

Location of Meeting	600 Maryland Ave, NW – 100
Time of Meeting	9:30 am – 11:45 am
Purpose of Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working Meeting to discuss Project Schedule and the interrelationship of key milestone dates for Section 106 & the EIS process 2. Discussion of design principles
Attendees:	Sharon Park, SI Amy Ballard, SI Martha Catlin, ACHP Judy Robinson, Robinson & Associates Erin Brasell, Robinson & Associates George Oberlander, National Coalition to Save Our Mall Charles Cassel, National Coalition to Save Our Mall Lynn Chase, SI Curtis Davis, SI Perry Wheelock, NPS/NAMA Jane Passman, SI Harry Rombach, SI Dreck Wilson, ASLAH Sally Blumenthal, NPS Felicia Bell, BCDCH Gene Keller, NCPC Tom Luebke, CFA Jill Cavanaugh, Berger Larry Earle, Berger Rudi Byron, Berger

SECTION 106 AND EIS TIMELINE

Sharon Park reviewed the current Section 106 and EIS timeline. She noted that the PDEIS is currently under internal review by SI & NCPC. She noted that the Archaeology Phase II findings and the effects of the undertaking still need to be resolved and included in the DEIS. Charlie LeeDecker will give a report on the findings at the September 19 meeting.

The purpose of the September 19 meeting will be to review of effects and identify the priority ones. The team has taken a first pass at prioritizing major effects in the draft summary of effects. On October 10, there will be an additional meeting that allows for a final discussion of effects and mitigations and the Draft PA. Several comments followed regarding the Draft PA:

- **Martha Catlin** acknowledged that a PA is the right output of the 106 process. She suggested the process should focus on the consultation process to avoid adverse effects that are foreseeable. The consultation period should keep all options open since effects will not be determined until a final design is established. She stated that the desired outcome might be a long way off, but it should be the job of the consulting parties to map out a process to get everyone there as painlessly as possible.

She stated that she thinks it would be more value to have a sliding scale of alternatives that are driven by both symbolism and program. She regretted that all the five current alternatives seem to have similar or equal adverse effects. She recommended including alternatives with some differences in size and scale.

- **Gene Keller** noted that NCPC's procedures don't allow for further decision making without a final formal Section 106 document. If the SI wants approval on a design, then the PA needs to be final.
- **Sally Blumenthal** noted that in the FEIS, the SI will have a preferred alternative and it would be valuable to have input on it from NCPC and CFA. It would be very bad if the SI does not solicit feedback on the preferred alternative and then the design team pursues it.

Several comments were made regarding the final Section 106 product:

- **Gene Keller** suggested that the final PA could stipulate that the process will include the consideration of additional alternatives as defined by the program architect. It is important to acknowledge the process and include the public.
- **Martha Catlin** stated that the approach Gene Keller suggested is unusual but acceptable. She acknowledged that we're not going to be able to limit alternatives. The Final PA must also acknowledge further considerations for alternatives, such as the program.
- **Harry Rombach** noted the differences between NEPA and 106; in NEPA, alternatives are dismissed to find an acceptable range whereas in Section 106, all alternatives possible are considered.
- **Sally Blumenthal** stated that some adverse effects cannot be mitigated. In that case, the final Section 106 document would be an MOU. As far as pure process, a piece of paper needs to be signed to keep things moving.

GENERATION OF DESIGN PRINCIPLES USING THE HISTORIC RESOURCES

Sharon Park began a discussion of design principles, noting that design principles are different from design guidelines because they are less prescriptive. Several comments were offered:

- **Sally Blumenthal** stated that every project since the WWII memorial has established design principles that are later ignored by the architect. She stated that it might be more helpful to utilize the GSA methodology. Citing the NMAI as an example, she noted that there were design parameters before the designer was chosen. These parameters were mainly based on setbacks. She and Gene Keller both noted that the NMAI is a building and the WWII and MLK are memorials (or landscapes).
- **Curtis Davis** stated that principles inform the goals which in turn inform the objectives. The objectives have purposes: to help inform the development of the PA. The principles and goals have to do with desire. Trying to get from desire to direction is done through objectives. Then they inform guidelines to give to the designers. The guidelines can be reviewed more broadly and inform criteria for selection. Standards are used by our reviewers internally as well as with NCPC and NPS and the public. The standards inform action. The PDEIS established a draft set of standards. The PA will exist for the staff to understand the aspirations for this museum and it will also be helpful for the design team. In terms of the design process, while nothing has been decided yet, there is the possibility of an open design competition. The design will not start earlier than May 2008 and the SI does not anticipate having an architect until at least October 2008.
- **Sally Blumenthal** asserted that the EIS process is out of sync with the programming process. The DEIS will be on the street at the same time as the architectural programming team commences. The EIS has alternatives based on square footage that have no relationship to the architectural programming team.
- St. Elizabeth's West Campus, the US Armed Forces Retirement Home, and Fort Belvoir were offered as examples of similar EIS processes.