

<b>Location of Meeting</b>	600 Maryland Ave, NW – 5001
<b>Time of Meeting</b>	2:07pm – 4:19pm
<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Status of the Smithsonian Institution in Section 106</li> <li>2. Update on Phase II Archaeology</li> <li>3. Review of Final Five Alternatives</li> <li>4. Presentation of Cultural Landscape Resources</li> <li>5. Methodology for Assessment of Effects</li> <li>6. Draft Matrix of Effects by Alternative</li> </ol>
<b>Attendees:</b>	<p>Jane Passman, SI                  Harry Rombach, SI                  Curtis Davis, SI                  Amy Ballard, SI                  Lynn Chase, SI                  Sharon Park, SI                  Brenda Sanchez, SI                  Nancy Witherell, NCPC                  Jane Levinson- NHP Intern                  Perry Wheelock, NPS/NAMA                  David Maloney, DC HPO                  Martha Catlin, ACHP                  Dreck Wilson, ASLAH                  George H.F. Oberlander, National Coalition to Save Our Mall                  Don Hawkins, Committee of 100                  Felicia Bell, BCDCH                  Patsy Fletcher, AAHGS, DC HPO                  Hany Hassan, BBB                  Ya Wang, BBB                  Don Edwards, JSA                  Matt Larsen, JSA                  Judy Robinson, Robinson &amp; Associates                  Erin Brasell, Robinson &amp; Associates                  Larry Earle, Berger                  Jill Cavanaugh, Berger                  Erin Kimsey, Berger</p>

**STATUS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION IN SECTION 106**

**Sharon Park** reviewed the chronology of the NMAAHC project

- In August, 2003, the Smithsonian began the process to become an agency of compliance.
- In December 2003, the Board of Regents was required to select a site for the NMAAHC. Plexus Scientific & PageSouthlandPage were hired to perform the Site Evaluation Study to select the possible sites for the museum. Though the study, four sites were assessed. At this point, Section 106 was not required.
- In 2005, the site assessment for these selected parcels was completed. Several meetings were held during that time, including meetings with the advisory law and public advocates.
- In 2006, the Board of Regents selected the Monument site. The NPS land transfer was a ministerial land transfer, so the process did not require NEPA or Section 106 at that time but Archaeology and Section 106 is now necessary.
- Currently, Berger is conducting the study of the potential Area of Effects and the SI is moving forward with the Archaeology Phase II.

## **UPDATE ON PHASE II ARCHAEOLOGY**

**Larry Earle**, on behalf of Charlie LeeDecker, conveyed that the Phase II archaeology study is in progress. Berger is working with the NPS and SI on the approval of the work plan and obtaining an archeological permit. The field work at the site is to be conducted between July 30 and August 17<sup>th</sup>.

## **REVIEW OF FINAL FIVE ALTERNATIVES**

**Hany Hassan**, *BBB*- presented the five alternatives. He stated that most of the alternatives remain similar to the previous designs with the exception of Alternative 5, “Enframing”, which received comments and the program reflects the recommended changes. Several comments followed:

- **Nancy Witherell** understood that the northern portion (fronting Constitution Ave) was supposed to be the higher volume.
- **Curtis Davis** explained that by using a smaller footprint, the building gets too tall and the balance between height and footprint is not right.
- **George Oberlander** stated that any building on this site will be imposing on views of the Washington Monument. He and his organization believe that this is reason enough as to why any design, and building on this site is wrong

## **PRESENTATION OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPE RESOURCES**

**Judy Robinson** stated that at the end of the last meeting there were requests to review the cultural landscapes in the project area. Therefore, the characteristics of NPS Cultural Landscape Reports are used in this presentation to create a common language and definition. A cultural landscape can be anything from small scale features to large scale landscapes. Several comments followed:

- **Martha Catlin** suggested utilizing the term “character defining feature” to help determine the significance.
- **Don Hawkins** suggested looking at each feature and defining the character giving characteristic.
- **George Oberlander** emphasized that the decision resulting from these discussions should respect the L’Enfant and McMillan plans.

## **METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS**

**Judy Robinson** presented several slides that explain the definition and examples of adverse effects. She explained that examples include damage, alteration, removal from location, change of character, neglect, transfer lease or sale, etc. She acknowledged that the task might seem overwhelming and explained that the matrix was a tool to generate discussion and get the ball rolling. The goal is to have participants return at the next meeting with completed matrices after giving it much thought and consideration.

Several comments and clarifications followed:

- **Martha Catlin** suggested that it would be more helpful if the participants did not have a blank copy, as she feels that it would be easier for the group to react to the determination. She stated that the vocabulary of the National Register is the most helpful in addressing effects and character defining features (ex: recreational uses, symbolism, etc.) and provides the best organizational tool to present this information. This will allow for

‘sorting’ based on the level of effect. She emphasized that symbolism is a huge part of the National Register documentation.

- **George Oberlander** stated that any intrusion to a viewshed, whether or not it is minimal, it is still intrusive and that is a problem. The determination of whether or not it is minimally intrusive is a judgment call.
- **Curtis Davis** stated that this exercise is not to place value. He stated that this exercise is to capture as many different issues that are an effect.
- **Don Edwards** reinforced that this exercise is not a test of knowledge, but rather an opportunity for a professional opinion to build upon this matrix over several meetings. This is an opportunity to contribute to the value to this process.
- **Patsy Fletcher** noted that Alternative 5 it is relatively busy, and it would have an adverse impact on the spatial organization. Alternative 1 would also have adverse impacts because it would interfere with the rhythm of the landscape.
- **David Maloney** stated that the chart may be asking too much at once. He asked if this process can be executed in phases or in steps. He referred to spatial organization, stating that it is a significant finding already that there is significant effect. He stated that we should look at the specifics related to a construction project on this site. He generally agreed with the populated cells that the consultant team provided. However, he feels that the Monument as an organizing feature needs to be mentioned here as well. An alternative with a striking, aggressive design could affect the Washington Monument as an organizing feature.
- **Perry Wheelock** asserted that the group needs to have a common understanding of what these “character defining features” are exactly. **Curtis Davis** agreed, stating that it is important to reach a common understanding of the range of effects and how they are being thought about by each participant. He feels that “Mitigation vs. Avoidance” in total is an issue that needs to be raised, while it may not be a complete consensus but a common understanding. There could be a range of avoidance and mitigation- each little piece doesn’t matter individually, but it is how they interact in totality.
- **Nancy Witherell** stated that the Washington Monument is a major organizing feature of Washington, and that there is an unavoidable sense of infringement whether or not from a distance, the impact is eminent.

The group concurred on several issues:

- Any of the alternatives if poorly designed, will generate an impact.
- Any alternative could have a significant effect on street trees – both roots and above ground construction.
- Whatever is posed for vegetation and planting could prove to be adverse if it is not accurate with the historic plantings or consistent with current plantings.
- The Monument Lodge is being dwarfed and is being confused as the entrance to the Monument
- There would be little impact on the Sylvan Theater
- A determination of effect on the Survey Lodge and Jefferson Pier will be reserved for the next meeting

**OTHER ISSUES**

**Martha Catlin** asked if there would be a change to a National Register nomination because of this project. She asked if the boundaries of these historic sites would need to be revised. **David Maloney** replied that this would need to be initiated by a Federal Agency. She stated that ACHP would expect the Smithsonian Institution to address this issue in the context of Section 106. The SI would probably need to initiate the process, and that it may be a matter of Section 110. She advised SI to plan for it.

**NEXT STEPS**

The next meetings will be held on July 18<sup>th</sup> at 9:30am, Room 1000 and August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007.