

<b>Location of Meeting</b>	600 Maryland Ave, NW – 100
<b>Time of Meeting</b>	9:37am – 12:05pm
<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Presentation of Phase II Archaeology scope &amp; schedule</li> <li>2. Presentation &amp; Finalization of APE</li> <li>3. Historical Framework for views &amp; vistas</li> <li>4. Presentation of new views &amp; vistas</li> <li>5. Continued Discussion of Effects</li> <li>6. Conclude comment period for Cultural Resources Report</li> </ol>
<b>Attendees:</b>	Amy Ballard, SI Jane Passman, SI Curtis Davis, SI Nancy Witherell, NCPC Hany Hassan, BBB Ya Wang, BBB Rudi Byron, Berger Jill Cavanaugh, Berger Charlie LeeDecker, Berger Larry Earle, Berger Judy Robinson, Robinson & Associates Erin Brasell, Robinson and Associates Sharon Park, SI Matt Larsen, JSA Don Edwards, JSA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding, NPS Perry Wheelock, NPS/NAMA David Maloney, DC SHPO Ineeter Brown, DCOP Martha Catlin, ACHP Thomas Luebke, CFA Dreck Wilson, ASLAH George H.F. Oberlander, National Coalition to Save Our Mall Patsy Fletcher, AAHGS

### **PRESENTATION OF PHASE II ARCHAEOLOGY SCOPE AND SCHEDULE**

Charlie LeeDecker presented the findings of the Phase 1 study. The draft was completed in February and the team is now proceeding with a proposal for Phase II. Phase II would be much more intrusive. Permitting will be administered through the NPS and he currently has a permit that is valid through Oct 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007. The SI confirmed that they now own the land and would own the recovered artifacts. He indicated that the work plan outline would be posted on the project website for the DC HPO and others to review. Charlie LeeDecker provided clarification on several issues following the presentation:

- National Register eligibility on the NMAAHC site has not yet been determined.
- He intends to verify if there are Native American burial grounds along the Potomac River adjacent to the site, as shown in an NCPC map.
- The archaeological public outreach component will include signage on the site

### **NMAAHC SITE LAND TRANSFER**

There was a brief discussion of the NMAAHC land transfer and the status of the SI, relative to the scope of Section 106 in the future. The SI has limited obligation to Section 106 while NPS has a larger obligation if the land is no longer in Federal control.

**Martha Catlin** emphasized that the ACHP would put this back on the SI because it's easy to assume this is not part of the undertaking because the action has been done without Section 106. She asked the SI to express why this is not part of the undertaking. There would be a way to not make this problematic, but SI needs to determine that and then let ACHP respond with concurrence or dissent.

It was decided to postpone the discussion for another meeting.

## **PRESENTATION AND FINALIZATION OF APE**

**Judy Robinson** presented the revised APE graphics, noting comments from the May 3 meeting. The APE now includes the US Capitol west steps, and the APE extends westward around the Lincoln Memorial and north to the White House. Arlington Cemetery is a point of interest. She noted that there is a second APE for Archaeology which is the site directly.

## **HISTORICAL CONTEXT** **HISTORICAL CONTEXT**

**Judy Robinson** stated that the team referenced the historical record to analyze the site, including:

- Washington Monument Grounds Cultural Landscape Report (CLR), Initial Draft Prepared by John Milner Associates, Inc. for the National Park Service, May 2003
- National Mall Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI)  
National Mall & Memorial Parks, National Park Service, 2006  
<http://www.nps.gov/nationalmallplan/Studies.html> (this link is to the NPS webpage that has all of their studies, but for some reason you can't link directly to the report because it is broken up into 4 parts).
- Draft National Historic Landmark Nomination, "Plan of the City of Washington" (Robinson & Associates, Inc., January 4, 2001) which updates and amends Sara Amy Leach and Elizabeth Barthold, National Register of Historic Places-Register Form, "L'Enfant Plan of the City of Washington, D.C." (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, April 24, 1997).

[See PowerPoint presentation on historical context]

## **PRESENTATION OF ALTERNATIVES, VIEWS & VISTAS**

Hany Hassan presented the alternatives and viewsheds. Hany Hassan stated that BBB categorized views into two types. The first shows where one could actually see the building partially or fully. The team went as far as from Arlington House to view the site from this context. Views were added from the steps of the Capitol, Lincoln Memorial and Air Force Memorial, steps of the Jefferson Memorial, and middle of National Mall. From the Ellipse, as one could imagine, the area is so vast and the views are so wide, if one looks strictly South towards Jefferson, in between the trees and your corner vision, one cannot see much of the site.

[See PowerPoint presentation on Views & Vistas].

**Curtis Davis** noted that these alternatives are for the EIS which will evaluate environmental effects. In the context of Section 106, the consultation process will define how the alternatives impact historical resources. The consulting parties are welcome to offer input on the various impacts to historic resources

and the way in which the alternatives impact various characteristics and how that might inform either avoiding an impact, adverse impact, or mitigating an adverse impact. He emphasized that the process is not in a design mode right now.

Following the presentation, several comments were made:

- **David Maloney** suggested making Alt. 5 slightly different by either raising the height of the smaller building or lowering the height of the other. He recommended taking a shot from the Air Force Memorial. He suggested shifting the vantage point from the SI Castle to the west. Finally, he recommended taking a shot of the views directly at the site from the Ellipse.
- **Thomas Luebke** made several statements:
  - The setback should start from the curb, not the sidewalk.
  - It would be best to move as far possible to the NE of the site
  - The 110' height is a big problem and cuts into the composition of this area
  - This site is a hinge point.
  - The least successful is the terrace scheme because it is too big and broad. It feels more alien and does the least for the views.
- **Martha Catlin** stated that rather than deference to the Monument, the team should be seeking successful juxtaposition to any of the historical elements in terms of views. She stated that she is fond of the lodge because it's diminutive. One can perceive the Monument as bigger than it is. That approach to the Monument is all about scale. **David Maloney** and **Nancy Witherell** concurred that the lodge is an important vantage point.
- **Jennifer Talken-Spaulding** stated that the view from Arlington House is a dramatic site and it seems that the terraced form and freeform look odd in that "boxy" background. She noted that regarding the building being on the SE corner, one thing to raise is that association, it's a hard place to situate. One could relocate the mass to the NE corner, because in the SE the association to the Mall is blocked, but it seems the larger the building is, the larger the wall on that corner, the more a disassociation for especially pedestrians and creates a "billboard" character.
- **Nancy Witherell** stated that she had envisioned the lower portion of alternative 5 being to the south, not the north, and the lower being more of a building and less of a platform.
- **George Oberlander** expressed the view of the National Coalition to Save Our Mall. There are only two alternatives: no build and build. No Build preserves the character and does not set it up as another example south of the center part of the Mall. He emphasized that this building at this site is not appropriate. NCPC records the buildable sites along the Mall and this site was never considered a building site, regardless of Congress. Anything permanent is contrary to original intent. The Monument grounds matter. The open space matters. Additional forms are not the right thing.
- **Thomas Luebke** clarified that the McMillan plan does show a building on this site.

### **NEXT STEPS**

**Larry Earle** reminded the participants that we are in the closeout period of the CLR and the Phase I report. We would like to offer up a three day grace period if anyone has any final comments [extending the comment period to the COB, Monday, June 4, 2007].