

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. Update on activities of the National Museum of African American History and Culture 2. Update on SI's Request for Qualifications for Design Teams 3. Site Analysis interim study for NMAAHC site 4. Findings of the consulting parties as a result of the EIS and Section 106 analysis
Attendees:	Sheryl Kolasinski, SI Kinshasha Holman Conwill, NMAAHC Sharon Park, SI Jane Passman, SI Curtis Davis, SI Harry Rombach, SI Brenda Sanchez, SI Bill Donnelly, SI Amy Ballard, SI Judith Robinson, Robinson & Associates Patsy Fletcher, AAHGS Martha Catlin, ACHP Dreck Wilson, ASLAH Tom Luebke, CFA Nancy Witherell, NCPC Christine Saum, NCPC Bill Dowd, NCPC Athena Hernandez, NCPC Perry Wheelock, NPS Felicia Bell, USCHA Judy Scott Feldman, National Coalition to Save Our Mall Victor Vines, Freelon/Bond Peter Cook, Freelon/Bond Sarah Kuehl, Peter Walker Associates MP Mattson, Peter Walker Associates

Sharon Park introduced the group and the purpose of the this last Section 106 meeting before the summer break.

UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

Kinshasha Holman Conwill provided an update on the current activities of the National Museum of African American History and Culture including the status of the ongoing work with Freelon/Bond as they work to ensure the design principles carry forward in the process.

The exhibition master plan is in progress to determine content to be displayed in the NMAAHC. The associated public involvement period includes sessions in six cities including the District of Columbia, Atlanta, Los Angeles, Detroit, and New York.

UPDATE ON SI'S REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR DESIGN TEAMS

Sheryl Kolasinski outlined the selection process for the design teams.

There will be a standard two stage A/E RFQ posted on Fed Biz Ops. The first step in the process is very general call for interested parties, after which the field will narrow to 3-5 of the most qualified firms who will be asked to participate in a design competition. EOE and Minority Business affairs will reach out to smaller businesses and minority firms, as they typically do. The first announcement is due out in a couple of weeks.

The geotechnical report will not be available for a few months but those requirements will be built into the scope, for qualified/experienced professionals. The first RFQ asks for a portfolio review.

She also addressed collection storage for the museum. The current solution for collection storage is not finalized but the plan is to use a modestly proportioned leased space. There is 40,000 sq ft of raw space at the new facility in Landover, MD that is replacing the 1111 N. Capitol Street location. The intent is to be at the Landover Maryland location for a very long time. It will support the needs of the collection for quite some time, although there will be additional need as the museum grows.

Approximately three to seven firms will compete in the design competition.

SITE ANALYSIS INTERIM STUDY FOR NMAAHC SITE

Sarah Kuehl Peter Walker Associates provided a brief PowerPoint presentation.

Curtis Davis referenced the pedestrian map showing the axial shift of the Washington Monument, questioning an issue raised earlier by Thomas Luebke regarding the axial shift and the pivotal hinge of the site and how movement occurs across the site.

Nancy Witherell noted that experiences along the Mall are very different than along Madison Drive. She noted the distinction between the perception of the space vs. the use of the space.

Sheryl Kolasinski stated her concern about over-thinking the determined paths to get to the site, because these paths might not inform the exact location of the front door. While it is important to document all pedestrian paths, this cannot necessarily dictate the single entry to the building site.

Dreck Wilson mentioned William H. Whyte's study of pedestrian movement studies in public plazas. He remembered that the NPS may have had some aerial recordings of the site, and if it would be possible to review these to determine pedestrian movement.

Perry Wheelock responded that it is possible and she will look into this study, if it exists. She also noted that the Monument Lodge is not on the maps, and it has a significant impact on the entrance and movement of the site. She finally observed that the whole area has become a tapestry of all plans throughout history, McMillan, L'Enfant plans, etc.

Judy Feldman Scott stated that the NPS talks about the Mall differently than any other agency and/or group. She expressed her concern that this site is being considered an extension of the Smithsonian Institution museums, and not an extension of the National Mall cross-axis. The McMillan plan would have undermined the Monument. She suggests that instead of considering the museum not as an extension of the existing museums, but in the context of the Washington Monument grounds.

Sarah Kuehl responded that the analysis is meant to show how the site it is both and extension and also a hinge site.

Martha Catlin stated that this is an opportunity for better joint planning with the agencies present today. This project is an opportunity, given the land ownership of National Mall. Future development on the Mall can be restricted, starting today. She noted that this site is a part of the National Mall, and a key part of Section 106 is mitigation and this site is in the area of mitigation.

Sarah Kuehl asked for clarification on how to approach the variety of plans for this area going forward.

Perry Wheelock responded that a preferred alternative from the National Mall plan will soon be available.

Martha Catlin proposed that the timing is good for pursuing a review of the current plans against the proposed plan. She used the term "Mall Citizenship" as an approach to mitigation, which will be helpful in the Section 106 process. She noted that NCPC is good at pulling people together.

FINDINGS OF THE CONSULTING PARTIES AS A RESULT OF THE EIS AND SECTION 106 ANALYSIS

Sharon Park provided an overview of the timing of the Tier I FEIS, noting that the document is posted on the project website, the NMAAHC website, NCPC website and the SI website. The Notice of Availability will publish in the Federal Register on Friday, June 27th 2008. You are invited to make comments. The Tier I Smithsonian decision document will then be published. This document will identify issues that cannot be resolved.

Tier II will pick up again with the A/E team and the consulting parties meetings will go on.

Nancy Witherell noted that the NCPC will need to make their record of decision, but cannot do so until there is a design to review which is scheduled for 2010 and 2011. At that point, NCPC will be able to more accurately evaluate impacts.