

PROJECT MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: EISENHOWER MEMORIAL 2009-002

MEETING: Section 106 Consultation Meeting
Wednesday, March 30, 2011 1:00-3:00pm (EST)

LOCATION: Old Post Office Pavilion, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC

PRESENT:

Company Name and Attendees:	Abbrev.
National Park Service Peter May, Perry Wheelock, Glenn DeMarr, Joel Gorder, Steve Lorenzetti	NPS
Eisenhower Memorial Commission Carl Reddel, Dan Feil, Annemarie Spadafore	EMC
General Services Administration Nancy Witherell, Christian Prescott, Angela Mar	GSA
DC Historic Preservation Office David Maloney, Andrew Lewis	SHPO
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Katy Harris	ACHP
National Capital Planning Commission David Levy, Shane Dettman	NCPC
Commission of Fine Arts Thomas Luebke	CFA
Department of Education John McGrath	DEd
Architect of the Capitol Troy Brown	AOC
Gilbane Building Company Carol Moore	GBCo
Gehry Partners LLP John Bowers	GP
AECOM Alan Harwood, Claire Sale, Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, Jon Miller, Greg Bordinowski	AEC
National Coalition to Save the Mall Judy Scott Feldman	NCSM
Committee for 100 Don Hawkins	CFO
Other Attendees Arthur Cotton Moore	ACM

PURPOSE: Review of Memorial Concepts

ITEM NO.	ISSUES DISCUSSED	ACTION BY
1	Introduction	
.1	Steve Lorenzetti began the meeting by welcoming everyone and introducing himself All the attendees then introduced themselves.	
.2	Alan Harwood suggested that the design team identify how far along they are in the design process. John Bowers said that the design process was approximately 30 percent complete.	
	Action: Information only.	None
2	Review of APE	
.1	Stephanie Dyer-Carroll reviewed the APE that was established in 2006, which is now the Primary APE. In 2010, with guidance from SHPO, NPS expanded the APE to encompass visual effects, adding a Secondary APE. Stephanie Dyer-Carroll summarized the historic buildings found within the APE.	

ITEM NO.	ISSUES DISCUSSED	ACTION BY
.2a	Judy Scott Feldman asked if the APE can be changed. She submitted comments regarding the inclusion of views west along Maryland Avenue from the Eisenhower Memorial site toward the Jefferson Memorial (as distinct to views from the U.S. Capitol to the Memorial site).	
.2b	Stephanie Dyer-Carroll said that from the U.S. Capitol, one cannot see past Reservation 113 to the Jefferson Memorial site.	
.2c	Alan Harwood said that those views are indicated in the APE by the directional arrows (both east and west) along the Maryland Avenue view corridor.	
.2d	Judy Scott Feldman asked whether design and development changes that would occur in the future are considered when developing the APE?	
.2e	Arthur Cotton Moore said that the Monumental Core Framework Plan and the Legacy Plan contemplate restoring Maryland Avenue to its southwest terminus.	
.2f	Katry Harris asked Judy Scott Feldman if there were any historic properties that lie outside the APE?	
.2g	Judy Scott Feldman said that with the restoration of Maryland Avenue called for in Framework Plan, the Jefferson Memorial would be in line with Maryland Avenue.	
.2h	Katry Harris asked Judy Scott Feldman if she thought that the Jefferson Memorial should be the terminus of the Maryland Avenue view corridor?	
.2i	Judy Scott Feldman said yes, she thought it should be the terminus of the Maryland Avenue view corridor.	
.2j	David Maloney said that although the Jefferson Memorial is not included in the APE, the vista from the Eisenhower site toward the Jefferson Memorial is included.	
.3a	Dan Feil said that when the site selection APE was developed, only reciprocal views between the U.S. Capitol and the Eisenhower Memorial site were considered.	
.3b	David Maloney said that views in both directions from the Eisenhower Memorial site were considered.	
.3c	Dan Feil disagreed, emphasizing that at the time, it was only views to the Eisenhower Memorial site from the capitol that were included, not views from the Eisenhower Memorial site to the Jefferson Memorial.	
.3d	Katry Harris said that previous considerations are not as important as current ones.	
.3e	Steve Lorenzetti said that views were expanded in this APE to include view both toward and away from the Memorial site.	
.4a	Katry Harris said that determinations of effects are based on current conditions (ie, without contemplating future possible improvements to the Maryland Avenue corridor, SW of the site). However, cumulative effects may be considered as well.	
.4b	Perry Wheelock asked if Katry Harris was referring to NEPA, or to the Section 106 process as well?	
.4c	Katry Harris clarified that it should be considered in the Section 106 process as well.	
	Action: Information only.	None

3

Review of Technical Investigations

.1	Stephanie Dyer-Carroll summarized the findings of the Determination of Effect (DOE) for the Wilbur Wright Building (FOB 10B) and stated that it is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places based on Criterion A (<i>Properties Associated with Events that have made a Significant Contribution to the Broad Patterns of our History</i>) and Criterion C (<i>Properties that Embody the Distinctive Characteristics of a Type, Period, or Method of Construction or Represent the Work of a Master, or Possess High Artistic Values, or Represent a Significant and Distinguishable Entity Whose Components Lack Individual Distinction</i>). The Building is eligible based on its role within the Urban Renewal efforts in DC, and as an example of the adaptation of Modern design to the needs of the federal government.	
.2	Nancy Witherell summarized the findings of the DOE for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Building (FOB 6) and stated that it is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places based on Criteria A and C. The Building is eligible because it was the first building constructed as part of Urban Renewal in DC, its embodiment of Modern design values, and innovation as flexible office space. The plaza, which serves as the forecourt to the Building, is the work of a master landscape architect, Lester Collins. In addition, CFA's approval of the Building signified a shift in the agency's role in Modernist architecture and its placement in Southwest DC.	
.3	Andrew Lewis said that SHPO formally accepted the DOEs on March 29, 2011.	

ITEM NO.	ISSUES DISCUSSED	ACTION BY
	.4a Katry Harris said that for buildings that are near 50 years old, a rigid 50-year old standard should not be applied. Instead, if an undertaking would impact a property during the life of that building, a broader definition should be used. The site selection process would have benefitted from this approach.	
	.4b Nancy Witherell commented that was correct, but at this point, they have now conducted the determinations. She added that for GSA's internal standards, it was better that the process had waited.	
	.4c Alan Harwood said that there had been an evolution of thought regarding Modern design and the importance of the buildings in the past five years.	
	.5 Andrew Lewis said that NPS has informally indicated that the National Air and Space Museum and the Hirshhorn Museum are considered to be contributing elements to the National Mall historic district. He also said that the Orville Wright Building (FOB 10A) would be considered eligible, as the criteria used in the evaluation of the Wilbur Wright Building largely apply to the Orville Wright Building, too.	
	.6a Stephanie Dyer-Carroll summarized the status of the Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment for the Memorial site, saying that it had been undertaken and is currently being reviewed by NPS.	
	.6b Perry Wheelock explained that the Phase 1A assessment is historic documentation, and will suggest a course of action, dependent upon the design.	
	.6c Stephanie Dyer-Carroll said that disturbance across the site would typically reach an average depth of approximately 10 feet due to the installation of trees, relief blocks, utilities, and other elements of the Memorial. The columns would also disturb soils down to 60 feet.	
	.7a Katry Harris asked if NPS was suggesting no archaeological testing until after the design was finalized?	
	.7b Perry Wheelock responded that the next step is geoarcheology. The timetable for this is to be determined, based on the review of the Phase 1A.	
	.7c Katry Harris said that archaeological effects need to be determined.	
	<i>Action: Finalize the Phase 1A following review by NPS and SHPO.</i>	AEC
4	Review of Current Design	
	.1 John Bowers reviewed the three concepts presented at the May, 2010 Section 106 meeting and the three revised concepts that were presented at the February, 2010 NCPC meeting. He described changes made to the designs that reinforce Maryland Avenue. He also described the refinement of the Promenade design between the LBJ Building and the Memorial, including the tapestry.	
	.2 Alan Harwood added that in Alternative 3, the core had been simplified, and would reflect both Eisenhower's military and presidential accomplishments.	
	.3 Carl Reddel said that both Eisenhower's military and presidential aspects were integral to his life. Consistent with that fact, the legislation for the Memorial requires that accomplishments in both areas be commemorated.	
	<i>Action: Information only.</i>	None
5	Potential Effects of the Memorial	
	.1a Don Hawkins asked if there is an overall idea for the Memorial design? People frequently refer to Eisenhower's modesty. Don Hawkins said that he did not glean an overall idea from the concepts shown.	
	.1b Carl Reddel said that the complexity of the man was surprising. He was modest, but very confident. Eisenhower was a truly modest servant of the country. He also respected limits of humans, as well as the dignity of each person. These attitude was informed by his upbringing, his origins, and his religious beliefs.	
	.2a Don Hawkins said that Judy Scott Feldman had raised a great question at the February, 2011 NCPC meeting- she said that the Jefferson Memorial is about democracy, the Washington Monument is about nation building, and the Lincoln Memorial is about reunification of the country. The Eisenhower Memorial is waiting for something.	
	.2b John Bowers said that the design team is continuing to consider options for conveying the central theme, but that they have not yet concluded their exploration.	
	.3a Arthur Cotton Moore said that he was concerned about the vista, which is part of the preservation of the L'Enfant and McMillan plans. He said that the elements of the Memorial design related primarily to the orthogonal streets, with little respect for the angularity of Maryland Avenue.	
	.3b John Bowers asked what, in his opinion, was the vista?	

ITEM NO.	ISSUES DISCUSSED	ACTION BY
.3c	Arthur Cotton Moore said that the 160' right-of-way (ROW) was the vista. Right now, Maryland Avenue is a mess, but he would like it to improve.	
.4a	Katry Harris asked if everyone had seen the model or images of the Memorial designs?	
.4b	All parties indicated that they had seen them at NCPC or at NPS.	
.5a	Katry Harris commented that she noticed the tapestries were not mentioned in John Bowers's description of the design alternatives.	
.5b	John Bowers said that he did mention them.	
.6a	Judy Scott Feldman said she had done research on vistas, and it is not a person standing in one place and their view from that point. It was important that they be considered in three dimensions: height, width, and visitor experience.	
.6b	John Bowers added that a focal point was important.	
.6c	Judy Scott Feldman agreed, and said that a focal point could be large or small. The vistas are wide, and the feeling that they evoke is important.	
.7a	Alan Harwood asked if Judy Scott Feldman felt that the 160' ROW is a "no-build" zone?	
.7b	Judy Scott Feldman and Arthur Cotton Moore said that columns were not appropriate for the 160' ROW, but landscape elements were appropriate.	
.7c	Arthur Cotton Moore said that he did not believe large columns would respect the ROW. In his redevelopment along Maryland Avenue, southwest of the Memorial, he was held to the 160' ROW standard. Although all of the buildings in this area are oriented to orthogonal streets, they do respect the Maryland Avenue ROW.	
.7d	Alan Harwood asked if it was acceptable to have some features in the 160' ROW? For instance, the Metro station canopy?	
.7e	Arthur Cotton Moore said that he did not know, but that elements should respect the angle (diagonal avenue).	
.7f	David Maloney said the historic resource is the L'Enfant Plan. It is not the vista but rather Maryland Avenue. It would be a mistake to focus on the vista to the exclusion of the L'Enfant Plan. He said that he is interested in how the elements relate to one another. Instead of focusing on how wide the vista should be, the question is what qualities should it have?	
.7g	Thomas Luebke commented that the Memorial site is not a square. Also, it is not private property or an office. There are numerous examples of things in the ROW throughout DC. But scale does matter. It would be helpful to look at the experience of Pennsylvania Avenue, which have trees that are likely 90' trunk-to-trunk, which narrows the vista of that avenue.	
.8a	Katry Harris said that all of the designs have the potential for adverse effects, such as to the significant landscape design, as characterized by NCPC and CFA. She added that the severity of the effects are important, and that Alternatives 1 and 2 seem to do a better job of preserving the L'Enfant Plan.	
.8b	John Bowers said that there are more elements of the Memorial in the ROW in Alternatives 1 and 2 than there are in Alternative 3.	
.8c	Thomas Luebke clarified that CFA preferred Alternative 3, and that they made no characterizations regarding effects on historic resources.	
.8d	Shane Dettman said that NCPC did not assign degrees to which the alternatives affected resources. It was largely a matter of scale.	
.9a	From ACHP's view, Alternatives 1 and 2 further the goals of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation better than Alternative 3. A fundamental tenant of historic preservation is that "real places matter" and provide context. This was reinforced during the site selection period. Alternative 3 with its tall "silos" does not relate. When there are big images of Abilene on the tapestry, it is antithetical to the creation of the place in the actual Memorial. She said that the tapestries' use of the Abilene landscape make him look small-minded, while at the same time obscuring buildings around the site.	
.9b	Alan Harwood asked if Katry Harris had determined that the buildings would be obscured by Alternative 3?	
.9c	Katry Harris said yes, the tapestries would clearly draw focus from the buildings. She said that the adverse effects for Alternative 3 are greater.	
.9d	Shane Dettman reviewed the process and sequence by which effects are evaluated, saying that the APE and resources are defined, confirmed with the SHPO, the effects determined, and so on. He requested confirmation that Katry Harris was representing ACHP in her statements.	
.9e	Katry Harris said that yes, she was here representing ACHP. She said that they are not required to receive SHPO's comments first, although it is typically done that way. She wanted to provide comments now because it is critical that NPS understand that there is a difference in the effects between the alternatives. Section 106 is an opportunity to modify the alternatives.	
.9f	Peter May asked Katry Harris if she thought the viewshed for Alternative 3 was worse?	
.9g	Katry Harris said that she thought it had a greater effect on the L'Enfant vistas.	

ITEM NO.	ISSUES DISCUSSED	ACTION BY
.9h	Peter asked if having tall objects framing the vista is worse than having objects in the middle of the view?	
.9i	Katry Harris said that there were no objects in the view in the other Alternatives 1 and 2.	
.9j	John Bowers showed the three alternatives when the 160' ROW is overlaid. The result is that Alternatives 1 and 2 each have several columns, relief blocks, and service buildings within the 160' ROW. Alternative 3 has two columns, some tapestry and one relief block, but the overall number of elements in the 160' ROW is less.	
.10a	Katry Harris said that the fundamental flaw of Alternative 3 is the tapestry. It obscures the LBJ Building, as does the size of the columns.	
.10b	Andrew Lewis asked if the columns were the same size across all alternatives.	
.10c	John Bowers answered that the column heights for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are as follows: 65', 50', and 70'.	
.11a	Alan Harwood asked Katry Harris if she thought that the design should be the one with the least impact?	
.11b	Katry Harris said that NPS has to look to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts. ACHP views that these three should be taken in sequence. Other factors can be considered, but in absence of other factors, yes, she would like to see NPS avoid effects to the extent possible.	
.12a	Perry Wheelock said that there are architecture, views and vistas, landscape, Maryland Avenue, and facades on the list of historic resources- are there any others?	
.12b	Don Hawkins said that the L'Enfant Plan was originally a diagram of public space. The designs obstruct Maryland Avenue in ways unlike any other avenues in DC. The clear solution is to treat it as a square on all four sides. This would separate the Memorial from the building behind it.	
.12c	John Bowers said that they had considered having a fourth street, or something similar. However, there are structural limitations, such as the LBJ Building's basement, and operational limitations, such as the security setback. He also commented that creating an urban island has a different feel; the Promenade will be a great opportunity.	
.12d	Don Hawkins commented that it would look odd if the two properties were not separated.	
.12e	Carl Reddel commented that EMC has consulted with the Johnson family and that they have embraced the idea of having the Eisenhower Memorial adjacent to the LBJ building.	
.12f	Don Hawkins thinks that the ratio of the Promenade is problematic. He would propose something akin to Freedom Plaza.	
.12g	David Maloney said that this site is not like Freedom Plaza. The relevant question is how you make the space comfortable to people? He would not say that having a four-sided square is the only way to accomplish this. The goal is a stronger sense of a pedestrian street.	
.12h	Steve Lorenzetti commented that Farragut Square originally had Connecticut Avenue going through it, and that is much improved since its reconfiguration.	
.13	Judy Scott Feldman said that all of the alternatives seem to require mitigations. The Memorial has the opportunity to focus and relate to other places, rather than being entirely inwardly focused. At this time, that does not seem to be the case with the current designs.	
.14	John McGrath said that his concerns focused primarily on the tapestry. It seemed ironic to him that the Eisenhower Memorial would obscure the Department of Education when Eisenhower had a strong role in education. He appreciates that modifications had been made to the imagery, and understands that the tapestry is still being developed, but remains concerned that it will still obscure the building. He also had concerns about sightlines and light to and from the building.	
.15	Katry Harris said that the installation of the tapestries might make it more difficult for GSA to find tenants for the LBJ Building.	
.16a	Andrew Lewis said that historically, the south side has been the main entrance. Is this the case?	
.16b	John McGrath said that the south side is primarily used, but that visitors use the north entrance, and that the address is 400 Maryland Avenue.	
.17a	Katry Harris asked if DED had any issues with the narrowing of the courtyard in regards to light in the library?	
.17b	John McGrath said that this is not an issue that they have raised.	
.17c	David Maloney raised the issue of the courtyard, saying that it is a primary design feature of the LBJ Building, and therefore a preservation issue. He said reducing its width would be an adverse effect.	
.17d	John Bowers said that they were respecting the 50' setback from the LBJ Building, delineating the two properties, and re-routing the utilities, all of which contribute to narrowing the courtyard.	
.17e	David Maloney said that the Promenade breaks into the courtyard. He also said that the service building lines up with the entrance to the Cohen Building.	

ITEM NO.	ISSUES DISCUSSED	ACTION BY
.17f	Carl Reddel said that EMC is aware of the potential impacts to the Department of Education as a result of the changes to the courtyard.	
.18a	Judy Scott Feldman asked how the Memorial can draw visitors around to the other buildings? Are there visitor centers in the neighboring buildings?	
.18b	Carl Reddel said that EMC is working with other agencies on this topic.	
.19a	Perry Wheelock asked what other landscape issues should be considered important?	
.19b	David Maloney said that the original design and the spatial organization of the existing plaza is an important element.	
.19c	Nancy Witherell commented that a key element of the landscape is the tripartite plan.	
.19d	Andrew Lewis said that the entrance to the LBJ Building should be observed.	
.21a	John Bowers said that they may shift the northern edge of the Promenade a few feet northward. He said that the design team would take another look at the courtyard, if those present thought it was important.	
.21b	Andrew Lewis said that would be a good idea.	
.22	David Maloney said that the historic spatial organization should be incorporated.	
	<i>Action: Continue to explore the northern edge of the Promenade.</i>	None

6 Update on the Design Process

.1	John Bowers reviewed changes in the tapestry design. He said that the images had changed to reflect that it is a piece of art, rather than a billboard or a wall. He said that it has taken significant time to progress the development of the tapestry, and that there are still numerous steps left before this is finalized. They plan to have a large-scale mock-up for people to visit. The design team will be looking at models, the view corridor, and the 160' ROW.	
.2a	Shane Dettman inquired whether they are considering any other configuration of the tapestry as part of Alternative 3 or other applications of the tapestry within one of the other two alternatives, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.	
.2b	John Bowers said that they are studying modifications of the current design, but not considering incorporation of the tapestry into the other two alternatives.	
.3a	Andrew Lewis asked if the subject matter of the tapestry was still being considered?	
.3b	John Bowers said that they had started with the Abilene theme, and were still working on content. They had received positive feedback from CFA regarding the use of the landscape.	
	<i>Action: Continue to develop the design.</i>	GP

7 Next Steps in the Section 106 Process

.1	Alan Harwood suggested that people put May 18th on their calendar for the next meeting. He said that they were planning to meet approximately every two months, which would allow time for the design to progress enough to address some of the issues that have been raised.	
.2a	Andrew Lewis asked if it would be a good idea to compare the NCPC design guidelines to the alternatives.	
.2b	Katry said that she did not think that the guidelines went far enough, because the Section 106 process looks at all kinds of resources.	
.2c	David Levy said that he would be interested in seeing the guidelines addressed to the extent possible.	
.2d	Andrew Lewis said it would be helpful.	
.3	Katry Harris noted that Section 106 activities are frequently addressed at the 15-30 percent complete stage.	
	<i>Action: Information only.</i>	None

PREPARED BY:

Claire Sale

ISSUED:

March 29, 2011

DISTRIBUTION:

Project Team