

Location of Meeting	600 Maryland Ave, NW – 5001
Time of Meeting	9:40 am – 11:34 am
Purpose of Meeting	1. Wrap up and confirm the list of Primary Character Defining Features of NR Resources in the APE 2. Discuss assessment of potential effects on these resources
Attendees:	Sharon Park SI Jane Passman, SI Curtis Davis SI Lynn Chase, SI Brenda Sanchez, SI Harry Rombach, SI Gene Keller, NCPC Nancy Witherell, NCPC Martha Catlin, ACHP Perry Wheelock, NPS/NAMA Thomas Luebke, CFA David Maloney, DC HPO Dreck Wilson, ASLAH George H.F. Oberlander, National Coalition to Save Our Mall Felicia Bell, USCHS Tom Whitley, Guild of Professional Tour Guides Patsy Fletcher, AAHGS Hany Hassan, BBB Judy Robinson, Robinson & Associates Erin Brasell, Robinson & Associates Jill Cavanaugh, Berger Catherine Price, Berger Rudi Byron, Berger

INTRODUCTION

Sharon Park stated that the purpose of the meeting is to review previously considered alternatives that were dismissed and review historic resources and a preliminary assessment of effects.

PRESENTATION

Harry Rombach presented an overview of the project history, including the site selection process, preliminary alternatives, alternatives not carried forward, and the alternatives reviewed in the DEIS. Any alternative under 350,000 would be considered a partial build scenario and is not acceptable for this project.

Following the presentation, Harry Rombach clarified that several issues:

- Setbacks and zoning determine maximum build out.
- All alternatives in the DEIS, including the No Action Alternative will be treated equally and given equal consideration. Those alternatives only include the alternatives carried forward, not all alternatives discussed.

DISCUSSION

David Maloney clarified some of his previous comments from the September 19, 2007 meeting. He stated that he was not suggesting that the NMAAHC become a branch of another museum; his previous statements were concerned with the matter of urbanism, not how the museums are organized. In the 21st century, it is important to stop thinking of the Mall as a mid-20th century space. Given the pressures on the Mall, not every museum needs to be a free-standing space with green around it. Urbanism has moved

beyond that model. He emphasized that adjoining buildings physically does not make them the same; they can have their own identity and style. The Portrait Museum is a good example: there two museums in one. One typical challenge with museums is how they bridge a street. He suggested looking at convention centers as they routinely meet this spatial challenge.

He stated that 350,000 SF appears to be easily accommodated according to the modeling, but a building analysis of what is possible on the site for zoning doesn't mean much for the DC HPO. The process is undercut if it appears that the only thing that controls the size of the building envelope is the zoning.

Martha Catlin articulated her concern about the point at which alternatives were dismissed. She stated that she would rather have the benefit of Section 106 analysis of all alternatives considered, so if the designer chooses to go in the direction of one of the dismissed alternatives, the work of evaluating those as acceptable or not acceptable from the 106 standpoint has already been completed.

George Oberlander stated that the site selection decision already made by SI should have been made on the basis of the completed findings of the EIS, not before.

Harry Rombach responded that Congress directed the Smithsonian Regents to select the site from four designated sites. DOI's attorneys determined that the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the site did not require it to perform NEPA and SI concurred. The SI considered doing an EIS on the site selection, but decided with NCPC to undertake an EIS after the site selection was made. **George Oberlander** stated for the record that he was not with NCPC at the time of that decision.

Subsequent to the meeting, Harry Rombach supplemented his response to Mr. Oberlander in an email to him on October 16, 2007, in which he stated that the Smithsonian is not a "Federal Agency" as defined by NEPA and therefore is not covered by NEPA. The SI goes through a NEPA process when projects are subject to approval by true Federal Agencies that do need to comply with NEPA. In the site evaluation and selection process, the Smithsonian did not go through the NEPA process, because the site selection decision was the exclusive authority of the Smithsonian Board of Regents, as directed by Congress. In acting independently, the site selection was not a federal action, hence no NEPA. Now that the SI has passed the site selection process and dealing with the massing of the building on the site, to which NCPC must eventually consider in the design process, the SI entered into a NEPA process jointly with NCPC. NCPC has traditionally relied on the submitting entities to do actually do the NEPA work, which is the case now. The NCPC review and approval process is a federal action and is the trigger for the SI's NEPA undertaking.

PRESENTATION & CONFIRMATION OF PRIMARY CHARACTER DEFINING FEATURES IDENTIFIED IN NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

Judy Robinson noted that "A" views are primary threshold views within the Washington Monument grounds that are very important as well as resources of primary importance to the significance of the grounds. "B" views are important multi-directional views within the Washington Monument grounds. Also includes features that contribute to the significance of the Washington Monument and grounds, or features that are in close proximity to the NMAAHC site. "C" represents important views from within the Washington Monument grounds to the outside periphery and street views along main corridors bordering the Monument grounds. Also includes features that contribute to the significance of areas surrounding the Washington Monument grounds., and "D" represents broad views within the city and features that contribute to the broader context of the city [see attached handouts].

Several comments and suggestions were made regarding the Historic Views diagram map:

- **David Maloney** made several suggestions. First, the White House and Jefferson Memorial views should be in blue as they are axial views. Secondly, red and yellow views should be shown as

cones, not arrows because they are panoramas. Instead of calling them gateway views, they should be titled panoramas. Finally, "E views" should be added (Aerial views from high observation points) which include views from across the river and from GWU.

- **George Oberlander** stated that the blue arrow should go from the back of the White House straight to the Jefferson Memorial. In addition, he suggested to title this map 'historic viewsheds' instead of views because that broadens it beyond the cone of vision.
- **Tom Luebke** reiterated that this site is a knuckle, yet this graphic does not address that characteristic in terms of the larger context of how these pieces fit together.
- **Dreck Wilson** requested connecting the panoramic views to the arrows and suggested the red be changed to another color.
- **Patsy Fletcher** stated that it would be helpful to include additional viewsheds in the January 10 public hearing presentation, such as Meridian Hill.

PRESENTATION of Draft Assessment of Potential Effects

Sharon Park stated that the Draft Assessment of Potential Effects utilizes a preliminary ranking system of stars [see attached handouts] which represents level of impact related to character defining features and buildings in proximity. Several comments and suggestions were made regarding the Historic Resources diagram map:

- **Curtis Davis** suggested using a screen over the Washington Monument grounds zone and surrounding areas rather than lines. **Hany Hassan** concurred, stating that a tone on the WAMO grounds would allow for an outline in other areas.
- **David Maloney** noted that the Ellipse should be highlighted as separate a feature from the White House grounds. With the Federal Triangle, he suggested highlighting the facades along Constitution Avenue as "A" type features (including the Department of Commerce, ICC, Mellon Auditorium, U.S. Customs, and IRS buildings). They are individually eligible for the Register and have more of an impact than the Triangle as a whole.
- **Perry Wheelock** noted that in dealing with cultural landscapes, buildings and structures are part of that landscape. 'Landscape' is not used in conjunction with turf, lawn, and trees; the word "vegetation" not landscapes would be appropriate.

NEXT STEPS

Sharon Park stated that the next meeting is on October 30, 2007. The agenda is to discuss assessment of potential effect. There will also be a meeting on November 16, 2007.

Curtis Davis stated that at the next meeting, in response to a request to use a video to show the different models, there will be a Google Earth model that will show some pre-determined scenes and be able to address concerns dynamically.

Harry Rombach noted that the SI is considering pursuing a tiered EIS process in which a Record of Decision (ROD) is issued for the decisions made early on in a process. Once a design is evident, there can be a more meaningful discussion of aesthetics and the effect on the surroundings. **Gene Keller** added that this two-step NEPA process will be acknowledged in the Public Hearing or in the FEIS, accompanied by some milestone points. For example, the document would need to define the further public involvement process.

Sharon Park confirmed that the DEIS does have a discussion of the site selection, and it will be part of the Public Hearing and available for public comment. She requested comments on the handout materials by the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:34am.