

Location of Meeting	600 Maryland Ave, NW – 400	
Time of Meeting	9:30am – 12:00pm	
Purpose of Meeting	1. Section 106 Road Map with process, products, and review benchmarks 2. Populating the S106 Design Principles	
Attendees:	Sharon Park, SI Jane Passman, SI Curtis Davis, SI David Maloney, DC HPO Andrew Lewis, DC HPO Martha Catlin, ACHP Gene Keller, NCPC Nancy Witherell, NCPC Tom Luebke, CFA	Peter May, NPS Perry Wheelock, NPS Judy Robinson, Robinson and Associates Dreck Wilson, ASLAH Kevin Storm, BBB Brenda Sanchez, SI Rudi Byron, Berger

SECTION 106 ROAD MAP WITH PROCESS, PRODUCTS, AND BENCHMARKS

Sharon Park reviewed the timeline for the continuing Section 106 process and highlighted the important milestones over the next year. This timeline delineates the interrelationship of the Section 106 and Tier I & Tier II NEPA process (See attached road map). She noted that the consulting parties will be given briefings as each milestone within the NEPA or design process is completed.

Design Competition

Curtis Davis described several aspects of the NMAAHC design competition. The teams that emerge from the design competition will be given all of the documents created throughout the EIS and 106 process. The design competition process will take about a year. The design competition will yield several concept alternatives to continue to address concerns about historic resources through consultation and public involvement.

Gene Keller described Wilson Bridge design competition process. Committees were established to review different parameters such as engineering and aesthetics. There was a specific Section 106 committee that reviewed the submissions and provided recommendations. There were mitigation issues discovered through that process that were carried into the design process. The design aspect was broken out very publicly in terms of alternatives. He noted that there was extensive public involvement.

Curtis Davis responded that the Smithsonian Institution is not in the habit of involving the public in all of their processes; however this site has reminded people of the significance of the involvement. The NMAAHC museum has a Council and an Advisory Committee which provide input as well. He summarized the structure of public and agency involvement going forward: the Tier II EIS scoping process will inform the design process, which will inform the Tier II preferred alternatives. A public and agency comment period will yield input that will affect the design concepts.

Sharon Park noted that the Smithsonian Institution will need to ensure that the design process and concepts are aligned with the environmental impacts and Section 106 process.

Curtis Davis concurred, stating that the products of the design competition could be fundamentally different, and would have to be assessed in terms of NEPA and 106 issues. He added that landscape architecture and sustainability will also be incorporated into this process. The NMAAHC is striving for LEED Gold.

Sharon Park added that a geotechnical report will also be undertaken in the Tier II, the findings of which will inform the design principles and mitigations.

Road Map

Sharon Park facilitated an interactive discussion where agencies provided feedback on the placement and timing of design reviews, outreach, and consultation on the road map. Based on the outcomes of the discussion, additional design reviews for CFA and NCPC were incorporated into the road map.

NCPC, because of its legal decision-making role that relies on NEPA and 106, requested a concept briefing that would precede the selection of a preferred concept. This briefing will help NCPC to understand the parameters that will inform the final design team and provide input on the designs, pursuant to NEPA and 106.

Andrew Lewis concurred, noting that if the DC HPO is not provided the opportunity to comment, it may turn out that one of the lesser impacting designs may be dropped out.

Judy Robinson added that the designers will have the benefit of the identification of the historic resources. **Martha Catlin** concurred, stating that the designers will need to know the relevance of the historic properties.

Preferred Alternative

It is important to include a set of design principles that will inform the design architect as our Tier I preferred alternative. Exact parameters will be included in the Tier II decision. For the Tier I preferred alternative, **Sharon Park** stated that it is not a matter of one EIS Build Alternative being the preferred.

Jill Cavanaugh added that the physical envelope of the FEIS preferred alternative will be defined by the range of heights and setbacks demonstrated by the range of Build Alternatives. The preferred alternative will fall within 60-105' in height (above ground), and will not be deeper than 45' below ground or exceed the maximum subsurface volume of any of the Build Alternatives.

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Sharon Park reviewed the design principles (*see attachment - please note that the Smithsonian Institution using these as a starting point for discussion; the format and content will be refined throughout the last consulting party meetings*). She noted that the design principles should convey the Tier I values that this building should reflect: these are not design guidelines (which may come out of the MOA). Several attendees provided input:

Tom Luebke recommended:

- Making the principles as succinct as possible
- Removing geotechnical issues but adding sustainability
- Several principles should be stated upfront due to their "heavy weight".
- Massing should respond to the context of the site but not the shape of the site
- Principle #5 should read: The architectural expression should [not] be sculptural in a way of visually communicating with the monument and not be comprised of harsh angles, forms or edges that overshadow or detract from the current dominance of the Washington Monument on the site. **Andrew Lewis** concurred.
- Relative to the building form projecting into the viewsheds, the NMAAHC should NOT project, not just avoid. It needs to respect the Mall lines.
- Remove Principle #4 "The architectural expression should strive toward a discernable geometry yet maintain a fluid form that compliments the Washington Monument" or rework it to include the architectural strength.
- Principles #7 & #3 should be combined.

- The museums can be folded into the frame but there could be a relationship to the building in the east. Principle #6 touches on this.

Martha Catlin recommended:

- A change in format of the principles from “the building should do this..”
- The design principles should resolve questions such as How does it relate? Why does it relate? What is the context?
- There needs to be one alternative that does respond to the context of the site
- Taking some of the mundane comments and revising them
- We need to tease out the larger principles

Judy Robinson noted that:

- The design principles should be informed and responsive to the historical context. The design principles pull out things the S106 process has focused on, but doesn't give the responsibility to look at everything. There needs to be more.
- Principle 6: “The composition of new design elements should respect the formality and dignity of its neighbor, the Federal Triangle complex”, just works with the Federal Triangle and leaves off the hinge pieces.
- L'Enfant and McMillan aren't mentioned

Nancy Witherell stated that:

- This meeting should focus on the methodology and then use that to define the principles.
- It might be possible to attach certain diagrams that convey and synthesize a lot of information
- Principles regarding the building form projecting into the viewsheds (#2 & #8) are connected and need to be further modified.
- This museum has to be both sculptural and part of the non-figural context.
- The context is the museum complex. It's how people will look at it and the buildings should reflect their content.

David Maloney stated:

- The most important thing to convey is that the building should have an indirect relationship to the Washington monument. All of the other buildings are framed to that composition; it's a background building. The designers should almost ignore the Monument and place the building in the frame of the National Mall.
- In terms of the important characteristics of the site, the sculptural property is important.
- Principle 6 addresses formality
- The design principles should remind people of the larger composition

Peter May stated that the notion of the frame implies uniformity that we might not want to portray. He used the analogy of the Museum as a necklace; a series of jewels that complement the face of the Mall. It's that image that we would want to encourage. **Martha Catlin** and **David Maloney** concurred.

Perry Wheelock noted that the word “view” is only mentioned once in these principles.

Curtis Davis asked the group “When is the composition [of the Mall] complete?”

David Maloney noted that this is a question that is continually asked and responded there are fundamental aspects that will never change while the structures will evolve.

Martha Catlin added that the goal is to prevent crowding on the Mall.

Tom Luebke stated that it comes down to a physical structure that supports the bigger idea that creates a civic space so whatever one is doing on this Mall location supports that structure. He noted that the McMillan Plan did show a building on this site.

David Maloney responded that the plans are important but people shouldn't throw away their sense of reason: those plans have mistakes.

Martha Catlin added that part of this needs to be educational about the National Register and we should be thinking about the periods of significance and how the site is used.

Judy Robinson added that the historic report addresses this issue.

Perry Wheelock added that there have been other plans for the Mall that reflect the mistakes that were made in previous plans.

Tom Luebke noted that that McMillan's plan was done before the automobile was highly used.

Curtis Davis added that both plans included building and landscape. The row of trees on the site helps set up the view of the Monument.

Tom Luebke responded that the Monument is in a league of its own. The landscape is architectural.

David Maloney added that the concept of scale is also a factor. The scale of the Castle, the scale of the larger buildings, the scale of the Lodge, etc.. An exciting new design could play off that well.

NEXT STEPS/ACTION ITEMS

The group concurred that another meeting would be helpful to preview the revised draft principles; May 6th at 9:30am.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm.