

Location of Meeting	600 Maryland Ave. SW 4 th Floor Conference Room	
Time of Meeting	February 18, 2009 9:35am-12:30pm	
Attendees	Sharon Park, SI Andrew Lewis, DC HPO Peter May, NPS Ken Walton, NCPC Bill Dowd, NCPC Gene Keller, NCPC Patsy Fletcher, AAHGS Nancy Witherell, NCPC Don Hawkins, Jane Passman, SI Thomas Luebke, CPA	F.J. Lindstrom, CFA Sarah Batcheler, CFA Nancy Witherell, NCPC Harry Rombach, SI Curtis Davis, SI Amy Ballard, AHHP, SI Dreck Wilson, ASALH Tom Whitley Lynn Chase, SI/NMAAHC Martha Catlin, ACHP

Introduction and Welcome

Sharon Park provided an overview of the December 4th, 2009 meeting between SI and NCPC during which the SI presented a history of the work and programming information for the NMAAHC completed to date. NCPC was very responsive and particularly interested in the conceptual design phase.

Update on Design Competition

Curtis Davis reviewed the six design firms that were selected for the competition and stated that submissions are due by March 27th. The teams are:

- Devroux & Purnell Architects/Planners, P.C, and Pei Cobb Freed & Partners Architects, LLP
- Diller Scofidio + Renfro in association with Kling Stubbins
- Foster + Partners and URS
- Freelon Adjaye Bond in association with Smith Group
- Moody Nolan Inc. in association with Antoine Predock Architect PC
- Moshe Safdie and Associates Inc. in association with Sultan Campbell Britt & Associates

The submissions will be exhibited to the general public in the SI Castle from Saturday, March 28 to Tuesday, April 7[subsequently extended through April 15]. The teams will have 55 days to deliver six boards that represent their concepts as well as a model at 1” = 16’ scale. A site model at a reference of 1:50 will also be made to inform the jurors. The presentations and jury deliberations will be closed to the public.

The jury will make its recommendation by mid-April. By late April the information should be available to the public. Don Stastny (design competition adviser to the Smithsonian Institution) wanted to have jury members who were both prominent in the profession but also educators who can successfully collaborate. The jurors include:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lonnie G. Bunch III • Robert Kogod • Maurice Cox • Robert Campbell • Adèle Naudé Santos • James A Johnson | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard D. Parsons • Franklin D. Raines • Linda Johnson Rice • Mike Bellamy, P.E. • Sheryl Kolasinski, FAIA |
|--|---|

The SI assembled a briefing package for each juror. The selection process will take three days (between April 1st and 3rd). There will be two days of presentation and one day of deliberation. The panel will write

a report which will be submitted to the SI Office of Contracting. SI anticipates that the architect will be under contract between mid-July and mid-September 2009.

There is an invitation for the Consulting Parties to view competition submittals on Friday, March 27th, 2009 between 6:00pm-8:00pm in the SI Castle, Schermer Hall.

Design Competition Discussion

One participant asked how the consulting parties can use competition to inform the EIS alternatives development and design principles.

Curtis Davis responded that the SI is looking to develop a point of view from the consulting parties so that the design can be informed by the consulting parties. He noted that the group is not selecting which design is best, rather, it is selecting characteristics or features that will enhance the NMAAHC site. In response to a question, it was noted that each team included design and production architects.

One participant asked if the current NMAAHC design process differs from the NMAI design process.

Curtis Davis responded that the NMAI was very focused on Indian culture and the building needed to respond to that cultural perspective that has been lost. Conversely, African American culture is so imbued in American culture that considerations for building design are different. Moreover, the NMAI did not have an associated EIS but had a very involved consultative process. Finally, the architects were selected out of an RFQ and there was no design competition involved.

Sharon Park added that all pre-programming and NEPA documents have been provided to the architects as background information so that they know how the six build alternatives were selected and are familiar with the site issues.

Martha Catlin asked if there has been an opportunity for the design teams to be briefed on the Mall Plan and its current status.

Curtis Davis responded that the SI referenced the National Mall Plan, however, the details of the Plan have not been shared. It was noted that NPS was planning to provide a briefing about its preferred alternative at the CFA meeting the following day.

Sharon Park stated that she believes that the architects are aware of the Potomac Park Levee project and the geotechnical issues that are being addressed as part of a joint Federal/DC hydrology study, as well as the National Mall Plan. Given the questions that the architects have been asking, it is clear that they understand the relevant issues such as the impacts to the views and vistas, cross axial relationships on the site, and the historical evolution of the Mall.

Sharon Park clarified that the winning design selected from the competition will not become the final design for the NMAAHC. Curtis Davis stated that the SI would like the products of the design competition to generate distinct concepts that coincide with the design principles. The concepts will be used to generate alternatives for evaluation in the Tier II EIS.

Martha Catlin asked if the Consulting Parties could make specific comments that would be given to the Jury at the time of deliberation regarding the six concept/idea designs from the competition. Both Curtis Davis and Sharon Park indicated that while public comments were welcome for the competition as a process, the comments would not be consolidated for use by the Jury. Don Stastny will be asked whether or not any of the comments will be summarized for the Jury, but as the deliberation process is controlled by a set of criteria and is not to be influenced outside of the Jury, there will not be formal comments made to the Jury.

Kick-Off for Tier II EIS: Group Discussion

Jane Passman reviewed the timeline for the Tier II EIS and continuing Section 106 Process. The SI has been trying to refine the road map to coordinate the design process with the Tier II and Section 106 processes.

The SI will refine the design principles based on the initial architectural concepts that are generated from the competition. Then, the refined principles would inform the design architect to guide the development of the Tier II EIS alternatives. The goal is to have this process occur prior to the Tier II EIS kick off and scoping. Since there is a greater number of impact topics that can be dismissed in the Tier II EIS based on the Tier I EIS, the goal is to combine agency and public scoping.

Sharon Park reminded the group that there will not be an architect on-board until September 2009. After the competition when there are six model alternatives, the consulting parties can begin meeting to discuss which options work within the six and which do not. The consulting parties do not have a role in the selection of a design team, only in evaluating the six alternatives.

There was discussion regarding the timing of several items on the timeline, such as when it is appropriate to develop a draft MOA and when three distinct concept designs would be presented to the agencies for review. Also, how would avoidance, minimization and mitigation be incorporated into an MOA?

Nancy Witherell stated that she wishes to have a discussion on avoidance and mitigation in April when the consulting parties discuss the design principles.

Gene Keller noted that documentation related to labels 800.4 and 800.5 needs to be in the DEIS, and then the MOA needs to occur when the Tier II ROD is developed. There cannot be an executed ROD until the outcome of the MOA process is resolved.

Martha Catlin asked if an additional evaluation of National Register properties is expected. If not, then 800.4 can be removed because it was completed in Tier I. In addition, label 800.5 can be consultation documents put in draft and final to capture input from participants.

Next Steps, Next Meetings, Process for Agency Reviews

Sharon Park reminded the team that the concept of the project must be considered within the framework of other projects in the area. For example, a new entrance to the aquarium on Constitution Avenue is planned. She asked for input from participants on other projects in the area.

Curtis Davis noted that information about pedestrian crossways and pathways would be particularly useful.

Martha Catlin suggested that the National Coalition to Save Our Mall may have that pedestrian information and Nancy Witherell stated that NPS may also have that information.

Sharon Park clarified that that the Section 106 process is in effect until groundbreaking.

Martha Catlin noted that the MOA could resolve the conclusion of the Section 106 process as well; stating that if the consulting parties do not need to meet anymore, then we will not meet.

Sharon Park announced that the next scheduled meeting is April 15th, 2009. The agenda will focus on discussion of the design competition models. The Consulting Parties agreed that perhaps the entire meeting should be on the competition submissions and that a later meeting be set aside for review of other on-going projects in the Area of Potential Effects, such as a presentation of the National Mall Plan.