMAAHC is likely to draw visitors from all over the world, the lasting effects of the construction and operation of the NMAAHC would be felt primarily within the region of influence.

Under the Preferred Alternative, neither the construction nor the operation of the proposed NMAAHC would significantly impact local economic development, demographics, or housing. Neither would they additionally burden on community services including local schools, police, fire and rescue services, or medical facilities, environmental justice, and the protection of children. The incremental increases in tourism and tourist spending that would directly result from the opening of the NMAAHC would have a beneficial effect on local economic development.

Infrastructure and Utilities
Under Preferred Alternative, neither the construction nor the operation of the proposed NMAAHC would significantly alter the existing infrastructure or utilities or exceed the existing capacities of these systems within the project area. Existing utilities around the site would be tapped to extend services to the NMAAHC site. During the construction and linkup stages there would be temporary, but not significant, disruptions to utility services in surrounding buildings.

Hazardous waste generated due to construction and operation of the new museum would be stored, transported, and disposed as per a hazardous waste disposal program conforming to applicable EPA and District regulations and thus there would be no significant effects.
There would be no significant effects on water, sewer, electric, gas, and telephone and fiber optic capacities due to added loads consequent to the construction and operation of the museum. There are adequate capacities available for servicing the NMAAHC buildings.

The proposed project is comparable in size and scope with other buildings on the Mall. The effects are predominantly specific to the site and normal for any construction taking place in already developed area; therefore effects are not considered significant.

Public Health and Security
Under Preferred Alternative, effects to public health, safety, and security are possible during both construction and operation. During the construction phase, the occupational health of the construction workers and safety of the pedestrians in the vicinity of the site would be preserved. During the operation of the facility, security issues such as bomb threats, terrorist acts, fires, spills, leaks of hazardous material and hazardous waste, and natural disasters would be considered.

Any effects to public safety and security concerns could be safely and adequately managed in accordance with all applicable regulations and policies, thereby limiting exposures or risks.

1.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The following actions were identified as having the potential for impacts to the resources that were evaluated in the Tier I FEIS. These projects include present and reasonably foreseeable projects within the National Mall and in the surrounding area:

- National Museum of American History, Kenneth E. Behring Center Public Space Revitalization
- National Mall Road Improvements
- Smithsonian Mall Wide Perimeter Security Project
- Department of Commerce, Herbert C. Hoover Building Modernization
- Martin Luther King Jr. National Memorial
- American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial
- Proposed Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial
- Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitors Center
- United States Institute of Peace Headquarters
- 14th Street Bridge Corridor Traffic Studies
- Relocation of the National Aquarium
- City Center Action Agenda

1.7.1 Cumulative Impacts as a result of the No Build Alternative
The No Build Alternative would not result in any impacts to the resource areas analyzed in the Tier I FEIS. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts to any of the resource areas.

1.7.2 Cumulative Impacts as a result of the Preferred Alternative

Cultural Resources
The NMAAHC is one of a number of anticipated projects in the vicinity of the NMAAHC site that will cumulatively affect the historic character of the National Mall. The potential cumulative effects of the build alternatives for the NMAAHC are apparent when the proposed project is
examined in the context of planned and proposed projects on or in the vicinity of the National Mall. The accumulation of these projects on the National Mall and surrounding monumental core would have an adverse effect on the Plan of the City of Washington and the logic for the design of the National Mall.

Aesthetic and Visual Resources
There are no current projects in the vicinity of the NMAAHC that would influence any measurable cumulative impacts on aesthetics or visual resources. Any estimation of future cumulative impacts would be highly speculative, and dependent upon unknown future variables. For example, it is known that the NMAH is contemplating a western expansion, which would extend the museum’s presence closer to 14th Street and the NMAAHC site. This would likely have some level of visual effect on the NMAAHC site, but would depend on the myriad of potential massing, access, and architectural design solutions employed.

Distribution and Movement of Groundwater
Impacts to geology and soils are site specific and are not affected by cumulative development in the region. Cumulative impacts would only occur if development immediately adjacent to the site affected these resources on the site, or if development on the site affected geologic resources of the site where other development may occur. Because the site is surrounded by roads, and the only development on the site would be that of the proposed action, no cumulative impacts to either geology or soils would occur under any of the proposed alternatives.

Activities proposed under the Preferred Alternative are not expected to have any significant impacts to groundwater quantity or flows. Slurry walls and pile sheeting would be used during both the construction and operation of the proposed NMAAHC so that there would be no groundwater drawdown outside of the construction area that could affect local water courses or building foundations. Groundwater flows would be altered as the volume of the structure located below the groundwater table would impede groundwater flows and would likely cause minor variations in the depth of groundwater within the immediate vicinity of the proposed structure. The depth of the groundwater table would rise on the up gradient side and become lower on the down gradient side. Any variations in the depth of groundwater would return to normal levels the further it moves away from the structure. In addition, permanent dewatering of the site would not likely be necessary given the depth of groundwater and construction techniques. Given the impacts to groundwater resulting from the Preferred Alternative combined with the impacts to groundwater created by the overall urban characteristics; the overall cumulative impacts to groundwater would be negligible, and not considered significant.

Surface Water and Floodplain Resources
The quality of water within the Potomac River and its tributaries has been and is currently being negatively affected by intense urbanization throughout the entire watershed. Increased stormwater runoff from increased impervious surfaces, point source pollutants from wastewater treatment plants and industrial discharges, and CSO are all factors that contribute to the degrading water quality of the watershed. While the current and proposed future development projects, and any other development project within the Potomac River Watershed, would be conducted in accordance with all applicable regulatory requirements for erosion and sediment control and stormwater management, each project has the potential to incrementally degrade water quality by:

- Increasing the transport of sediments and other pollutants through overland runoff;
- Increasing the total percentage of impervious surfaces; and
- Increasing the total amount of wastewater and stormwater generated.
Under the Preferred Alternative, the overall potential to adversely impact surface water quality is negligible. While these potential negligible impacts would contribute to the overall water quality degradation caused by other past, current, and future development within the watershed, the actions proposed under these alternatives would not result in measurable changes to the overall quality of the Potomac River Watershed. Overall adverse cumulative impacts to surface waters would be negligible and not considered significant.

**Air Quality**

The metropolitan Washington D.C. area is currently in nonattainment for ozone (O3) and PM2.5. This in itself is a cumulative impact, resulting from use of cars and stationary sources, as well as from construction of new projects in and around the area. This cumulative impact is a result of past development that has generated the populations and land use patterns that have led to heavy reliance on automobiles and the urban infrastructure that generates air pollution.

Any project that is constructed in this region has the potential to add traffic and other pollution emitting sources that would contribute to the cumulative degradation of air quality in the region. There would be adverse impacts to air quality from construction activities. Although the project’s impacts would be temporary, would not an exceed NAAQS standards, and would be reduced through mitigation measures, the project would add to the continued exceedance of regional standards for ozone and PM2.5. The proposed action, in combination with other cumulative projects, such as the construction of future memorials, road improvements, and other construction projects, would cumulatively contribute to the continued exceedance State and Federal ambient air quality standards. Overall, adverse cumulative impacts to air quality would not be considered significant.

**Noise**

As the NMAAHC site is located in an already noisy commercial and public area and not in close proximity to any residential use, there would be little if any cumulative adverse impacts to noise under any of the proposed Build Alternatives. In addition, there is little opportunity of major growth or development within the immediate area of the National Mall, therefore, adverse cumulative impacts to noise under any of the proposed Build Alternatives would not be significant.

**Transportation**

While each of the cumulative effects projects has the potential to influence transportation conditions within the project area (i.e., vehicular trip generation, parking, and Metro use), the overall impacts of these projects would not likely to be considered significant. The vehicular trip generation for these facilities would be well distributed, minimizing effects on the roadway network. The effects from construction traffic and lane closures that associated with these projects would be temporary and not significant. No significant effects on vehicle parking within the immediate site area would be expected, and no significant effects on existing public transportation would be expected.

Under the Preferred Alternative, neither the construction nor the operation of the proposed NMAAHC would significantly alter roadway network and traffic, vehicle parking, existing public, transportation, and existing pedestrian and bicycle circulation and safety beyond their existing conditions. The resultant adverse cumulative that would occur when these impacts are combined with the impacts associated with the cumulative projects would not be significant.
Land Use Planning and Policies
The cumulative effects projects would not likely have any significant impacts to current land uses and zoning of the National Mall and downtown Washington D.C. area, and all of the planned construction would be in compliance with land use designations and applicable zoning laws.

Construction and operation of the proposed NMAAHC would not have any significant adverse cumulative impacts to land use or zoning as they relate to development and development patterns. The proposed construction would be in compliance with land use designations and applicable zoning laws. The land use of the project site would continue to be designated for public use with the Smithsonian Institution taking over administrative jurisdiction of the site from the National Park Service. Some uses of surrounding land may be altered to accommodate movement of vehicles, supplies, and people during the construction phase of the project, which may impact the use of surrounding sites in addition to other projects in the study area.

Visitor Use and Experience
The addition of Martin Luther King Jr. National Memorial, American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial, Proposed Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial, and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitors Center would likely increase visitorship to the National Mall. Many of these visitors would likely also visit museums associated with the Smithsonian Institution, resulting in overall beneficial impact to visitor use and experience to Washington, D.C.

No significant effects would be expected to visitorship or visitor experience during the either the construction or operation of the proposed NMAAHC. After construction is complete, as the proposed NMAAHC becomes established, it is expected that the normal fluctuations in visitorship to the National Mall and Smithsonian Institution museums would level out. There would be minor beneficial impacts on the annual Black Family Reunion, and significant beneficial effects on visitor experience would be expected with a museum that responds to a new and different cultural subject matter which may improve the sense of personal relevance. In addition, because the site is set apart from other museums by roads, there would be no effects to other museums in terms of accessibility, convenience, visiting hours, or prices.

The beneficial cumulative impacts of the actions associated with the Preferred Alternatives, when combined with the beneficial impacts to visitor use and experience from the additions of the proposed Martin Luther King Jr. National Memorial, American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial, Proposed Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial, and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitors Center, would not likely be significant. Cumulative impacts to visitor use could include the increase in visitorship per year to Smithsonian Institution museums. However, the increase in choices of sites to visit around the National Mall may lead to a reduction in the demand for visitorship of other non-Smithsonian Institution facilities. The proposed museum may possibly be substituted for another museum or monument given an individual visitor’s time constraints. Overall, the total visitorship for the Smithsonian Institution would possibly increase due to the opening of other museums of the Smithsonian Institution.

Communities and Businesses
Ongoing and planned projects in the vicinity of the proposed site could result in cumulative effects when considered together with each of the proposed alternatives for the construction of the NMAAHC. Projects in the area include the ongoing Lincoln Memorial Circle Rehabilitation and Security Improvements; the proposed Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center; construction of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial; the National Academy of Sciences addition; and nearby road improvements such as improvements to the 14th Street Bridge.
Each of the cumulative effects projects has construction timelines that may overlap at least partially with that of the NMAAHC, resulting in a greater simultaneous influx of spending into the local economy. Although this would increase the amount of economic growth in the region of influence, the growth experienced would not be cumulatively significant. Furthermore, none of these projects are expected to have any effects on demographics, housing, or community services since there is not expected to be any significant in-migration as a result of any of these projects. In addition, there are no significant cumulative effects expected to local businesses; although there may be a temporary increase in local spending, there would be no long-term cumulative effects, and short-term cumulative effects, while beneficial, would not be significant. Finally, there would be no cumulative effects expected on environmental justice and protection of children, due to the proximity of these projects to the National Mall; they are not adjacent to any census tracts that may be characterized as low-income or minority. Therefore there would be no cumulative socioeconomic effects as a result of these projects.

**Infrastructure and Urban Systems**

There would be no adverse significant cumulative effects on utilities as a result of the proposed NMAAHC. While the proposed NMAAHC would add to the service requirements of the cumulative effects projects, however, since a majority of the service providers will be regional agencies, comparative loading numbers would not be significant and adequate capacities would be available.

**Public Health and Security**

Those ongoing or proposed future projects located within the immediate vicinity of the proposed NMAAHC and considered for the cumulative impacts analysis for public health and safety and include: NMAH Kenneth Behring Center Public Space Revitalization; Department of Commerce Modernization; National Mall Road Improvements; 14th Street Bridge Corridor Traffic Project, and Relocation of the National Aquarium. Similarly, Smithsonian Mall-Wide Perimeter Security Project includes the NMAH.

There is a potential for cumulative effects on pedestrians and bicyclists within the area surrounding the site during construction activities should the construction of NMAAHC initiate during latter part of the 2007-2012 time frame scheduled for the National Mall Road Improvements, NMAH Kenneth Behring Center Public Space Revitalization, and Department of Commerce Modernization. Although the initiation of the NMAAHC construction has not been defined at this point, it is assumed that it would be in the 2012 timeframe. The completion of the construction is projected at 2015. The level of the cumulative effects would depend upon the extent of the construction activities of the other actions in the proximity to the area of the NMAAHC construction activities. The level of cumulative effects would also depend on the duration in which the construction activities of the other actions and those of the NMAAHC coincide. However, it is anticipated that with proper coordination with the applicable Federal and local agencies, the adverse cumulative effects would be addressed by enhanced signalization, signage and pavement marking improvements; therefore, the effects are not anticipated to significant.

The perimeter security measures to be put in place for the NMAH under the Smithsonian Mall-Wide Perimeter Security Project are scheduled for completion by 2009. Therefore, there would be no cumulative effects of the NMAAHC construction activities on the pedestrians and bicyclist using the area.
Long-term, it is anticipated that the NMAAHC site would benefit from the improvements to the streets in the surrounding area from other actions such as National Mall Road Improvements Project, which would provide beneficial effects for pedestrian, bicyclists, and vehicles by improving lighting, roadway, traffic control devices, sidewalks, etc. Likewise, the purpose of the 14th Street Bridge Corridor Traffic Project is to reduce congestion and improve mobility, traffic operations, and safety for all movements in the corridor. Therefore, the NMAAHC site would benefit from the improvements.

Based on the existing demand for the U.S. Park Police and District of Columbia Fire and Emergency services, the construction and operation of the NMAAHC as proposed under any of the build alternatives is not anticipated to contribute significantly to the cumulative effects of the increase in demand for such services.

### 1.8 MITIGATION MEASURES

This table lists the recommended feasible mitigation measures that would be implemented to address the environmental impacts of the Preferred Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>The exact nature of mitigations for adverse impacts on cultural resources will be determined through ongoing consultation within the Section 106 process. In addition, the tiered EIS process allows for more precise mitigations to be defined as concept designs are crystallized.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual/ Aesthetic Resources</td>
<td>In the short term, concealment screens could be designed and implemented around the site during construction. The screens could be utilized to convey information relating to background and mission of NMAAHC, including elements of African American history and culture. As with Cultural Resources, the exact nature of mitigations for adverse impacts on visual and aesthetic resources will be determined through ongoing consultation within the Section 106 process and Tier II analysis. The tiered EIS process allows for more precise mitigations to be defined as concept designs are crystallized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Distribution and Movement of Groundwater (including geology and soils) | Site-specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be developed for controlling runoff, erosion, and sedimentation during construction in accordance with the D.C. Erosion and Sedimentation Control Act of 1977 (amended in 1994). BMPs could include, but are not limited to:  
  - Using erosion containment controls such as silt fencing and sediment traps to contain sediment on site where necessary;  
  - Covering disturbed soil or soil stockpiles with plastic sheeting, jute matting, erosion netting, straw, or other suitable cover material, where applicable; Inspecting erosion and sediment... |
## Distribution and Movement of Groundwater (continued)

- Control BMPs on a regular basis and after each measurable rainfall to ensure that they are functioning properly, and maintain BMPs (repair, clean, etc.) as necessary to ensure that they continue to function properly;
- Sequencing BMP installation and removal in relation to the scheduling of earth disturbance activities, prior to, during and after earth disturbance activities.
- Prohibiting sediments from entering storm drain inlets by surrounding or covering the inlet with a filtering material. Several types of filters are commonly used for inlet protection: silt fence, rock filled bags, or block and gravel. The type of filter used depends on the inlet type (for example, curb inlet, drop inlet), slope, and volume of flow.
- Stabilizing construction exit with gravel to reduce the amount of mud transported onto paved roads by vehicles, which can then be transported to storm drains via stormwater runoff. The construction exit does this by removing mud from vehicle tires before the vehicle enters a public road.

## Surface Water Resources (including floodplains)

Implementation of erosion and sediment control plans, as directed by the Erosion and Sediment Control Program, would minimize erosion of exposed soils, slow the rate at which water leaves the site, and capture eroded soils and concentrated nutrients before they enter the downstream water flow. Increases in surface stormwater runoff during construction would be controlled by stormwater BMPs as well as erosion and sedimentation controls to reduce potential impacts to adjacent land and waters (See Distribution and Movement of Groundwater mitigations above).

Effluent created by dewatering practices associated with construction of the proposed facility would also be managed in a way that minimizes the potential impacts to water quality within the Potomac River Watershed. Dewatering practices are used to remove groundwater or accumulated rain water from excavated areas. The muddy water pumped from these excavations, would be diverted to an on-site temporary sedimentation basin or to an area completely enclosed by silt fence in a flat vegetated area where discharges can infiltrate into the ground.

Effluent would never be discharged directly into storm drains unless the sediment has been removed before discharge.

All dewatering practices would be in compliance with all local and federal permits, and DCWASA permitting processes. DCWASA allows for the discharge of construction/dewatering projects to the public sewer system on a case-by-case basis. However, prior to discharge, the contractor must submit a Temporary Discharge Authorization (TDA) Permit Application. The application submittal shall include an analysis of the wastewater, a copy of any engineering plans or documents, and a site map showing the discharge location. Once a permit is obtained, the permittee must submit periodic monitoring reports to the Pretreatment Coordinator as required under site-specific conditions in the TDA permit. Unscheduled random inspections of project sites may also be conducted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Impacts to air quality would be minimized during construction by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using ultra low sulfur diesel fuel in off-road construction equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limiting unnecessary idling times on diesel powered engines to three to five minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Locating diesel powered exhausts away from fresh air intakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilizing water or appropriate liquids for dust control during demolition, land clearing, grading, on materials stockpiled on the ground surfaces, and other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Covering open-body trucks for transporting materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Controlling dust related to the construction site through a soil erosion sediment control procedure that includes, among other things:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spraying of a suppressing agent on dust pile (non-hazardous, biodegradable);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Containment of fugitive dust; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjustment for meteorological conditions as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Noise | Noise during the construction would be mitigated by confining activities to normal working hours, and by employing noise-controlled construction equipment to the greatest extent possible; Construction contractors would adhere to the District of Columbia noise standard requirements; Arrival of heavy equipment and materials would be scheduled to occur during normal work hours to the greatest extent possible; and Air compressors and construction equipment would meet current EPA noise emission standards. |

| Transportation | The effects from construction traffic and lane closures would be minimized by conducting construction activities and transporting materials during the weekday off-peak periods, and utilizing the lower volume streets (15th Street and Madison Drive) whenever possible, in keeping with the District and Federal regulations. To address the increased potential amount of pedestrian-vehicular conflicts that would occur, enhanced signalization, signage and pavement marking improvements could be made. Additionally, the discussed underground pedestrian connection across 14th Street would also decrease pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. |

| Land Use | In the Preferred Alternative, outdoor space on the grounds of NMAAHC will be open to the public and support a range of programmed activities, to be determined in the future, that will enhance the adjacent open space and landscape. |

| Visitor Use & Experience | Concealment screens would be designed and implemented around the site to decrease impacts to visitor experience from increased noise and dust generated from the construction activities. The loss of a public space for gatherings and demonstrations would be mitigated by providing outdoor space on the grounds of NMAAHC that is open to the public, accessible to visitors with disabilities, and supports a range of programmed activities. |

| Communities and Business | Since effects of the operation of the museum are expected to be beneficial to the ROI, no mitigation would be required. |

| Utilities and Infrastructure | Disruption to existing utility lines during construction would be mitigated by providing adequate setbacks, shielding, and embankments to prevent accidental damage or earth shifting from around the utility lines. Any utilities occurring in the construction area would be adequately rerouted. |
Utilities and Infrastructure (continued)  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to the site’s periphery and away from construction limits. Prior to construction, coordination with different service providers would help to reduce the construction and utility laying time within and around the site. In order to avoid disruption to the existing gas transmission line in the Preferred Alternative, the configuration of the basement levels could be slightly modified to avoid the minimum required setback. The configuration of basement levels can be extended to the property line of the site assuming that the design process takes into account the ground shock effects and adequately details the design of building perimeter walls and basement floor slabs. Proper solid and hazardous waste management as per regulation and applicable criteria would minimize any adverse effects to the environment. Hazardous waste storage, transportation, disposal and accidental spills would be addressed in accordance with the EPA and District/state/local regulations. Adequate contaminant monitoring systems like chlorine monitoring system for potable water and toxic and combustible gas sensors would be considered and incorporated in the building systems design where appropriate. Hazardous waste would be stored, transported and disposed in accordance with Smithsonian Institution procedures and polices and applicable laws and regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Health and Security  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Appropriate signage would be posted near the site to redirect pedestrians and bicyclists away from the construction area during the construction period. Construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the applicable regulations and guidance and would ensure the safety and health of the workers during construction. In addition to the 50-foot setback, potential mitigation measures for building security could include:  
  - Hardening of the museum structure and façade; and  
  - Using appropriate materials for the construction.  
  - Potential perimeter security measures, pursuant to the Smithsonian Mall Wide Perimeter Security Project (See Section 3.3), include:  
    - Hardening of the furniture that would typically be installed along a streetscape such as benches, bus shelters, and newspaper stands;  
    - Installing low plinth walls, planters, and curbside hedges with embedded security.  
In addition, the NMAAHC would require enhanced signalization, signage and pavement marking improvements to increase pedestrian safety. |   |

1.9 FEIS COMMENTS AND RESPONSES  

Following the publication Tier I DEIS and the subsequent comment period from December 21, 2007 to January 18, 2008, the Tier I FEIS was prepared and incorporated responses to the comments received. The Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Tier I FEIS was published in the Federal Register on June 27, 2008. The formal review period for the Tier I FEIS closed July 28, 2008, 31 days after the release of the document. Three letters were received on the Tier I FEIS.
1.9.1 Comment Letter 1 - Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

EPA stated that the Tier I FEIS adequately addressed their Tier I DEIS comments submitted on February 2, 2008. The EPA has no objections to the construction or operation of the NMAAHC at the selected site.

The EPA enumerated several additional comments related to Environmental Justice that should be addressed in the Tier II NEPA process:

1. A standard method of assessment to identify potential areas of Environmental Justice concerns. EPA suggests using the state, county, and Ward level of percentages of minority and low-income residents to be used as benchmarks in identifying at-risk communities. These benchmarks should be used as the instrument by which individual communities that may be impacted by the NMAAHC may be measured. This screening will provide a list of communities of concern in the region of influence (ROI).

2. Consider and identify minority and low-income populations in the ROI and consider if any of these communities will be adversely affected by all activities associated with the construction or operation of the NMAAHC, and specifically, the short term and indirect impacts associated with construction and the resultant noise, dust, waste management, and traffic impacts to adjacent neighborhoods. The location of these impacts, if any, should be located and quantified.

3. Consider public engagement with target communities to discuss potential impacts that may occur as a result of the proposed action.

Response:
A Traffic Control Plan will be prepared during Tier II. This plan will determine the routes construction vehicles will most likely take to and from the site during the construction phase of this project. These proposed construction routes will be overlaid onto maps showing socioeconomic and demographic data within the District and surrounding counties. If the routes are shown to travel through or adjacent to minority and/or low-income neighborhoods, their impacts will be quantified, and mitigations will be established to avoid or minimize noise, dust, waste management, and traffic impacts on these populations. Public participation will be encouraged during Tier II with special emphasis on any neighborhoods or communities within the District or surrounding counties that would be disproportionately affected by the proposed action.

1.9.2 Comment Letter 2 – District Department of Transportation

DDOT stated that the Tier I FEIS adequately addressed the Tier I DEIS comments submitted on January 24, 2008, but restated that the curbs on 14th Street should not be used for visitor drop off, nor can Metrobus stops be used concurrently with tour bus stops.

DDOT accepts that the service entrance location will be identified in the Tier II NEPA process and encourages the Smithsonian Institution to fulfill its commitment to work with DDOT to resolve impacts to traffic resulting from the service access.

Response:
During the Tier II analysis, the Smithsonian Institution will include DDOT in the scoping process so that they may be involved in the evaluation of impacts related to the design of the facility, particularly the impacts resulting from the main visitor entrance and service access. During the Tier II scoping process, DDOT can work collaboratively with the Smithsonian Institution and design architects to identify a suitable drop off area for tour buses and implement mitigation measures to offset any adverse impacts to traffic along 14th Street.
1.9.3 Comment Letter 3 – National Coalition to Save Our Mall

The National Coalition to Save Our Mall provided numerous comments focused around four general themes:

1. Concern that critical information will not be made available until Tier II
2. Concern that the Site Selection Process was contrary to the National Environmental Policy Act.
3. Concern for the stability of the Washington Monument, and a perceived lack of data relative to groundwater levels and soil conditions
4. Concern for the NMAAHC’s Effect to Historic Resources and the belief that any of the potential building configurations embodied in the Tier I FEIS alternatives is incompatible with the architectural surrounding.

Responses

1. In the course of the NEPA process for the NMAAHC’s construction and operation, it became apparent that certain impacts, particularly impacts on historic, cultural and visual/aesthetic resources, would best be analyzed using concept designs, but that the development of concept designs would benefit from results of environmental analysis. The decision to issue a Tier I FEIS allows the Smithsonian to use the best available information to inform concept development. Tier II analysis will be completed before final design decisions are implemented.

2. The Tier I FEIS, and this ROD explain that the Smithsonian was not required to perform NEPA analysis during the site selection, but is performing NEPA analysis in partnership with NCPC because the NMAAHC design will be submitted to NCPC for approval, triggering NEPA requirements.

3. Tier I concluded that the individual and cumulative effects on flooding, groundwater and soils relative to nearby structures, including the Washington Monument, would be insignificant based on analysis of existing studies enumerated in the Tier I FEIS. The Smithsonian Institution will commence a geotechnical analysis in Fall 2008. The Tier II NEPA process will incorporate the findings of this survey including a more detailed analysis of the underlying geology, soils, and groundwater conditions and the potential impacts to the vicinity, including the Washington Monument. Smithsonian is participating in developing a joint Federal and District study to analyze and better manage interior drainage and stormwater in the Federal Triangle/Mall area. In addition, there is a current effort to develop a new levee at 17th Street in order to provide reliable river flood protection.

4. The Smithsonian Institution has determined, along with the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, that construction of any museum building, as defined in this undertaking’s authorizing legislation, on this site will have an adverse effect on historic resources. The Smithsonian will endeavor to minimize and mitigate such affects. At this stage, the Tier I FEIS design principles have been developed to ensure that the future concept designs respond to the historical landscape and recognize important views and vistas. There will be multiple design reviews presented to NCPC over the course of the Tier II NEPA process and continuing Section 106 process (see Attachment B).
1.10 DETERMINATIONS AND FINDINGS

At this stage, completion of the Tier I FEIS, it can be determined that the Preferred Alternative will not have a significant effect on groundwater, surface water, and transportation resources, and on air quality, noise, land use, visitor use, communities & businesses, infrastructure, utility services, public health and security areas. There will be adverse effects on some visual and aesthetic resources as well as on the historic character of the Washington Monument Grounds, historic views and vistas, and other historic resources in the area of potential effect. Using the Preferred Alternative, the Smithsonian Institution will develop concept designs that will yield more refined building parameters against which the impacts to visual and cultural resources can be more accurately assessed in Tier II. Additionally, the Smithsonian will commence geotechnical analysis in the Fall of 2008, which will be incorporated in Tier II.

The Preferred Alternative would have long term beneficial impacts by providing a national venue for the collection, study, preservation, and exhibition of artifacts, documents, and programs relating to African American life, art, history, and culture. The national venue will be a meeting place for all people to learn about the history and culture of African Americans and their contributions to and relationship with every aspect of the collective national life of America. In addition, the NMAAHC would provide a forum for collaboration with other museums, historically black colleges and universities, historical societies, educational institutions, and other organizations that promote the study or appreciation of African American issues.

1.11 SECTION 106

The effects of the construction and operation of the NMAAHC on historic and archaeological resources have been assessed in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its implementing regulations (36 C.F.R. 800). The Preferred Alternative will have adverse effects on several resources listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as described in the Tier I FEIS.

The measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse effects to these historic and archeological resources will be resolved through continuing consultation with the NMAAHC Section 106 consulting parties, which will extend into the Tier II NEPA process (See Attachment B). At the conclusion of the Tier II NEPA process, it is anticipated that there will be a final Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement that will formalize the measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse effects to historic and archeological resources resulting from the proposed action.

1.12 FUTURE ACTIONS TO REDUCE POTENTIAL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

During Tier II, the Smithsonian Institution and NCPC will assess the impacts of a full range of viable alternative concept designs on viewsheds and views such as of service areas, historic resources, geotechnical, loading and access, and any other effects important to the ultimate decision.
ATTACHMENT A

NMAAHC Section 106 Consultation Supporting Materials
Streets
2nd Street  Constitution Avenue
3rd Street  Independence Avenue
4th Street  Pennsylvania Avenue
6th Street  Virginia Avenue
7th Street  New York Avenue
8th Street  Indiana Avenue
9th Street  Maryland Avenue
10th Street  Madison Drive
11th Street  Jefferson Drive
12th Street  Henry Bacon Drive
13th Street  Daniel French Drive
14th Street  Lincoln Memorial Circle
15th Street
17th Street
19th Street
20th Street
21st Street
22nd Street
23rd Street

Appropriations and Reservations
Reservation No. 1: President’s Park
(Original Appropriation No. 1)
Reservation No. 2: Washington Monument Grounds
(Original Appropriation No. 3; Reservation No. 2)
Reservation Nos. 3, 3B, 4, 5, 6, and 6A: National Mall
(Part of Original Appropriation No. 2)
Reservation No. 332: West Potomac Park
Reservation No. 333: East Potomac Park

Plan of the City of Washington, DC
Contributing Streets, Reservations, and Appropriations

SECTION 106 | CULTURAL RESOURCES
Individually Listed Historic Properties

1. American National Red Cross [NHL, NR, DC]
2. American Pharmaceutical Institute [NR, DC]
3. Arlington Memorial Bridge [NR, DC]
4. Arts and Industries Building [NHL, NR, DC]
5. Bartholdi Fountain [NR Exempt, DC]
6. Bulfinch Gatehouse and Gateposts [NR, DC]
7. Constitution Hall (Daughters of the American Revolution) [NHL, NR, DC]
8. Corcoran Gallery of Art [NHL, NR, DC]
9. DAR Memorial Continental Hall [NHL, NR, DC]
10. District of Columbia District Building [NR, DC]
11. The Ellipse [NR]
12. Jefferson Memorial Bridge [NR, DC]
13. Federal Reserve Board Building [DC]
14. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial [NR]
15. Freer Gallery of Art [NR, DC]
16. Korean War Veterans Memorial [NR]
17. Lincoln Memorial [NR, DC]
18. Lock Keeper’s House [NR, DC]
19. National Academy of Science and Engineering [NR, DC]
20. National Archives [NR, DC]
21. National Gallery of Art West Building [DC]
22. National Museum of Natural History [DC]
23. Old Post Office Building [NR, DC]
24. Pan American Union (Organization of American States) [NR, DC]
25. Smithsonian Institution Building (Castle) [NHL, NR, DC]
26. U.S. Botanic Gardens [DC]
27. U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing [DC]
28. U.S. Capitol and Grounds [NHL, NR, DC]
29. U.S. Department of Agriculture (Administration Building) [NR, DC]
30. U.S. Department of Agriculture South Building [NR Eligible]
31. U.S. Department of the Interior (New Interior Building) [NR, DC]
32. U.S. Department of the Interior Offices [NR]
33. U.S. Department of the Interior South Building [NR Eligible]
34. U.S. Department of the Treasury Building [NR]
35. U.S. State, War, and Navy Building [NHL, NR, DC]
36. Van Ness House Stables [DC]
37. Vietnam Veterans Memorial [NR]
38. Washington Monument and Grounds [NR, DC]
39. White House [NR, DC]
40. WWII Memorial [NR, DC]

Affected Area:

- The Mall [NR, DC]
Historic Districts and Contributing Properties

**The National Mall Historic District**

- Northwest Rectangle Historic District
  - Determined Eligible for the National Register
  1. Old Department of the Interior Building (GSA)
  2. Corcoran Gallery of Art
  3. Pan American Union (Organization of American States)
  4. DAR Memorial Continental Hall
  5. DAR Constitution Hall
  6. American National Red Cross
  7. American Institute of Pharmacist
  8. National Academy of Sciences
  9. Federal Reserve Board Building
  10. Office of Personnel Management
  11. Van Ness House Stable
  12. War Department
  13. Sherman Statue, Sherman Park
  14. Benjamin Franklin Statue, SE corner Pennsylvania & 12th Street
  15. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, Market Square Park
  16. General George C. Meade Memorial, Meade Plaza
  17. Peace Monument, Pennsylvania Avenue & 1st Street
  18. Captain Nathan Hale Statue, Department of Justice
  19. Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain, Mellon Park
  20. U.S. Post Office Building, Federal Triangle
  21. Freedom Plaza
  22. U.S. Post Office Department (Ariel Rios)
  23. 56 Signers Memorial
  24. Vietnam Veterans Memorial (see individual memorial listing)
  25. Vietnam Women's Memorial
  26. Korean War Memorial (see individual memorial listing)

**Seventeenth Street Historic District**

- Determined Eligible for the National Register
  1. Old Department of the Interior Building (GSA)
  2. Corcoran Gallery of Art (see individual listing)
  3. Pan American Union (see individual listing)
  4. DAR Memorial Continental Hall (see individual listing)
  5. American National Red Cross
  6. American National Red Cross Administration Building
  7. American National Red Cross Office
  8. American Red Cross D.C. Chapter House
  9. American Institute of Pharmacist

**Pennsylvanian Avenue National Historic Site**

- NHS, October 15, 1966; DC Inventory, June 19, 1973
  1. Department of Treasury
  2. Department of Commerce, Federal Triangle
  3. District Building, Federal Triangle
  5. Internal Revenue Service Building, Federal Triangle
  6. Department of Justice, Federal Triangle
  7. Labor Department, Interstate Commerce and Departmental Auditorium
  8. National Archives, Federal Triangle
  9. Old Post Office Building, Federal Triangle
  10. U.S. Post Office Department (Ariel Rios)
  11. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial
  12. Reflecting Pool
  13. Stone Seawalls
  14. Independence Avenue Extension

**Federal Triangle Historic District**

- DC Inventory, March 7, 1968; Federal Triangle National Register
  1. Department of Commerce
  2. District Building (see individual listing)
  3. Federal Trade Commission
  4. Internal Revenue Service
  5. Department of Justice
  6. Labor Department, ICC, and Departmental Auditorium
  7. National Archives (see individual listing)
  8. Old Post Office Building (see individual listing)
  9. Ariel Rios
  10. Jefferson Memorial Grounds (see individual memorial listing)
  11. Constitution Gardens
  12. 56 Signers Memorial
  13. Vietnam Veterans Memorial (see individual memorial listing)
  14. Vietnam Women's Memorial
  15. Korean War Memorial (see individual memorial listing)

**West Potomac Park Historic District**

- National Register, November 30, 1973 (revised November 11, 2001); DC Inventory, November 8, 1964
  1. Lock Keeper's House (see individual listing)
  2. Tidal Basin
  3. Number 4 Fountain
  4. John Paul Jones Monument
  5. Japanese Cherry Trees and Statuary
  6. Lincoln Memorial Grounds (see individual memorial listing)
  7. John Ericsson Monument
  8. DC WWI Memorial
  9. Kutz Bridge & Independence Avenue Extension
  10. Jefferson Memorial Grounds (see individual memorial listing)
  11. Constitution Gardens
  12. 56 Signers Memorial
  13. Vietnam Veterans Memorial (see individual memorial listing)
  14. Vietnam Women's Memorial
  15. Korean War Memorial (see individual memorial listing)
  16. Independence Avenue Extension

**East Potomac Park Historic District**

- National Register, November 30, 1973 (revised November 11, 2001)
  1. Potomac Railroad Bridge
  2. U.S. Engineers Storehouse (900 Ohio Dr., SW)
  3. Field House, Golf Course, Mini Golf Course
  4. Ohio Drive, SW

**National Mall Historic District**

- Determined Eligible for the National Register
  1. Old Department of the Interior Building (GSA)
  2. Corcoran Gallery of Art
  3. Pan American Union (Organization of American States)
  4. DAR Memorial Continental Hall
  5. DAR Constitution Hall
  6. American National Red Cross
  7. American Institute of Pharmacist
  8. National Academy of Sciences
  9. Federal Reserve Board Building
  10. Office of Personnel Management
  11. Van Ness House Stable
  12. War Department
  13. Sherman Statue, Sherman Park
  14. Benjamin Franklin Statue, SE corner Pennsylvania & 12th Street
  15. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, Market Square Park
  16. General George C. Meade Memorial, Meade Plaza
  17. Peace Monument, Pennsylvania Avenue & 1st Street
  18. Captain Nathan Hale Statue, Department of Justice
  19. Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain, Mellon Park
  20. U.S. Post Office Building, Federal Triangle
  21. Freedom Plaza
  22. U.S. Post Office Department (Ariel Rios)
  23. 56 Signers Memorial
  24. Vietnam Veterans Memorial (see individual memorial listing)
  25. Vietnam Women's Memorial
  26. Korean War Memorial (see individual memorial listing)
  27. Jefferson Memorial Grounds (see individual memorial listing)
  28. Constitution Gardens
  29. 56 Signers Memorial
  30. Vietnam Veterans Memorial (see individual memorial listing)
  31. Vietnam Women's Memorial
  32. Korean War Memorial (see individual memorial listing)
### Overarching Principles & Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Character/Quality</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The NMAAHC building and site design will be exquisite and monumental.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NMAAHC building and site design will be unobtrusive and neutral.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mission and Program

| The NMAAHC building will have a minimum height that is not out of character (too horizontal) with its surroundings. | X            | X            | X            | X            |              |              |
| The NMAAHC building will have a mean height that will exceed the height of the tallest museum building on the Mall (National Gallery of Art East Building) or the cornice height of the Commerce building immediately opposite the NMAAHC site. | O            | O            | O            | O            | O            | O            |

#### Monumental Context

| Monuments, museums, memorials and other cultural resources. | X            | X            | X            | X            |              |              |
| Strong linkages (physical connections and/or visual connections) will be reinforced with museums, monuments, memorials and other cultural resources. | X            | X            | X            | X            |              |              |
| Measures to reduce risks to security will be applied equally to all alternatives. These measures will be incorporated during the design phase of this project. |              |              |              |              |              |              |

#### Urban Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical context</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The NMAAHC building and site design will provide a transition from the museum row to the Monument and beyond.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NMAAHC building and site design will provide a transition from the museum row to the Monument and beyond.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Historic and Cultural Resource Protection Principles

| View from the Washington Monument will be protected and enhanced when designing and placing mechanical equipment and functions typically located on a museum roof. |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| Key views are deemed to be the reciprocal views to and from the Washington Monument, including views of the grounds to the base of the Monument and from and the top of the Monument, views of the Mall from the north and south along 15th Street, and views from Constitution Avenue towards the monument. |              |              |              |              |              |              |

#### Visitor Use and Access Principles

| Visitor use and access space for NMAAHC programs and activities will be provided. | XX           | X            |              |              |              |              |
| Multiple entrances to NMAAHC will be provided that accommodate different group purposes and that facilitate public circulation from the Mall and Monuments and other museums, and from public transportation. | XX           | X            |              |              |              |              |

#### Functional Principles

| Functional principles will be developed during the design phase. | XX           | X            | X            | X            |              |              |
| Opportunities for pedestrian connections to the National Museum of American History will be considered for all action alternatives. |              |              |              |              |              |              |

### NMAAHC Principles Matrix - March 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Building Alignment</th>
<th>Washington Monument Orientation</th>
<th>Free Form</th>
<th>Terraced Roof</th>
<th>Enframing</th>
<th>Low Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
<td>Alternative 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cultural Resources

**Views and Viewsheds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Panorama of WAMO grounds from WWII Memorial and Base of Reflecting Pool</th>
<th>Panorama of WAMO grounds from 17th Street &amp; Constitution</th>
<th>Panorama of Washington Monument grounds from 14th Street &amp; Constitution</th>
<th>E Multidirectional views from WAMO</th>
<th>B Multidirectional views from WAMO</th>
<th>Viewshed along Independence Avenue</th>
<th>Viewshed along Constitution Avenue</th>
<th>Multi-directional panoramic views within the Washington Monument grounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 6</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 7</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 8</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Floodplains**: No Significant Effect/Minor Effect
- **Air Quality**: No Significant Effect
- **Noise**: No Significant Effect
- **Traffic, Parking, Pedestrian, Bicycle Circulation**: No Significant Effect
- **Ground Water**: No Significant Effect
- **Water Quality**: No Significant Effect
- **Soils**: No Significant Effect
- **Vegetation**: No Significant Effect
- **Pesticides**: No Significant Effect
- **Public Health and Security**: No Significant Effect
- **Public Use and Experience**: No Significant Effect
- **Public Health and Security**: No Significant Effect
- **Utilities and Infrastructure**: No Significant Effect
- **Public Health and Security**: No Significant Effect

### Visual Resources

**Land Use, Circulation, Vegetation and Topography** are indistinguishable per alternative.

- **Building and Structures**: Diminishes visual impact of the Monument
- **Viewshed to Old Post Office tower toward Washington Monument grounds**: Height and massing would potentially obstruct views of the Old Post Office tower from the Washington Monument grounds and potentially obstruct views of the Washington Monument from the tower observatory
- **Top of Old Post Office**: View becomes obstructed
- **Constitution looking west**: View becomes obstructed
- **SW corner of WAMO grounds**: View becomes obstructed

**Effects Matrix**

- **Cultural Resources**: The adverse effect is apparent and would diminish overall integrity, or would alter a character-defining feature(s) of the National Register eligible/listed property.
- **In Cultural Resources, the adverse effect is detectable, but slight, and would minimally diminish overall integrity, or affect the character-defining feature(s) of the National Register eligible/listed property.**

---

In Cultural Resources, the adverse effect is apparent and would diminish overall integrity, or would alter a character-defining feature(s) of the National Register eligible/listed property.

In Cultural Resources, the adverse effect is detectable, but slight, and would minimally diminish overall integrity, or affect the character-defining feature(s) of the National Register eligible/listed property.
ATTACHMENT B

Roadmap for NMAAHC Tiered NEPA process, Section 106 Consultation, and Design Process
Roadmap for National Museum of African American History and Culture EIS - Section 106 Consultation - Design Process

**Key:**
- **Product**
- **Decision Document**
- **Process**
- **Review/Milestone**
- **Meeting**

**2008**
- Tier I FEIS Decision
- Design Competition
- Tier I FEIS Decision
- Section 106

**2009**
- Scoping
  - Geotechnical analysis
  - Analysis of Effects Report
    - Draft MOA
    - Repeat 800.4
    - Repeat 800.5
  - Final Concept Briefing
- Design Competition
- Briefing to NCPC, Agencies & Public
- Program

**2010**
- Concept Briefing
  - Agencies & Public
  - Concept Review
    - CFA & NCPC
    - Full Commissions
  - Concept Update(s)
    - CFA & NCPC
    - Full Commissions
- Design Competition

**2011**
- Final Design Review
  - Concept Review (CFA & NCPC)
  - Full Commissions
- MOA
- 106 Compliance

**2012**
- Final Design Review
  - Design Competition
  - Program
- Roadmap
- Design Principles
- 800.3
- 800.4
- 800.5
- Tier II NEPA
  - SI & NCPC
  - Tier II ROD or FONSI
- SI Tier II FEIS Decision
- Decision Document
- Process
- Review/Milestone
- Meeting

**Key Dates:**
- 7/2/08
ATTACHMENT C
NMAAHC Tier I EIS Viewshed Analysis
View from the top of the Washington Monument

View from 14th Street looking north

View from 15th Street looking north

View toward NMAAHC site from Washington Monument base

View from NE Corner of 14th & Constitution

From Constitution Avenue looking east

From center of Ellipse looking southeast

From southwest corner of Washington Monument grounds