

Location of Meeting	600 Maryland Ave, NW – 5001
Time of Meeting	9:40 am – 11:45 am
Purpose of Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present “Alternative 6 – Low Profile” 2. Google Earth Presentation of NMAAHC Alternatives 3. Review preliminary assessment of overall effects and begin discussing effects by each alternative
Attendees:	Sharon Park, SI Jane Passman, SI Amy Ballard, SI Judy Robinson, Robinson & Associates Erin Brasell, Robinson & Associates Gene Keller, NCPC Curtis Davis, SI Martha Catlin, ACHP Harry Rombach, SI Nancy Witherell, NCPC Patsy Fletcher, AAHGS Kevin Storm, BBB Perry Wheelock, NPS Hany Hassan, BBB Jill Cavanaugh, Berger Catherine Price, Berger Rudi Byron, Berger

ALTERNATIVE 6

Curtis Davis introduced Alternative 6, which will be included for analysis in the DEIS in response to concerns that the range of Alternatives did not sufficiently address a smaller profile building. He acknowledged that Alternative 6a (250,000gsf) does not meet the purpose and need but it is the smallest footprint that could realistically work. Alternative 6b is 350,000gsf.

Hany Hassan presented Alternative 6a & 6b as having a minimal footprint and height. He stated that both options are identical in their above ground profile with four floors at 30,000sf. The 100,000+/- gsf difference is absorbed in the below ground area: 6a has two below grade levels and 6b has three. The Alternative is aligned with the main mass of the NMAH to the north /south and is closer to 14th Street and the urban grid to the east/west. This alignment maintains a distance from the Washington Monument. To the south there is open space for an outdoor programming.

GOOGLE EARTH PRESENTATION OF NMAAHC ALTERNATIVES

Curtis Davis presented a Google Earth demonstration of all six alternatives in context.

In response to the presentation, **Martha Catlin** suggested determining optimal viewing points from the site to the Washington Monument, in terms of quality. These viewing points could be comparative and inform the design process in that one might find a special viewpoint. She noted that by creating new opportunities for viewing, it might provide mitigation for lost views. If this project changes the perception of the Monument, the process should work with this change to make it a positive experience.

REVIEW DRAFT EFFECTS MATRIX FROM OCTOBER 10TH MEETING

Judy Robinson described the process to continue development of the matrix, noting that the project team has added the preliminary effects for all the alternatives identifying certain views as major adverse.

Several comments followed:

Martha Catlin stated that the view from the Old Post Office Tower does not seem like a minor impact. From the tower, the base of the Monument disappears and one cannot appreciate it as a part of the landscape. She recommended denoting this view as 'moderate', noting that she is limited in the information to say so definitively.

Perry Wheelock commented that the perception of views differ between pedestrians and vehicles, in terms of relative height and speed. She noted that the canopy of trees affects viewsheds; it is not a dense screening but rather as interference.

DISCUSSION OF EFFECTS BY ALTERNATIVES

Sharon Park presented the viewshed analysis from the June 27, 2007 consulting party meeting in an effort to determine the aspects that work on the site and the associated adverse effects. She suggested the massing models be analyzed in terms of massing, blocking, and enhancement. During the presentation, several comments and observations were made relative to the alternatives.

Alternative 1

Martha Catlin enquired about the status of the characteristics at this stage in terms of formality versus massing. She stated that this alternative is at odds with its surroundings; it does not relate to uniqueness of 15th Street, nor does it maximize the uniqueness of the site. It has blockages with height. She noted that there are other examples in the Federal Triangle of shapes that would be more attuned to this site if they were used.

Judy Robinson noted that this alternative accepts the setbacks of the adjacent buildings and relates much more strongly with the city grid and fails to relate to the WAMO grounds in relationship to the continuation of the row of museums along Constitution Avenue and this site as a hinge.

Martha Catlin responded that the other adjacent buildings (to which this alternative is aligned) are not located on the same type of site.

Curtis Davis noted that alignment with the street edge does not become a formality. This is only intended to highlight a notion about alignment with the gridlines, not the street line, resulting in a non-formal alignment on the street side

Alternative 2

Dreck Wilson enquired about the 30 degree angle at Madison Drive. Sharon Park responded that in 2001 or 2002, it was realigned to direct the public to the Monument and accentuate the park like qualities.

Alternative 3

No Comment

Alternative 4

Martha Catlin observed that this alternative presents the greatest opportunity for new views and vistas.

Nancy Witherell requested that BBB provide the area of each floor plate.

Sharon Park noted that as a building in being integrated into the landscape, this alternative has a unique quality to it.

Alternative 5

Nancy Witherell stated that the low height looks odd, or out of place from Constitution Avenue. **Dreck Wilson** noted that the two masses do not emphasize the corridor or the view that is typically set up by a rhythm that leads to an opening. The two volumes are more of a mass rather than a sequence of voids and solids or vertical elements. He also noted that along Constitution, there is a rhythm along the street created by the volumes of the buildings and these two masses do not possess the same rhythm.

Perry Wheelock advised the team to be careful about utilizing an organic green building/terrace roof because it introduces a character to the area that is extremely different than the surrounding area.

Judy Robinson presented additional images that the project team has taken to enhance the assessment of effects on historical resources:

- View down the Mall from the American History Museum
- View from WWII Memorial
- View from the Center of the Ellipse
- View from the Jefferson Memorial towards the Federal Triangle.

The group concurred that the view from down the Mall can be incorporated into the viewshed analysis.

NEXT STEPS

Sharon Park stated that the next matrix chart will have the six alternatives across the top and will identify the impacts to the historic elements. She stated that the project team is developing principles that should inform the design. She requested feedback and comments on specific effects and reminded consulting parties that the next meeting is **Friday November 16th at 9:30am.**