

Location of Meeting	600 Maryland Ave, NW – 400	
Time of Meeting	9:30am – 12:00pm	
Purpose of Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of Public Hearing and summary of comments 2. Discussion of priorities of consulting parties relative to comments received 3. Confirmation of Tier 1 & Tier 2 Elements 4. Establish a format for developing guidance for design architects/landscape architects 5. Timeline/benchmarks for setting up consulting party meetings '08-'09 	
Attendees:	Sharon Park, SI Jane Passman, SI Curtis Davis, SI Harry Rombach, SI Amy Ballard, SI David Maloney, DC HPO Martha Catlin, ACHP Gene Keller, NCPC Nancy Witherell, NCPC Frederick Lindstrom, CFA Ken Walter, NCPC	Nell Ziehl, NTHP Felicia Bell, USCHS Perry Wheelock, NPS Peter May, NPS Patsy Fletcher, AAGHS Jess Commerford, Berger Rudi Byron, Berger Judy Robinson, Robinson and Associates Hany Hassan, BBB Kevin Storm, BBB

Sharon Park welcomed the attendees and introduced Nell Ziehl from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, who will be participating as a new consulting party member in the Section 106 process.

REVIEW OF PUBLIC HEARING AND SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Berger provided an overview of the January 10, 2008 public hearing. A total of eight speakers provided testimony including five individuals and three representatives of organizations. The Smithsonian Institution elected to extend the public comment period for an additional two weeks, to February 19, 2008. During the comment period, thirteen letters were received. These letters, combined with the public testimony and the website comment forms, generated 105 separate comments. The common themes of the comments included:

- Site selection, specifically the level of appropriateness of the Monument site
- transportation, including service and loading access, traffic, pedestrian access, and bus access
- Alternatives and urban design context, relative to massing, height, and setback.
- Flooding and Geotechnical issues
- Sustainability
- Resource areas in the DEIS

DISCUSSION OF PRIORITIES OF CONSULTING PARTIES RELATIVE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

Sharon Park stated that all comments on alternatives will help to inform the design element of Tier 2.

Curtis Davis noted that the goal of the tier 1 process is to illustrate concerns about the values people have about the space. He stated that there is not a lot of articulate written discourse about the landscape quality of the Mall. The SI would like to ensure that within the tier 1, the qualities that inform the landscape and make it unique are well articulated.

Perry Wheelock responded that the Washington Monument Cultural Landscape Report provides a new approach to analyzing the site and land. NPS is making great strides in this topic.

Judy Robinson confirmed that this document has been used extensively in the presentations; many specific landscape features have been highlighted.

Jane Passman noted that the consulting parties have been discussing historic resources within the S106 process, but the EIS and the future design will take into account urban design issues that are not confined to historic properties such as landscaping for the perimeter security improvements.

Martha Catlin responded that it was not appropriate to draw lines between concepts as it prevents the site from being analyzed comprehensively. She noted that this site is an evolving property. All characteristics and its components are part of its history and character; urban design is a part of that. The goal is to achieve a compatibility with the characteristics for the setting. She stated that the landscape document should be a consultation document on which everyone can comment.

Several representatives from organizations clarified their comments on the DEIS.

Patsy Fletcher stated that Alternative 6 has the most support from AAHGS, although too much underground space is objectionable.

Martha Catlin requested that the Smithsonian Institution provide an outline for the approach to interact with different commissions and organizations through the concept design process. A road map will ease the period between now and concept approval.

Frederick Lindstrom stated that, during the concept approval process, CFA would be amenable to meeting together with NCPC in initial staff coordination.

David Maloney summarized the DC HPO comments:

- In hindsight, this location is a defensible site and the most appropriate for the NMAAHC.
- It is important to examine the relationship of the NMAAHC to the north Constitution row of museums. Originally, the Mall did not extend past 14th Street...indicating that something different needs to be done at this site.
- The relationship of the site to the buildings around it, as well as the other end of the Mall (east Gallery) is important.
- Alternative 6 is the closest to meeting the right objectives; it has the best overall scale and reduces most troubling impacts.
- Service and loading access must be underground. No frontage should have a loading dock.
- The view from Arlington Cemetery and the Arlington House are important. Presently, no alternative presently shows a relationship to the row of museums.
- The NMAAHC has the ability to shape the 21st century Mall. It will be its first contribution. McMillan concepts and the City Beautiful movement are no longer current.
- In the context of 21st century urbanism, the building should engage the street. The 'front door' should face 14th Street, similar to the National Gallery which faces 4th Street.
- A pedestrian bridge over 14th Street should be explored, providing a practical solution to access (to the WAMO) as well as reshaping the design of the entire Mall.
- The NMAAHC could be split across 14th Street. The current space at the adjacent NMAH is not well utilized.

Felicia Bell stated that the Jepson Center for the Arts at the Telfair Museum of Savannah, Georgia utilizes two spaces in a historic district with a pedestrian bridge.

Martha Catlin states that she sees this process evolving into a set of meaningful alternatives that serve Section 106 purposes instead of the current NEPA alternatives.

Peter May emphasized the importance of mitigating the soil conditions in relationship to the Washington Monument. He also noted that the new FEMA floodplain maps will place the NMAAHC in a 100 year floodplain. He states that what needs to be clear is how that remapping may effect the decision making process.

Gene Keller stated that NCPC, as a Federal Agency, needs to comply with E.O. 11988, and as the Responsible Federal Agency in this process needs to assure the EIS conforms to the E.O. The flood insurance program is an initiative under local jurisdiction, in this case the District of Columbia. If the District participates in the insurance program, it will be the party responsible for implementing the program and assuring private property coverage. While the Federal government is self insuring, NCPC still need to assure compliance with the E.O.

Nell Ziehl stated that the NTHP recommends limiting the program size to 350,000 gsf to limit the impact. The NTHP disagrees with the DC HPO regarding the building orientation; the NMAAHC should face the Washington Monument.

TIER 1 & TIER 2 ELEMENTS

Sharon Park presented an outline of tier 1 and tier 2 elements.

RESOURCE AREA	TIER 1	TIER 2
Cultural Resources		
Determine adverse effects	x	
Views & Viewsheds		x
Buildings and Structures		x
Spatial Organization		x
Visual Resources		
Landscape Features		x
Symbolic Values		x
Views & Viewsheds		x
Groundwater		
Distribution and Movement of Groundwater	x	
Geotechnical		x
Surface Water		
Effluent/site drainage discharge		
Flooding		
Air Quality		
Noise		
Transportation		
Short Term Impacts (construction)	x	
Parking, Traffic, Tour Buses	x	
Service access and loading		x
Pedestrian & bicycle access		x
Land Use	x	
Public access		x
Open space		x
Visitor Use and Experience	x	
Communities and Business	x	
Utilities and Infrastructure	x	
Public Health & Security	x	

Several consulting party members made comments:

- Fredrick Lindstrom requested that, in addition to the views from the Old Post Office, views from Arlington Cemetery and Lincoln Memorial be added. He also requested views from the White House be explored.
- Peter May clarified that geotechnical issues should be added the groundwater

- Curtis Davis stated that the geotechnical scope of work will take into account concerns such as peer review and full scale monitoring.

PROJECT TIMELINE

Curtis Davis presented the benchmarks for the NMAAHC:

- Overall, the schedule is on target to open the facility in 2015.
- A programming activity is scheduled to end this fall.
- The geotechnical work has started and will be completed in June 2008 and ready for review in September 2008. The geotechnical task is focused on developing a scope of work to support Tier 2.
- The NMAAHC has an advisory board of national people from different disciplines. The NMAAHC and SI will solicit a designer by January 2009.
- There is an interest in doing an international design competition. Sharon Park noted that the SI needs to package tier one information to inform this process.

NEXT STEPS

Sharon Park requested that each consulting party think of their top three priorities. Through this process, it is important to understand the major elements. The next meeting will be in April 2008, probably during the week of the 15th.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm.