

SAH

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

COMMISSION MEETING

OPEN SESSION

Thursday, September 7, 2006

Suite 500
401 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20576
12:30 p.m.

PRESENT:

CHAIRMAN JOHN V. COGBILL III

VICE-CHAIRMAN PATRICIA ELWOOD

MR. HERBERT F. AMES

MR. JOSE LUIS GALVEZ III

MR. ARRINGTON DIXON

MS. AMY HALL

MR. MICHAEL MCGILL

MR. ROBERT MILLER

MR. DONALD MURPHY

MR. RALPH NEWTON

MR. MICHAEL SAZONOV

MR. JENNIFER STEINGASSER

I N D E X

<u>Agenda No.</u>	<u>File No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
1		Report of the Chairman	5
1A		Proposed Committee Meeting Dates for Calendar Year 2007	
2		Report of the Executive Director	5
3		INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS	
3A		Briefing by the Corps of Engineers on Flooding and Flood Prevention in the Monumental Core	21
		Information Presentation: L. Schiffer	
4		ACTION ITEMS--With Presentations	
4A	6694	Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial, Maryland and Independence Avenues, S.W., Washington, D.C. Site Selection and Design Guidelines	60
		(Commission action requested: approval of the site selection and design guidelines pursuant to Public Law 107-117, Public Law 109-220 and the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 8905))	
		Presentation: M. Marcus	
4B	1485	Federal Capital Improvements Program for the National Capital Region, Fiscal Years 2007-2012	118
		(Commission action requested: adoption pursuant to 40 U.S.C. ' 8723(a))	
		Presentation: S. Wood	

I N D E X

<u>Agenda</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>File</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
3		INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS (Continued)	
3B	CP-01	Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: District Elements Information Presentation: J. Mann	130
3C		New York Avenue/Florida Avenue Charrette Information Presentation: M. Weil	151

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. COGBILL: Good afternoon. Welcome to the National Capital Planning Commission's September 7, 2006 meeting. Would you all please stand and join me in the Pledge.

[Pledge of Allegiance.]

MR. COGBILL: Thank you. Noting the presence of a quorum, I would like to call the meeting to order. If there is no objection, the Open Session Agenda will be adopted as the order of business. Seeing and hearing no objection, the Agenda is adopted.

[The agenda follows:]

0

Report of the Chairman

MR. COGBILL: Report of the Chair. The Chair would like to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from Congressman Tom Davis who is the Chairman of the Commission on Government Reform and a member of this Commission designating David Marin as his First Alternate, Lawrence Halloran as his Second Alternate, Michael Sazonov as his Third Alternate and Victoria Proctor as his Fourth Alternate to the Commission.

Michael is with us today in his first meeting with us. Michael, welcome and thank you for being a part of our Commission.

MR. SAZONOV: Thank you very much.

MR. COGBILL: That concludes my--I guess I do have one other item which is the approval of the meeting schedule for Calendar Year 2007. I would jus ask you all to take a look at that. It is in your packet. You will note there are alternatives for July, the 5th of July or the 12th of July. My thought would be to move that to the 12th. I don't believe we have major conflicts with any other date.

1A

[The meeting schedule for Calendar Year 2007 follows:]

MR. COGBILL: So, if there is no further discussion on that, assuming that we will accept July 12 as the meeting date, I would entertain a motion--

DR. ELWOOD: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GALVEZ: Second.

MR. COGBILL: Motion made and seconded. Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

MR. COGBILL: Opposed?

[No response.]

MR. COGBILL: Abstentions?

[No response.]

MR. COGBILL: The motion carries. Thank you. We are off to a good start.

We will move on now to Agenda Item No. 2 which is the Report of the Executive Director, Ms. Gallagher.

Report of the Executive Director

MS. GALLAGHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon to members of the Commission and the public in attendance.

As you can see from the size of your packets, the month of July was not a slow month for

the staff at the NCPC. We were very, very busy this past month. Among the work that we conducted, I approved eight projects under the Commission's delegated authority and those reports are included in your packets.

I understand we have a witness who wishes to provide testimony on four of these delegated actions. So I ask, Mr. Chairman, that we allow Mr. Robert Brannum to speak on these four delegated actions and, at the conclusion of his presentation and Commission discussion, that I will continue with the remainder of my report.

MR. COGBILL: This is a little different from what we have done, but these are on the delegated agenda. We talked about this in this in the Executive Committee and felt like they could stay on the agenda, but we did feel like we needed to offer Mr. Brannum the opportunity to make his comments to this.

If this is no objection from the Commission, I would ask Mr. Brannum to come up and provide us with his remarks.

MR. BRANNUM: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Robert Brannum, ANC Commissioner 5C-04. In my limited time, I will try

to be very brief and to the point.

I am opposing the Executive Director's recommendation to approve the Eisenhower Memorial.

I oppose it on two grounds. One, I think the traffic pattern that has been approved--

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Brannum, I think you are going to speak to that. That is an item and we actually have you down to speak to that separately.

MR. BRANNUM: Yes.

MR. COGBILL: So, if you want to just talk about the delegated items, then we will bring you back up for the Eisenhower.

MR. BRANNUM: The delegated items presumably are the parking. My only objection to those would be the manner by which the Commission extends opportunity to the community to become engaged. I think closing alleys, giving the alleys to organizations to--basically giving public property for an organization or developer to build, to me, is an anathema to taxing for the use of land, giving the land, public lands, to an entity to build and there is no money coming to the city.

This is city property. That alley is city property. But alleys are being closed and are going to be developed and used by a developer and

there is no money coming to the city. Nothing. You are giving public property away by closing the alley.

I think we need to take a look at that process, because that is essentially what we do when we close alleys and allow someone to build, to give them the air space over it, to close off and to make it a use for their business, you are giving the property away rather than having them buy it at market rate or some other negotiated rate. This should be done and I don't think the federal government should be giving District property away or air rights that belong to the city.

I also think that the staff should engage the public a lot before it goes to its recommendation rather than have the discussion and then make a recommendation, have the public come in to give their views on something that, in essence, is always a final decision.

I think the Executive Director and the staff of the Commission ought to go out and engage the public first or have it a check-off item where individuals, organizations, come before the Commission and want to make presentations or close an alley or do something, they have a check, what

is your community interaction. Have you gone to the affected ANC commission in the District of Columbia?

It is not the responsibility of the District of Columbia government through the Executive Office of the Mayor to contact community groups. It seems to me that function is the responsibility of the agency that is seeking your approval, that they should be the ones to go out and that the staff should be sure that they have taken the step to at least invite the community to comment on what they are proposing rather than come to the Commission, have the Commission approve it and then, through some means by which a lot of community organizations don't know, it be done or have an impact on their community, get it and come here and try to convince you in three minutes.

I think that is wrong. There is too much power--this city has too much rights that are taken away. I think we need to--I live here. Washington, D.C. is my home. This is the Capital City but it still home to me. We pay the taxes for these roads.

I think a lot of confusion out there in America that somehow the federal government pays

for the District services. That is not correct. Our taxes pay for us, not the federal government. These streetlights, these roadways, they are maintained by District of Columbia residents, by D.C. Fire EMS, by D.C. WASA, not the federal government and there needs to be a little more respect about the people who live here and work here and send their children to school.

We are the taxpayers in this city, not just the tourists. We are the ones that maintain this city.

Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you, sir. Just for the sake of the Commission, there are three delegated items that deal specifically with the closing of streets or public alleys. Those are File No. 6692, 6696 and--is that 0303(b)? What is that? Okay; 6691.

I would just comment that--and I will turn this back to the Executive Director in a second--but what we do in these is we really--our role here is limited and it is really to determine whether there is a direct adverse effect on the identified federal interest. Our role is to consider that in light of the federal elements of

the Comprehensive Plan.

So our role in this is not so much as an approving authority but simply to review it in light of how it impacts the federal Comprehensive Plan and whether this somehow adversely affects the federal interest. So the public process is really outside of our approval part.

Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: I would just like to say that, many years ago, actually, it was almost pro forma that the alley closings would be on the open agenda. I don't know what that changed. It was not for purposes of reimbursing the District but for purposes of seeing if there were any adverse--for the reasons that you stated and other reasons.

Then I don't know why but it started being a delegated item. So you might want to check into that and see what caused the change and what caused it to be on the open session. But I do distinctly remember that.

MS. STEINGASSER: Mr. Chairman, to address Mr. Brannum's comments, and I am sympathetic to his desire to have more of a voice in the process, I think it is important to kind of understand the

process.

The alley closings are not submitted initially to NCPC. We are not the receiving agency for these. They are submitted to the District of Columbia government through the Office of the Surveyor. The Office of the Surveyor then distributes those applications to all relevant agencies including WASA, Department of Transportation, Department of Public Works, Office of Planning and NCPC, also, as a referral agency so that the City Council can receive these comments back.

They are then sent back to the Surveyor and then forwarded to the City Council where a public hearing is held. At that time, public comment is taken by the City Council and the agency comments are all considered.

If the alley closing is for office or commercial purposes, there is a contribution required to the Housing Production Trust Fund. The alleys, however, are not required to make donations if it is for residential purposes. So that is why sometimes there is and sometimes there isn't.

But there is, indeed, a public hearing process. I think it is important for people to

understand that, as NCPC, we are one of many referred agencies. We are not the original recipient and determining agency for closing those alleys.

MR. COGBILL: I think that is consistent with my note that we really are, in this case, simply looking at it as it affects the federal interest.

Thank you, sir. We look forward to hearing from you at one of our next public hearings.

With that, if there are no other questions or comments from the Commission, I will turn it back to the Executive Director.

MS. GALLAGHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to update you on five of our major planning projects this afternoon.

First, the National Capital Framework Plan; last month, our staff and the staff of the CFA, the Commission of Fine Arts, conducted extensive outreach on this project. We met one-on-one with our local and federal planning partners on this project including the Park Service, GSA, the Department of Defense, the D.C. Office of Planning and the Department of

Transportation, the Anacostia Waterfront Corporation, Kennedy Center, Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, Department of Agriculture and WMATA.

We have also been conducting meetings with private stakeholders including the Downtown Bid, the Federal City Council, Committee of 100, the National Coalition to Save the Mall, the Washington Convention and Tourism Corporation, just to name a few, because we feel it is not only important that we discuss the future of the extended area around the Mall with federal agencies but with, also, the private stakeholders in this process.

So those have been very, very informative meetings. Yesterday, we held a very productive meeting with the Framework Plan working group where we discussed the results of our July 25th public meeting. I have included in your packets, as an attachment to my report, our summary comments of that July 25th public meeting where we had 60-plus very important members of the community participating in that meeting.

At yesterday's meeting, we also presented some very initial planning concepts for our four primary focus areas for the Framework Plan. So I

am very excited about the input that we are getting from our working group and from the public.

We will be posting the results of our public meeting on our website. Just in looking forward, we are scheduled to conclude a preliminary framework plan and design concepts for some very special focus areas presenting to you and to the Commission of Fine Arts in January and February of 2007. So we are moving forward very productively on that study.

We are also making a good deal of progress in our RFK Stadium Site Redevelopment Study. We received significant input from the public at our July 19th meeting. We have also been conducting outreach with our stakeholder agencies over the past several months. So, right now, our staff is summarizing their own, using this input, land-use and planning recommendations for that 190-acre RFK stadium site.

This project has also generated a great deal of interest by the local media. I have described all those, listed all that out, in the public-affairs section of my report. But there is a lot of interest. We are going to be talking about this project for a long time. So we should

all pay attention. We will be presenting our preliminary recommendations to you at next month's Commission meeting.

The White House Area Transportation Study is also making progress. They are looking at--they are using a very sophisticated traffic-modeling technology to look at the aspects and the impacts of the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue and E Street and looking at mitigation measures to address those impacts.

The consultants are also developing a visual-impact assessment that will look at the urban-design impacts of various traffic alternatives. They will be making a presentation at the November Commission meeting.

The Railroad Alternative Feasibility Study, the CSX Railroad Alignment Study, is making progress in identifying alternative rail alignments for relocation of that line. The next significant milestone for that project is the identification of feasible corridors for that new alignment and, following that, a cost-benefit analysis of the impacts of the various alignments. We will be making a presentation to you on that study at our November Commission meeting.

Our CapitalSpace project, our open-space plan for the District of Columbia, continues to make progress in their assessment of open-space needs and assets in the District of Columbia. Our staff and our staff consultants spent a good deal of time this summer going out to 225 ballfields, courtyards, playground facilities that are owned by numerous agencies, the National Park Service, the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation and D.C. Public Schools which provides a really wonderful opportunity to address the open-space and recreational needs of the District.

Our consultants are now preparing a summary report of that work and we will be sharing that with you at our December meeting.

Our Office of Public Affairs has been very active over the past month. Because we are coming upon the fifth-year anniversary of the September 11th, 2001, tragedy, we have been getting a lot of media requests for interviews to discuss the security impacts of preventive devices for protecting against the kinds of physical barriers that have been put in place since--well, actually since 1995, Oklahoma City.

Many of the media really do focus on

September 11th. What we have seen is September 11th has just been an acceleration of the security problems that we have been facing for the past ten years.

Bill Dowd and I did an interview about a week or so ago. I understand from some of my friends that it was aired this morning on WAMU. I didn't hear it, but that was a very productive interview.

Our Worth of the Nation publication which tells the story of planning for the Nation's Capital, we are happy to report that that will be published in November by Johns Hopkins University.

Our Office of Public Affairs is very involved right now in developing an outreach program where they are reaching out to local academics, researchers, students and the general public just to make sure that that report is widely available and known to the public here.

Finally, on public affairs, before you leave today, I hope you take some time to take a look at our lobby display because we have revamped our lobby. We are now displaying some of our recent success stories including not-so-recent Legacy Plan, the Memorials and Museums Master Plan,

our work on the South Capitol Street, the Downtown Circulator, and our upcoming release of Worthy of a Nation.

Finally, I have one personnel announcement. In August, Michelle Desiderio joined NCPC's staff as a community planner with our Planning Research and Policy Division. Before coming to NCPC, Michelle worked for six years as a senior policy product developer with the FannieMae Corporation. She also worked with the New York City Department of City Planning and the National Association of Homebuilders.

Michelle has a Masters Degree in urban planning and environmental policy from the University of Virginia and a Bachelor's of Science in environmental studies. So we welcome Michelle to our staff.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

[The report of the Executive Director and delegated actions follow:]

MR. COGBILL: Thank you.

Welcome, Michelle. Any comments from the Commission at this point on the Executive Director's report? Thank you very much.

We will move now to Agenda Item No. 3. This is an information presentation on flooding and flood-prevention on the Monumental Core.

Ms. Schiffer.

**Briefing by the Corps of Engineering on Flooding
and Flood Prevention in the Monumental Core**

MS. SCHIFFER: Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. During the floods of this summer, some members of the Commission expressed interest in learning more about the flooding on the Mall and what effect it might have on our planning activities.

The Corps of Engineers has graciously agreed to come and brief us. I want to introduce Mr. Steve Garbarino from the Corps of Engineers who is in charge of the flood-control project on the Mall. He is going to introduce some members of his staff that he came with and give us a short briefing about flooding on the Mall.

Mr. Garbarino.

MR. GARBARINO: Thank you, Lois. Mr.

President, members of the Committee, folks in the audience, good afternoon. I have got a brief presentation. We are going to be talking about the flood-protection project we have in D.C. I am also going to spend a couple of minutes talking about the flood that we all experienced back in June here that caused a lot of interior flooding, caused a lot of damage to various government buildings and so forth. So I am going to address that.

I have eleven slides. I will go through those. If you have got any questions, please ask.

I did provide a handout to members of the Commission. You can follow along. You can write on the back.

Before I get started, though, I would like to thank the Commission for allowing me to be moved up in the agenda. I know you have got an awful lot on your plate to talk about today so I appreciate that. Traffic is tough.

But, before I get going, I want to introduce some of the folks that are behind the scenes in all of this and make a big difference. The first is Dennis Sibel--if they would stand to identify themselves. Dennis is a hydrology and hydraulics engineer commonly referred to as an H&H

expert. He is the guy that tells us that you've got a flood coming.

So he looks at all the models and the gauges and so forth and says, this is the situation. Get ready. The trigger. You gotta do something.

The next individual i want to introduce is Jim Ludlam. Jim is a civil engineer. He is in our civil-design group. Jim is intimately familiar with the D.C. Emergency Flood Manual. So he works quite a bit with the National Park Service and others in laying all of that out.

These two individuals are part of the team for this project. There are others in the District that support this project as well and they work on it.

Any questions before I get started? If not, let's go ahead. Again, Washington, D.C. local Flood Protection Project. The existing project; this project was built in 1939. It actually came on line in 1940. It came on in the aftermath of the storm we had in 1936. I think it is referred as The Great Flood of '36.

Obviously, a lot of things have changed since then. The landscape has changed. A few more

monuments. The project includes a levee commonly referred to as the Potomac Park Levee between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. It includes temporary closures. What do I mean by temporary closures? These are essentially sandbags, earth and so forth, to keep back the flood waters.

There are three of them. One is at Constitution Avenue west of the 23rd Street. The other is at 17th Street just south of Constitution Avenue and north of the World War II Memorial. Then we have a couple of small closures at Canal and P Streets adjacent to Fort McNair.

Highlighted in red there, the little red squares, are the location of the temporary closures, again 23rd, 17th and then at Fort McNair.

This next slide is rather interesting. What you see here is--excuse my choice of colors but the blue area is the inundation area during a 100-year event. These areas that are blue get water on them. Don't think of them in terms of being totally covered, but they do get wet. The areas in pink, and I think you fall just outside of that pink area, is the area that would be inundated if we did not put in the temporary closures.

But you can see for the most part that the East Potomac Park, the Tidal Basin, even Fort McNair, they get some water. They get damage.

I mentioned the D.C. Flood Emergency Manual. There is a manual that has been put together. It is a plan with a coordinated response where various entities get involved and move forward in the event of a predicted flood. It is updated about every ten years by the Baltimore District. We actually prepared it to begin with.

I mentioned the closure at 17th Street. Actually, it is done in two phases. The Phase I involves sandbags, Jersey barriers, plastic sheeting. I will show you some pictures of what that looks like. This action is triggered when the Potomac River at the Washington Avenue gauge, which is in Georgetown, just across the river there, predicts a flood height of 7 feet.

When it gets to that point, a trigger. Action is taken. For Phase 2, if it gets above that and gets up to 10 feet at that Wisconsin gauge, the second trigger comes in and we do something a little bit more serious. We go to an earthen levee.

MR. MCGILL: Excuse me. When you say

that, do you mean 7 feet above flood stage?

MR. GARBARINO: When it gets to that height at that gauge.

MR. MCGILL: But is it above flood stage?

MR. GARBARINO: At that point, it is getting at flood stage.

MR. MCGILL: So the height of the river, in total, is 7 feet.

MR. GARBARINO: Right.

MR. MCGILL: Not 7 feet above flood stage.

MR. GARBARINO: Correct.

MR. MCGILL: Okay.

MR. GARBARINO: So then it is triggered at that point and they go ahead and do that. The folks that do that is the National Park Service. But with this project, the National Park Service is responsible for doing to O&M, the maintenance and actually putting in these temporary closures at 17th and at 23rd.

The trigger for 23rd, by the way, is 19 feet. The last closure is at Canal and P Street. The responsibility there goes to D.C. Emergency Management Agency. They are responsible for putting in the sandbag closures.

DR. ELWOOD: Excuse me for a second. If

you could go back one.

MR. GARBARINO: Sure.

DR. ELWOOD: When you say "construction of this closure is extremely time-consuming and has the most potential for failure," what is the "this?" What is the "this" referring to?

MR. GARBARINO: "This" refers to the fact that it is going to take an inordinate amount of time to go out there and put in these sandbags. The concern is that it will take up so much time that it won't be done in time to prevent flooding. So it is very time-consuming, very labor-intensive, to do that.

DR. ELWOOD: Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: So this really means Phase 1 and Phase 2, sandbags and the construction of the earthen levee.

MR. GARBARINO: Correct.

MR. COGBILL: Okay.

MR. GARBARINO: The National Park Service has storage of facilities that have all the sandbags and the sand and so forth for this.

Let's talk about Phase 1. Here, again, 17th Street. You can see, this is during tropical storm Isabel. In anticipation of a flood coming,

the National Park Service is very responsive. They put this up in just a couple of hours, I suspect. It is about 300 feet long. You can see it going across 17th there. It consists of sandbags, plastic, and then there are some Jersey barriers that tie into high ground.

Now let's talk modifications. We touched upon the time consumption and all this. In 1946, and then with WRDA in '96, Congress--they thought about this a little bit. They said, we need to have a better way of getting a handle on this in the event of a flood. The construction of temporary closures is extremely labor-intensive and what they decided to do was come up with some project modifications that would allow it to be more efficient.

We could be more responsive and not have to get hung up trying to put out sandbags and so forth. Besides, folks have other commitments at the time. In the rush to get things done, this takes a lot.

Also, the Congress recognized that, along the Potomac Park Levee, there is kind of an inundation on the top of it. You may not be able to see it, but there needs to be some additional

material placed on top of that levy to make it uniform across the top. So that would be part of the modification as well.

When I say "material," I am talking no more than about a foot of additional material across there.

It is important to point out that, in the absence of these temporary closures, this estimate for damages would total over \$200 million in the Mall area. This is based upon October 2005 price levels. So places like the Smithsonian, National Archives and so forth would get a lot of water and a lot of damage.

Yes?

DR. ELWOOD: The Flood Control Act of 1946 has not been implemented; is that correct?

MR. GARBARINO: That's correct.

DR. ELWOOD: Thank you.

MR. GARBARINO: That's correct. What happened here, ma'am, is that when it came out in '46, it authorized some modifications. Nothing happened. Congress came back in 1996 and said, we have got modifications here, folks. Let's get these on.

What is the status? The District, in

response to the Congressional directive, is in the process of putting together some preliminary plans.

We have put together a decision matrix. That decision matrix is going to be our planning to allow us to go through all the various options for making these temporary closures more permanent.

We want to do away with the sandbags and Jersey barriers as much as we can. I don't think that is totally possible because we still have to deal with the streets and so forth. But if we can minimize the length of this and pull it in a little bit, that would be to everyone's benefit. So we are exploring that to see what we can come up with.

In terms of funding, the last time this project received any funding was in 2004. We received \$165,000 for the preparation of the designs and so forth. To be honest with you, funding is tough. This project is on 100 percent federal lands. It is hard to get money, especially in this environment.

I don't know how things are going to shake out of Committee here. I have asked for funding for '07. We will have to see. It is been, in the past, taken out at the last hour so I don't know if it is going to be in the President's budget or not.

The estimated cost of construction is \$3 million. Of course, when we complete the design and we will certainly sit down with all the stakeholders, you folks included, and go through this and make sure that we are all on the same page because I know there is a major concern here in D.C. With whatever we do there, it doesn't retract from the monuments and the national treasures and so forth. So we are sensitive to the aesthetics aspects for whatever we come up with. So we will sit down and talk about this more.

Let's turn our attention here a little bit to the June, 2006 flooding. I have heard all kinds of rumors; you know, you had a 300-year event, a 100-year event, it did this, the river came up. That is not true. Although we did have quite a bit of rain, the flooding that you experienced in the Mall area here was not caused by the river overtopping its banks.

On the contrary, what happened is you had some interior flood problems. You can see this one particular chart that I have up here--I had mentioned earlier the Wisconsin gauge. The Wisconsin gauge is the trigger. On this particular day, that gauge was down. It wasn't operational.

So what I am showing here is the Potomac River at Little Falls. Now, while that may be upstream several miles, our H&H folks are able to take that information and kind of correlate it down. At the Wisconsin gauge, if it had been operational, would have been about 6 feet. So it is below the trigger point for action to be taken for closures. That starts with 17th Street.

You can also see in here--I thought it was rather interesting, on this particular slide, it shows the flood stage at 10 feet and the river crested at 9.5 feet a Little Falls.

As I mentioned, the problem was interior flooding. You get high flows on the river and some of the local streams and so forth. They all come together and the water has nowhere to go. So you get a localized rainfall. If it can't get into the sewer system, the stormwater system can't handle that capacity at the pumping stations, it has nowhere to go but back up out on the streets.

If the buildings aren't flood-proofed, and there is a way for water to get in or they don't have very good drainage, sump pumps or whatever, they are going to get some wet basements. I know the National Archives folks received quite a bit of

flooding. I received calls from the Fine Arts folks. Everybody, it seems, was calling saying, we got wet.

Now, while the 2006 flood was a nuisance, a major problem, things could have been worse. What I am showing here is a picture of the 1942 flood. That is referred to as the flood of record.

You can see the Jefferson Memorial. The water got all the way up to the steps. The Potomac River in the distance. The Tidal Basin up front.

The point I am trying to make here is that you get the right mix, the right combination, of tide, local rainfall, the storm that might stall out west a little bit, and all of that comes together, this is what the local flood-protection project is designed to keep you protected from.

Any questions?

MR. AMES: I'd like for you to go back to the slide where you showed the Mall area with the different colors, the pink and the blue. Explain to us where everything is, the Lincoln Memorial--I see that. The Washington Memorial is where?

MR. GARBARINO: I don't know if you have got a pointer on this or not.

MR. AMES: Let me just go to my point.

MR. GARBARINO: Okay.

MR. AMES: I don't mean to beat a dead horse, but we have just been involved in approval of a reception center for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. It is a 25,000 square-foot center that is underground in the Mall area and you are sitting here telling me the Mall area is the 100-year floodplain, obviously less than the 100-year floodplain because the '46 picture you showed is serious.

I don't think there is any stopping it now but I just have got to make sure that everybody understands that not only building additional things on the Mall area is bad for business because of the dangers that lay out there with the possibility of flooding.

But then we look at a Congress-mandated facility underground in a flood-prone area--how much sense does that make?

MR. GARBARINO: I don't know. I don't make those decisions. But it is obvious from this that it is a low area. That's what happens.

MR. AMES: I am not fighting the battle and I didn't ever fight the battle of whether that facility needed to be built.

MR. GARBARINO: Understood.

MR. AMES: My fight was where it was being built. Really, I wasn't even considering the flood issue. I was concerned that we have got too much stuff there already. Then you are here telling me that we have got problems with flooding and there is lots that needs to be done.

Interior flooding is not something that Washington faces by itself. There are communities all over this country that have interior flooding problems because infrastructures in this country have not kept up with growth.

MR. GARBARINO: That's correct.

MR. AMES: We have the same thing in my hometown today. But if we are going to push forward--and I know how hard funding is. It is not only hard in Washington. It is hard in local communities across this country. But if we are going to sit back and allow things to keep being built in these areas, all we are doing is adding to the tax bills of what it costs to re-do and clean up when you do have floods.

I mean, nobody can project what is going to happen and when the next big flood is coming. But it doesn't take but just the stars lining up

right and, all of a sudden, you have got a brand-new 25,000-square-foot facility underground, Congressionally mandated, that is flooded out.

Then you have got the ruination of several memorials and stuff on the Mall in the Memorials corridor that are going to be ruined. So, you know, I assume that you all were not involved in the approval of this last monument or facility going in, but somewhere along the line, I am sticking my hand out to you and saying, look, the Corps of Engineers, we need your help to make sure things like this don't happen.

I don't know where it stands on being built, but I sure wish there was some way somebody could get parts of your report here today to the people that are going to firm this thing. We have had groups come up and say, we are against that--and it is not just the 25,000-square-foot center. It is other things that are coming because we know that, as much as there is a moratorium, any time a hot button is pushed, then it is going to be mandated that something else be built there.

All we are doing is digging that hole deeper every time we do it. I look for help from the Army Corps of Engineers and I appreciate the

fact that you are here today because you are validating even stronger issues of why we should look not only at the Mall area but the Memorials Corridor to make it better for everybody, because it is just going to cost more money in the long run.

Thank you very much.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. McGill?

MR. MCGILL: I would like to ask you a series of questions.

MR. GARBARINO: Sure.

MR. MCGILL: First, on the issue of the river flooding and then on the interior flooding. Just so I can get this in perspective, I like to think in terms of cubic feet per second. I was at Great Falls Visitor Center one time and I was curious what the rate was for the flood that occurred, I think, in January of 1996.

I think it said either 230,000 or 260,000 cubic feet per second at the peak of the flood. I am astounded that a river that has a normal flow of 22,000 can accelerate to that amount in what I view as--I mean, the Potomac doesn't strike me as being an especially big river.

Am I correct that it was that high,

something like 260,000 cubic feet per second?

MR. GARBARINO: Actually, that is--because the flood that I showed you up there for '42, and Dennis, you can correct me if I am wrong, but the flood, for instance, of 1936 was approximately 485,000 cfs. The flood for 1942 was 450,000. So, yes--this project, by the way, the Flood Protection Project in D.C., is designed for a 575,000-cfs flow event. We are authorized to go to 700,000 cfs.

MR. MCGILL: Okay. In that flood, as I recall, and I think I am correct it was January of '96--I am not positive--but I remember reading in the paper that either the Corps or the D.C. government controlled some kind of metal gates in the sewer system that would keep the Potomac from backing up into the sewer system during the flood stage, yet they were either rusted open or the controls didn't work or something. They were not shut.

Could you describe whether that system exists, who controls it and whether it works.

MR. GARBARINO: I am going to turn that question to either Dennis or Jim. Probably Jim. Come on up to the microphone.

MR. LUDLAM: Are you referring to the '96

event?

MR. MCGILL: Yes.

MR. LUDLAM: I believe, at that time, some of the gates were in a dilapidated condition. Since then, D.C. WASA has gone in and retrofitted some of those gates and put in hydraulic bladders that close off these openings. Whether or not they have completed all the systems, I can't address.

MR. MCGILL: Is that system part of the network you presented today or is it independent?

MR. LUDLAM: Not directly. It is independent but we coordinate with them for closure at times.

MR. COGBILL: Would you go ahead and give your name and title.

MR. LUDLAM: My name is Jim Ludlam,
L-u-d-l-a-m.

MR. MCGILL: Okay. Thank you. With regard to the internal, or whatever term you use for the flood that is caused by run-off, as occurred in this last event, I also have the impression that D.C. WASA has some ability to manually bypass the pumping stations and the Blue Plains plant and directly dump run-off into the river if the conditions warrant.

I am not sure I am correct in that and I would like to know whether that is true and does that kind of action substantially reduce the damages caused from interior run-off when it occurs.

MR. GARBARINO: I don't know if we can answer that question. Jim, can you? I mean, that is not part of our function here. That question would have to be directed to them as procedurally how do they deal with that. Do they have some sort of safety mechanism to route that water out to the river to provide more capacity? I don't know.

MR. MCGILL: Then, finally, with regard to the interior flooding problem, how do you avoid making the interior flooding problem worse with the system you are proposing to put in place?

MR. GARBARINO: Let me just say this.

MR. MCGILL: Because, you know, a levee works in two directions.

MR. GARBARINO: Yes; it does. That is one thing that people need to have a clear understanding of. I also have the projects up in Pennsylvania, Scranton, Olyphant and so forth.

MR. MCGILL: Wilkes-Barre?

MR. GARBARINO: Actually, that is another

co-worker of mine. Janet Harrington has the Wyoming Valley, but I have the other ones. Oftentimes folks think that, I have got a levee out there, I am protected and I am not going to get flooded. That is not true because, as you have indicated correctly, you have an interior situation where water has nowhere to go.

So, even with this project that I just talked about, you are going to have ponded areas and you are going to have areas that this water is going to sit for a little bit until the river either goes down or it gets into the storm cistern and out. Yes.

How do you minimize that? You certainly want to make sure that, while you are building the levees, there are opportunities to channel that water, re-route it, so it gets into a catchment basin and then be discharged into the river. You try to do that. You certainly don't want to exasperate the situation and make it worse.

Also, what we do with our non-federal sponsors on these flood projects is we actually go out and rate the size of pumps that will be needed. It is their responsibility to take care of the interior flooding. We tell them what size pumps

they need in the event of a flood event. We actually put it in as part of our O&M Manual for the project so that they know when they have to deploy these pumps, what size pumps they are, where they should go. Then they can pull the cord on them and take care of the flooding.

MR. SIBEL: May I add to what you just said?

MR. GARBARINO: Yes.

MR. SIBEL: I am Dennis Sibel. I am the H&H guy that he introduced before. Regarding how you not make this worse with a levee in place, the bottom line is there already is a levee there. It is buried in the area between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. It is already there.

The only thing our project does during a flood is to make those three closures. Those three closures are integral and require--so the water doesn't come through the openings in the protection. So, by making those closures more efficient and be made quicker, we are not worsening conditions. We are just allowing the project to function better during a flood event.

MR. MCGILL: Okay. The reason I ask these questions--I am with GSA. In the last June 25

event, a wall of water came down Constitution Avenue, filled the moat around the Internal Revenue Service Headquarters basement windows. broke through the windows, shorted out the sump pumps and filled the sub-basement and basement with 32 feet of water. So it wasn't just a wet basement and a little ponding.

Thank you very much.

MR. COGBILL: Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: I, too, wish to thank you very much for giving us the information and taking the time to come here today. I just would like to point out to everybody, and you can verify this, that I was in a situation where we were watching the possible approach of another very, very bad storm that was hovering over, I think, South Carolina, as a matter of fact.

Fortunately, it did not hit us. I am not going to ask you what it would have done it if did hit us, but the possibility is that it could have and we were watching it very carefully.

I am very concerned, of course, as everybody is who realized what the potential impact of this could be. You have a project that has not been funded.

MR. GARBARINO: That's correct.

DR. ELWOOD: I also, if I read this correctly, even with the funding of this, there will still be problems with your sewer system, et cetera; is that correct?

MR. GARBARINO: That's correct.

DR. ELWOOD: I know that I have seen this several time on our federal Capital program and I keep seeing it, and I think I have even asked why are we seeing this again. It does say that you did receive some funding, but I think I heard you say you have not received any funding; is that correct?

MR. GARBARINO: I received funding in 2004.

DR. ELWOOD: \$165,000?

MR. GARBARINO: Yes. And I know that there has been funding put in, I think it was in the House version. I don't know if it was in the Senate. I don't know what is going to come out of Committee. I don't know. It's in. It's out. It's in.

DR. ELWOOD: In that respect, I would like to ask that we, as a Commission, write a letter, if this is possible, to address the seriousness of this if we all agree. I know we are recommending

all these projects, but this one seems to keep getting overlooked. I would like to make the recommendation that we make a special point of the damage that can be caused if we keep putting this off, and how much more expensive it will be for the city than if we do this. That is number one.

Number two, I would like to ask you a very frank question. Have we made things worse on the Mall because of the building that we have been doing there?

MR. GARBARINO: I don't think so. I was just going to raise that. It is interesting that you mention that because, as the gentleman indicated, you are putting in all of these new things, new monuments and so forth. That's great, but it is very important that, as we go forward, whatever is being planned down the road for additional monuments and so forth and the use of the landscape, that nothing compromises the levee line of protection for this project.

So we need to be on the same page. I don't think that is a problem. I am getting the heads shaking east and west. It is not a problem at this point, but be sensitive and be aware of that. All the more reason, when we do come up with

a design, that we are going to sit down and share with you folks and the rest of the stakeholders, we want to make sure that we all get by in here because I am going to come to you with a recommendation that this is what we want to do in terms of making these more permanent, do you concur.

DR. ELWOOD: Okay. Has the floodplain--one of our mandates, by the way, if I am correct, is not to allow building on floodplains.

MR. GARBARINO: Most of that area is in a floodplain.

DR. ELWOOD: It is; is that not right? I know that is one of ours. So we need to, perhaps, point that out to Congress a little bit more forcefully and, in that sense, maybe we could enlist your help. But now I am proposing that we help each other and write this letter.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make that recommendation.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURPHY: I just wanted to clarify. On the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Center, since Commissioner Ames brought it up, that that is in an

area that is protected by that 23rd Street dike that was described a little bit earlier. So that particular facility wouldn't be compromised by a flood event that you just described; is that right?

MR. GARBARINO: Correct.

MR. MURPHY: I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. ELWOOD: It would not? It would not be compromised?

MR. GARBARINO: That's correct. As long as you put in the measures, it should be fine.

DR. ELWOOD: Put in the measures that--

MR. GARBARINO: Temporary closures at 23rd. If that temporary closure is in place, it protects that area from being inundated.

DR. ELWOOD: May I, Mr. Chairman?

MR. COGBILL: Yes.

DR. ELWOOD: When you are talking about temporary closures, are we talking about the sandbags?

MR. GARBARINO: Yes.

DR. ELWOOD: That you said take so long that, by the time that you do it, it would be too late?

MR. GARBARINO: Yes--well, 17th takes the

longest to put in. 23rd, that triggers at 19 feet. You have a little bit more time and you have less area to deal with. 17th takes a lot of time. That is why we are recommending permanent.

The point I want to make is that, whatever it is, temporary or permanent, as long as that is in place in the breach, the Memorial is fine. Without it, it is wet.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. McGill?

MR. MCGILL: Another topic that I thought of. I also was in St. Louis during the flood of '93 and I have read a lot about that flood incident. To what extent is the Corps being asked, or is the Corps proposing, to create levees above here on the Potomac that would prevent flooding from occurring, traditional Mississippi River-type levees, that would keep the river in its channel during flood stages but would exacerbate the flood risk downstream?

MR. GARBARINO: We are not proposing anything in that regard. That is something that would have to come down from Congress and say, hey, Corps of Engineers, here is the authorization. Go take a look at it. We would have to do all types of studies. We would go through the two-phase

planning process, recon, feasibility. It would take a while.

MR. MCGILL: But there hasn't--I mean, I am talking about the entire length of the Upper Potomac. There has been no system of levees installed in the last few decades.

MR. LUDLAM: The last two decades, yes; there have been two projects added on the south fork of the south branch of the Potomac at Morefield and Petersburg, West Virginia. They are fairly small areas. It is not like miles and miles and miles of levees like you are talking along the Mississippi. And there are no other current studies or proposed projects anywhere in the Potomac for building levees, to my knowledge.

MR. COGBILL: Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: I am raising this question and I don't know if there is an answer to it or not, but just as when you build a house or an apartment, you take certain precautionary measures, I was wondering if, when you build a memorial, it could be mandated that, in order to get the approval of the Commission, you need to install what will be necessary to protect it.

MR. COGBILL: I guess my point to that

would be that would implicit as part of the design feature. But, certainly, that is probably something that is within the purview of Congress, one, to legislate and certainly commissions to impose as design standards. I don't think it would rise, necessarily, to the level of a statute, but certainly that, I would argue, is something that would be required.

As we have heard, that is one of the issues that I guess, hopefully, is being considered that there is going to be some reliance on the flood-protection system that is proposed by this, even, I guess, as primitive as it is. But I don't know that we would have the ability, at this point in the Commission, to pose that.

DR. ELWOOD: For example, and I know, if I am correct, that, with the World War II Memorial, there was a lot of money left over. I am just wondering if we missed our calling or mark in knowing that something was being built on a floodplain and not asking that, as part of that, the World War II Memorial Foundation should take care of and pay for the levee that is needed.

It is done in the construction business in many instances. It is too late for that, maybe,

but we are still in the process of Vietnam. It is just something I would like to have us consider because it seems to me that, even a memorial proponent or a memorial foundation would want to protect their own property, if you will.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURPHY: I just wanted to make an observation. During Isabel, in Baltimore, in Baltimore Harbor, there is a building called the Trade Center which is owned by the state. Now, that building has a ramp that acts as a--below the building where all the switch-gear and all the major mechanical components were in that building.

The impact of Isabel, a combination of wind-blown as well as the rain, literally overflowed their flood gate that they have. That building was out of commission for essentially four months. All the tenants had to find other places to go work and a major upheaval and a major re-doing of the entire infrastructure of that building.

I can imagine a similar thing happening to Vietnam unless a provision is made to close off that ramp that gets into that building.

MR. COGBILL: I think these are good

points and certainly something that needs to be considered as we go through the design phase.

MS. STEINGASSER: I was just wondering, who reviews the building-construction permits for the memorials? The city does if it is subject to zoning but it is my understanding that, if it not subject to zoning, that the Army Corps was involved direction with the review of those permits.

Does anybody--the Park Service would review the permit, the construction permit?

MR. MCGILL: I suspect that part of the environmental NEPA compliance, it probably would be subject to evaluation.

MS. STEINGASSER: It is my understanding--I thought Army Corps weighed in on those construction permits. So there is an opportunity for internal coordination that may relieve some of our concerns.

MR. GARBARINO: We do, but I am not sure if that is the situation here. I am looking back at my colleagues and they are going, "Uh-uh."

MR. COGBILL: Does that mean, no, we don't want it or no, we don't do it.

MR. GARBARINO: Don't go there.

MR. COGBILL: Yes, Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: So, basically, it seems the answer to your question might be no one.

MR. COGBILL: I think this is something that we ought to probably send back to the staff and ask for you all to come back and report to us on what that process is. I think it raises some good questions.

I can certainly understand the impact of levees and drainage systems since I work in Richmond and we have had some interesting experiences on that where the manhole covers are blown off and the bottom becomes inundated with water.

Dr. Elwood, to your point about doing a separate letter with respect to this project, the only concern I have is that, as part of the FCIP, which we will actually act on today, is that we do take a specific action with respect to every project in that which is to make a recommendation with respect to that.

Certainly, this is one that is both recommended and strongly endorsed by us as the NCPC. I would have some concern in picking out one project from this list of 300 or 400 and commenting on that specifically. So that is the only concern

I have from a policy point of view.

But I would certainly entertain other comments or discussion from the Commission.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to something Commissioner Elwood said. I think it is important to keep in mind that there are things that individual property owners or monument and memorial sponsors can do and there are other things that must be done by the larger government.

It would not be prudent for us to say to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, you have got to build a levee all the way around your building because levees can tend to shift flood risk to other places.

What happens many times, like in Florida and now in New Orleans, is that they are saying the occupiable level of the house must be higher off the ground. Along the Mississippi River, after the floods of '93, the government actually bought out some towns and moved them from the river bottoms up to the hills.

So there are things that can be done on a small scale and a large scale but I think it is important for us to keep in mind that there should

be sharp distinctions between what we require an individual applicant to do versus what the government as a whole should do.

Instead of saying to an applicant, well, you are in a floodplain, you must build a massive levee, we might say, you are in a floodplain, you can't build.

MR. COGBILL: Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: Response. We tried that. We do say, you are in a floodplain. But we still vote for it. So I don't know what the correct remedy would be to ask but I think when it impacts--when there is some dangerous impact if you don't do something, perhaps that sets a project off from another that is recommended and strongly endorsed, because we have recommended and strongly endorsed this.

But I am just thinking, when it comes to safety, and I know with terrorists, we sort of have mandated that that has taken a priority. Well, this has something to do with public safety as well.

So I am just throwing that out that maybe there is something that distinguishes these projects from each other and, perhaps, it is the

public-safety factor and a dangerous impact if you don't do something versus we want to do this and we strongly endorse it.

I don't really know what the answer is and I don't even know what the remediation would be or what we would ask from a memorial proponent, but I don't see why we should not be able to do that. It is government land that is being given. I know it is private money but government takes care of that land. So I really think it is worth serious consideration.

MR. COGBILL: Other questions or comments?

You had suggested that we write a letter and I had suggested that, perhaps, we do not. Is there--

MR. AMES: I have something to say. I understand where she is coming from about a letter.

I would be a strong proponent of that except for the fact that I would like for your request of staff to come back to us at our next meeting, during whatever part of the meeting you want to do it, to explain to us the process of what we, as a Commission, can and can't do.

It is obvious that there is a higher authority than us that can require things to be done, but, you know, sometimes common sense gets

left out in the wind.

I asked a question and then you can make that question anything you want. If you get the sandbags put up, you don't have a problem. If you don't get the sandbags put up, you have got a big problem. Who is going to determine that? That is not part of what we are worried about.

What I want to know is where, along the line in the building process, which I consider approval of that process, as part of that process of approving plans and their plan, that would be in place in case of a flood.

But one of the things you said, I am scared to death if the answer comes back that there is nobody that has the authority to check that, then the Corps of Engineers and the National Capital Planning Commission need to put their heads together and get whoever has got to put that in place to put that in place because that is crazy.

A lot of crazy things get done in this city. We know that. But that doesn't mean we can't work to change them. But I would like to see the staff come back to us with how those things are controlled and then, if we need a letter on that specific project, we will.

But then, again, if the answers are right--we may need to be stronger about what we are looking at but, without a full understanding of it, I think we would be misguided to go off and say, we need to do this.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that you request staff to do that for us.

MR. COGBILL: What is the timing? How long would it take you, Ms. Gallagher, to have a report back to the Commission?

MS. SCHIFFER: Why don't we say at least a progress report in a month and maybe we will have an answer by then.

MR. COGBILL: So we will expect to hear from staff at the next meeting.

MR. DIXON: Mr. Chairman, I have a question and a comment. How much does it cost to put the sandbags up when we need them?

MR. GARBARINO: I don't know. That one you will have to ask the National Park Service. I don't know what it is, what the cost is. But time and effort; yes. Plus, they have to store that material for extended periods.

MR. MURPHY: Why don't we just make that part of the report that we get back. I certainly

don't know.

MR. DIXON: It would be interesting to see what a \$200 million project compared to X amount of dollars as needed to put the sandbags up would be.

MR. GARBARINO: That's what we will look at as well.

MR. DIXON: Also, I think that Dr. Elwood's position is going to make sense. Why don't we look at also whether we could, even now, talk to some of the residents of the Mall who have big groups and big constituencies and see if they can't get together and say, let's pay to protect the area we are on. They may be happy to kick in some of their--tap their constituencies that they use to effectively to lobby us, they should tap into them and maybe they will be willing to put some money on the table.

We pay taxes for policemen to protect our community, not necessarily to protect my house. Why can't they pay up to help for the levee that will protect their areas whether it is specifically around their monument or not. It seems like that is something to be looked at. Maybe we need to convene those folks and talk with them and say, look, we have got a problem.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Galvez?

MR. GALVEZ: Just in follow up, I mean, if we don't get to the point of doing a letter in response to this right now, maybe there is a way we address the recommendation for projects that have potential public impact in terms of safety or economic loss and highlight that as a special feature in terms of what we recommend.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you very much for your time.

MR. GARBARINO: Thank you very much.

MR. COGBILL: My thanks to the Commission for a very good discussion.

MR. DIXON: Mr. Chairman, I think we should thank Dr. Elwood. She is the one that, several months ago, asked for this. Obviously, she has got a good issue here, as usual. Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: We will move on to Agenda Item 4A which is site selection and design guidelines for the Dwight Eisenhower Memorial. I will ask Mr. Marcus to come forward.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial

MS. MARCUS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. The National Park Service has requested site approval for the Dwight

D. Eisenhower Memorial in Washington, D.C.

The August 4 submission consists of five parts; the National Park Service proposed site, the design guidelines that the Park Service proposed for the site, an environmental assessment, public comments received on the environment assessment and the Park Service summary and analysis of the public comments received.

I would like to spend a moment to review the background for this project. In January, 2002, Congress authorized the Eisenhower Memorial to be constructed in the District of Columbia. Between 2002 and 2005, the Eisenhower Memorial Commission studied 26 sites in the District.

In April of 2002, the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission recommended that the Eisenhower Commission consider sites in Area 1 noting that Area 1 was appropriate for a Presidential memorial.

In a follow-up action in 2005, the NCMAC recommended the Eisenhower Commission's preferred site which straddles Areas 1 and 2. This is the site before you today.

In 2006, Congress authorized the Eisenhower Memorial to be built in Area 1. Also

this year, the Park Service and the Eisenhower Commission completed an environment assessment on the project.

This slide shows the proposed site straddling Areas 1 and 2. While the EA analyzed the proposed site and the no-action alternative, it also discussed why the other 25 sites were previously eliminated. Sites 9 through 24, shown here in white, were eliminated because they were outside of Area 1. Sites 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8, shown in yellow, were eliminated because they fell in the Reserve area created by Congress in 2003.

Site 6, also in yellow, was eliminated at the request of the Architect of the Capitol. Two additional sites shown in green, the Auditor's Building and the proposed United States Institute for Peace site, were considered at great length but rejected due to functional and operational conflicts with the existing and planned facilities at those locations.

The Eisenhower Commission studied two of the remaining sites in greater detail, the proposed site shown here as No. 1 in red and blue and the Freedom Plaza site as No. 2. The Freedom Plaza site was eliminated due to the lack of a direct

correlation between Eisenhower and the adjacent federal agencies.

NCPC staff is supporting the proposed site, No. 1, shown here, along Maryland and Independence Avenues.

This is a summary of what we will be recommending to the Commission today, approval of the proposed site for the following reasons; it is a prime candidate in the Commission's Memorials and Museums Master Plan, it is appropriate to locate a Presidential memorial in Area 1, the surrounding institutions have a strong thematic relationship to Eisenhower's legacy and the surrounding architecture in Southwest D.C. reflects his time in office.

Considering the site for a memorial of this size is an opportunity to improve its urban design, consolidating the site. A memorial at this location, designed appropriately, would be compatible with the L'Enfant Plan and is supported by the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Officer.

Additionally, we are recommending approval of seven comprehensive design principles rather than the Park Service's proposed design guidelines

because we find that performance-based design principles are more appropriate for this project at this time.

Through analysis and consultation, staff has developed these seven design principles which we consider to be a sound framework for the design as it moves forward on the site. The principles address the most important characteristics of the site and its surroundings.

The most important characteristic of the site is the Maryland Avenue right-of-way including the reciprocal vistas to and from the U.S. Capitol that it provides. Building on this characteristic, staff has developed the following design principles to guide the design of the memorial and recommends them for your adoption today.

These principles will also be considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at its September 21st meeting and will provide guidance for continued Section 106 consultation. Finally, these principles and continuing consultation form the basis for the Executive Director's finding on the EA.

After reading each design principle, this important characteristic of Maryland Avenue will be

demonstrated in the slides that follow. The design principles are; to preserve reciprocal views to and from the U.S. Capitol along Maryland Avenue, to enhance the nature of the site as one in a sequence of public spaces embellishing the Maryland Avenue vista, to create a unified memorial site that integrates the disparate parcels into a meaningful and functional public gathering place and that also unifies the surrounding precinct, reflects the L'Enfant Plan principles by shaping the memorial site as a separate and distinct public space that complements the Department of Education Headquarters and other surrounding buildings, respect and complement the architect of the surrounding precinct, respect the building lines of the surrounding rights-of-way and the alignment of trees along Maryland Avenue, incorporate significant green space into the design of the memorial.

The four-acre site is bounded by the Department of Education Building on the south, by 4th and 6th Streets on the east and west, and by Independence Avenue on the north. Surrounding the site are the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Air and Space Museum, the National Museum

of the American Indian and the Cohen Building which houses the Voice of America and the Department of Health and Human Services. The site also encompasses a portion of Maryland Avenue which has been significantly altered over time.

Here the current uses are seen at closer range. The darker asphalt paving on the northern spur of Maryland Avenue indicates where traffic has been diverted onto Independence Avenue at mid-block to avoid the complex routing of traffic through an intersection at Maryland Avenue and Independence at 4th Street.

The area north of the Department of Education is currently its entrance forecourt and includes a sunken courtyard. Last year, the Department of Education submitted site plans for plaza improvements to NCPC. In September, 2005, the Executive Director approved the plans with the understanding that improvements would complement and not interfere with any future development of a memorial adjacent to that site.

The improvements have not been implemented and subsequently the Department of Education signed a memorandum of understanding with the Eisenhower Commission supporting the concept of designating

the plaza in front of its building as the preferred site for the Eisenhower Memorial.

According to the applicant's EA, memorial site development would be restricted within 40 feet of the Education Building.

The Commission's Memorials and Museums Master Plan designates the site as Prime Candidate Site 3 highlighted here in red. Also in the vicinity to its southwest is Reservation 113 at the intersection of Maryland and Virginia Avenues identified as Prime Candidate Site 19 in green.

These prime sites for commemorative works recognize the significance of being near the Capital and the Mall and also the importance of enhancing now disparate parcels with coherent designs that would reflect the principles of the L'Enfant and McMillan plans.

Although the Commission's 1997 Legacy Plan envisioned Maryland Avenue restored as a boulevard with monumental vistas, its 2001 Memorials and Museums Master Plan, shown here, created two memorial sites along the avenue, both the proposed site, highlighted in red, and down at Reservation 113 would be the Prime Site 19.

The site location is also appropriate due

to its direct connection to Eisenhower's legacy. There is a thematic relationship between Eisenhower and the federal entities and museums that surround the proposed site many of which were created or expanded during his presidency.

The next three slides demonstrate the importance of enhancing the views through the site to and from the U.S. Capital. Staff recommends that enhancing these views will be among the most important tasks of the designer in developing the memorial design.

This view, looking northeast towards the Capital, is taken from the proposed memorial site. This next view is taken from beyond the site further south along Maryland Avenue.

Finally, this view looks southwest along Maryland Avenue towards Reservation 13 which is the grassy area in front of the GSA Regional Headquarters and is also another prime candidate site.

Currently, three government agencies share administrative jurisdiction over the site which is entirely federally owned; the National Park Service, the District of Columbia Department of Transportation and the General Services

Administration. Each administer portions of the site as shown here.

GSA and DDOT will transfer jurisdiction to the Park Service allowing the applicant to unify the parcels into a single site for the Eisenhower Memorial that would also become a new public space along Maryland Avenue. Staff believes that the creation of a public space at this location would complement the L'Enfant Plan.

Creating a new public space which preserves the qualities of the Maryland Avenue right-of-way rather than reconstructing Maryland Avenue through the site is also endorsed by the D.C. Historic Preservation Officer as evidenced in his comments following an August 29th consultation meeting.

The SHPO wrote, "It is the shaping of view corridors and public spaces framed by building sites that is the essence of the L'Enfant Plan rather than functional roadway configurations that have sometimes been changeable over time in subdivisions of the public space."

The following slides will demonstrate how the nature of Maryland Avenue has changed over time. The site is highlighted in yellow. Is this

1870's map reflecting development of the L'Enfant Plan, Maryland Avenue linked Reservation 113 and the Capital crossing B Street, which is now Independence, at a 45-degree angle at 4th Street.

The McMillan Plan gave greater definition to the Mall as a precinct and gave greater prominence to B Street, widening it and renaming it as Independence Avenue.

As implemented, Independence Avenue became the major thoroughfare for vehicles rather than Maryland Avenue. A spur was constructed to carry Maryland Avenue traffic through Reservation 5 to intersect with Independence Avenue at mid-block. The remainder of the Maryland Avenue right of way is now used for parking on that site.

The Commission's environmental procedures require that an EA, or an EIS, be prepared at the site-submission stage and at subsequent stages for all commemorative works. The Park Service has submitted an EA at the site-selection stage and NCPC was the cooperating agency on it. The Park Service circulated the EA for 30 days to receive public comment receiving six comments which primarily address the NEPA process and potential effects to Maryland Avenue.

The Park Service will use the Section 106 consultation process under an HPA to consider the potential for effects to Maryland Avenue. NCPC procedures require the applicant to complete the initial Section 106 steps at the site-selection stage.

The Park Service initiated consultation by letter to the D.C. Historic Preservation Officer on August 9th. In the letter, NPC determined no adverse effect to the National Register qualities of the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans. It identified two organizations that requested to be consulting parties and suggested that developing memorial or agreement during consultation would enable them to continue to avoid adverse effects during design.

NPC and NCPC co-hosted a consultation meeting to hear the views of consulting parties on August 29th. During the meeting, both agencies heard comments on NCPC's seven proposed design principles and NCPC staff revised the design principles to reflect those comments.

In the D.C. SHPO's August 31st response to the NPC initiation letter, the Preservation Officer indicated that it was not necessary to make an official determination of effect for the project at

this time. Instead, he outlined an appropriate plan for moving forward with consultation on the project.

The SHPO's letter, which you have in your packet in front of you, states several things that I will read over here. "We believe this project offers the significant opportunity to realize a national memorial goal while enhancing the symbolic qualities of the historic L'Enfant Plan. It properly utilizes a prime site identified in the Memorials and Museums Master Plan and we believe that reconfiguration of the site and its administrative jurisdiction is a necessary corollary of this utilization."

It goes on to say, "This statement of design principles appear useful for the purpose of forging a consensus during the site-selection phase but that the design team will need a more detailed set of guidelines before embarking on the design phase."

Finally, "An MOA that incorporates design guidelines and indicates a procedure for review of the memorial design would be an appropriate vehicle to address the effects of the project on historic features."

Finally, it is important to note that the Executive Director has issued a finding of no-significant-impact for the site selection which is contingent upon implementing mitigation that adheres to the design principles and to continuing the Section 106 process.

The Executive Director's recommendation is that the Commission approves the site for the Eisenhower Memorial provided that the applicant design the memorial using the Section 106 consultation process to meet to the Commission's satisfaction the following design principles which we will review again; preserve the reciprocal views to and from the U.S. Capital along Maryland Avenue, enhance the nature of the site as one in a sequence of public spaces embellishing the Maryland Avenue vista, create a unified memorial site that integrates the disparate parcels into a meaningful and functional public gathering place, reflect the L'Enfant Plan principles by shaping the memorial site as a separate and distinct public space that complements the surrounding buildings, and respect the building lines of the surrounding rights of way and the alignment of trees along Maryland Avenue, and, finally, incorporate significant green space

into the design of the memorial.

The Director further recommends: that the Commission does not adopt the applicant's draft design guidelines as submitted and notes that additional or more detailed design guidelines may be developed and be incorporated in a Section 106 memorandum of agreement as consultation continues; finds that potential effects to the historic Maryland Avenue right of way and associated views and vistas merits special attention and, therefore, underscores the requirement that the applicant obtain, prior to and during design development, the views of the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Officer and consulting parties through the Section 106 consultation process; and notes that the Executive Director has issued a finding of no significant impact for the site selection subject to the development and implementation of appropriate mitigation through adherence to the design principles and the Section 106 consultation process.

That concludes my presentation and I would be happy to answer any questions.

[The staff recommendation and list of registered speakers follow:]

MR. COGBILL: Questions for staff at this point? Mr. Ames?

MR. AMES: Yes. I am going to be sure that the design guidelines that were presented by the National Park Service versus the design principles that were inserted by the National Capital Planning Commission, that that has been an ongoing discussion with the Park Service and that they agree with that.

MR. MURPHY: Yes; it has and we do agree.

MR. AMES: Okay. Then that is the only question I have. Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. McGill.

MR. MCGILL: I am just curious about one of the design principles because it seems to me it is contradictory within itself, and that is No. 6, "Respect the building lines of the surrounding rights of way." One of the problems with Maryland Avenue is that the building lines don't respect the Maryland Avenue right-of-way. They are at an angle to it because they relate to either Independence Avenue or streets to the south.

So aren't we making a contradictory statement there? It seems to me we want them to respect the Maryland Avenue right-of-way.

MR. LEVY: I believe, Mr. McGill, we are talking about the building lines of all of the surrounding streets so that any structures, for instance, that would occur as part of the memorial design would respect those building lines, Independence Avenue, 4th and 6th Streets included.

MR. COGBILL: Does that answer your question, Mr. McGill? Okay. At this time, we will move to the public--oh; I'm sorry.

MS. STEINGASSER: That's okay. Ms. Marcus, I just want to make sure, with the finding of no-significant-impact, the design principles and the continuation of 106, that encompasses all the impacts that were considered. There is nothing else that needs to be addressed?

MS. MARCUS: That is what the finding of no-significant-impact is predicated upon, upon the potential effects to historic features being worked through in consultation.

MS. STEINGASSER: You think those design principles embody all of those?

MS. MARCUS: We do.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Other questions from the Commission? We will move to the public portion of

this matter. We have four registered speakers. Each of those will be speaking on behalf of organizations. As our rules provide, each representative will have five minutes to speak.

If you have not been here before, we do have a clock on the wall that does count down. At one minute, you will see an orange light, amber light. Of course, at the end, there is a red light and a sound which is usually pretty distracting.

So I just warn you in advance. At this point, I will move forward and I will ask Mr. Robert Brannum to come back who is the representative for ANC-5C-04.

MR. BRANNUM: Thank you. Very briefly, I would hope that the staff would, doing the flood plan, remember that people live in Washington D.C., and they have been coming up with these flood-control plans to mitigate flooding in downtown in this area, that that water has to go somewhere.

In August of '01 and June of '06, it is my neighborhood, Bloomingdale, that is always impacted by heavy rains. It is my neighborhood where police cars are floating and the officers are waist-deep; Bloomingdale. So you have to remember that the

federal interest cannot be to just protect the downtown and let the residents in the upper parts of Washington flood out because you want to protect these monuments downtown.

So I hope that you remember that whatever flood controls you come up with has to impact, has to consider the impact on people who live and go to bed at night in Washington, D.C.

As far as the memorial site is concerned, my opposition is not to the site but to the closing of Maryland Avenue. I will say right here that I will oppose DCDOT transferring its jurisdiction to National Park Service for that site. I do so because I feel that, one, the study is flawed because in the closing of Maryland Avenue, I use Maryland Avenue to get off of Independence Avenue to make an easier access down to 6th Street further down to Southwest rather than having to go along and fight that tourist traffic along Independence Avenue.

Also, I don't think this plan takes into consideration the D.C. Emergency Evacuation Plan for the City which has the U.S. Capitol Police with barricades along Independence Avenue and 4th Street that block off traffic.

So you are blocking off Maryland Avenue from traffic now with this new site and having all the traffic go up and down Independence Avenue. There is nothing that is planned that says that you interchange how that impacts on the emergency-evacuation route for the people that live here and the tourists that come into town because the Capitol Police have barriers, now, that block access up and down Independence Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue and they also have their cars up and down those cross streets.

There is nothing in this that addresses that issue. As one who has been involved in emergency management at the community level, I think it is important. We are not only talking about trying to protect the monuments. I am trying to protect the lives of the people that live here and go to bed at night and those that visit us.

I think we need to be a little bit more sensitive to the people that live here. If I sound like a skunk and look like a skunk in the room, smell like a skunk, or sound like the elephant in the room, I'm sorry. But having lived here all my life and seen how the rights of the District are overrun by federal interests or how federal

interests seem to say that our interests don't matter, don't mirror, the interests of the local population, I think needs to be addressed.

We who live here need to be a part of this planning process. I have nothing against the Eisenhower Memorial but, somehow or another, people need to understand that there is more to building monuments in this town. There are people who live here. When they put up these structures and when they change traffic patterns, it is not just downtown.

This is a 24-hour city. When everybody is gone and we are traveling trying to pick up children, go to meetings and our roads are blocked, or diverted, it impacts us, how we get our deliveries from truckers. It happens. It surely happened on Capitol Hill when they closed off Pennsylvania Avenue. Businesses closed.

Pennsylvania Avenue, when they closed off Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House, it has an impact on public transportation and the subway. I don't see any of that in this discussion.

It is great that we want to honor the Former President. But people live here. It is not just simply people live in Iowa and Massachusetts

and Rhode Island and Arkansas and Oklahoma. People who live on Oklahoma Avenue have a right. People who live on Abner Street have a right to be involved in this process. I think we need to understand, everybody needs to understand, that people live here.

Children go to school here. We work here. We have a right to be involved. Somebody has to speak up for us.

Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you, sir.

I will now ask Mr. Nelson Rimensnyder from the D.C. Republican Committee to come forward.

MR. RIMENSNYDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. The D.C. Republican Party is very supportive of the site and having a memorial to honor President Eisenhower.

There are only two presidents in the 20th Century that really used the bully pulpit of the presidency to advance political rights of the District of Columbia, President Eisenhower and President Nixon.

Eisenhower sent eight messages to Congress on the matter. He wanted us to have a right to vote for President and be represented in Congress

with voting members. Interestingly, his major ally in the in the Senate on this was the grandfather of the current president, President Bush. So the Republican Party has been trying to get a third president to use as bully pulpit, the current President Bush for voting representation which is, of course, coming up this month in Congress, the Davis, Tom Davis, and Eleanor Holmes Norton bill.

The Republican Party would like the memorial in some way to reflect Eisenhower's interest in the civil and voting rights of the residents of Washington. I think this would be very important because people from all over the country and the world will visit this memorial.

When Eisenhower came to this city, it was segregated. When he left, it was an integrated city. Mamie Eisenhower and the President refused to go to the segregated theaters in Washington until they were integrated. He sent his attorney general into the courts to press for the integration of restaurants and other public places in the city. So he really did a great deal for the political and civil rights of Washington.

We would also like the memorial in some way to maybe have a kiosk or some place where items

and books about the President's life can be purchased. We think that is very important.

I also have brought an article which I will pass around that I wrote about Eisenhower and his connection with the city. I think he was interested for many reasons. One, he lived here in the city for 14 years of his life when he was in office or coming up through the ranks. He didn't live in any base out in Maryland or Virginia. He lived in the city, in apartments in the city.

His son went to the public schools for a number of years. So he witnessed the segregation in this city and the disenfranchisement of the people and I think it had an impact on him as president.

So we are very supportive of this project and we hope it goes forward and we hope that the citizens and members of our committee, the Republican Committee of the District of Columbia, will be consulted at appropriate times on the design.

That's all I have to say. I would glad to answer any questions and I will circulate the letter. Do you have the letter? Is the letter from the committee in your--

MR. COGBILL: I don't believe that we do.

MR. RIMENSNYDER: Then I will circulate copies of the letter also from the Republican Central Committee.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you.

MS. STEINGASSER: Mr. Rimensnyder, if I could ask a question. You mentioned that you are supportive of a kiosk or something that would sell information, books, about the President. How do you see that being integrated into the design? It is interesting because it is nice that it is being mentioned up front so it can be integrated in. I was just wondering if you had any--

MR. RIMENSNYDER: As I understand from a presentation that the National Park Service conducted I went to a couple of months ago, they are going to provide an on-site ranger, a Park Service ranger, on I guess regular hours of the day when most tourists would be there. So I think if that is going to be the case, I think then it would be appropriate to have some kind of a small kiosk that would be available and open.

Some have even suggested, some members of the Committee even thought that maybe something larger should be explored where there would be a

small exhibit of some kind about his life that would be integrated into the memorial in some way.

MS. STEINGASSER: Are you coordinating with the Memorial Committee, itself, on those design ideas?

MR. RIMENSNYDER: We have been, yes. We have been consulting with them and they know of our interests and have been encouraging that we stay in touch on this. Yes.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you, sir. We will now move to Mr. Don Hawkins on behalf of the Committee of 100.

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you. I am Don Hawkins representing the Committee of 100. I really am pleased to hear the personal testimony from Mr. Brannum and Mr. Rimensnyder that makes this something other than an abstraction in an empty space.

Myself, I was part of Eisenhower's first inaugural, the high-school band, St. John's High School Band, marched luckily just in front of the elephants at the tail-end of the parade.

I am afraid I have to begin with a bit of a complaint and a caveat. The Committee of 100 has

not really been participating through I don't know what kind of clerical problems. We simply didn't receive any communications directly until the EA was produced. It arrived, for some reason, and I do not blame anybody else present for this--it arrived on my desk three days before the end of the comment period.

So our first involvement was really at the meeting on August 29th, although we did get a look at the EA and quickly made a few comments. Our general sense of it was that it really didn't get very deeply into the problem of locating a memorial here and we weren't really sure just how it had come about that this was the chosen place. The wording in the EA is not very explicit and refers to the wrong exhibit at the back, or the wrong appendix.

So we haven't really had a very good sense that we knew what was going on. At the August 29th meeting, the discussion about the design points, design criteria, was a very good one and, at that time, we discussed an alternate that was not in the EA.

One of the problems with the EA is that it only gave one alternate, one design and a no-build

alternate. On the basis of that one, let's say, distribution of roadways and such, I would have thought that--and a number of people I have discussed this with would have thought that that would--that a finding of a no-significant-impact could not be done on the basis of that pattern, road pattern, if only because it is the only way any L'Enfant avenue in the city would have been shaped just like that.

This is all just words but if we look at the pattern, look at it saying, well, the Eisenhower Memorial is going to be the front yard of the Department of Education and the avenue would really have stopped. It would have announced its stopping by having a memorial smack in the middle of it, in front of it.

The idea that was discussed at the August 29th meeting which seems to have some acceptance in general is that a pattern more like Freedom Plaza with roadways all the way around allowing the memorial site to be read as an element, an event, in the progression up the avenue instead of being the end of the avenue.

From what we have seen of the process, it is hard to tell whether we have missed very much

because what we have got is the EA as a result but we don't have a very strong feeling that the processes have been as open and as systematic and as fair as possible and with all of the kind of input that we have found today you can get when the process is open.

I believe that we will now receive all of our communications properly. I don't think that that will continue to be a problem but it isn't the only problem with this.

This is a purely subjective comment. It doesn't feel as though it has been taken very seriously yet, the real problems of making something fit on that site. I hope that the design guidelines that are being adopted and which we support will help with that.

Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Steingasser?

MS. STEINGASSER: I just have another questions. Mr. Hawkins, you referred to the design guidelines. Are you referring to the seven design principles put together by NCPC?

MR. HAWKINS: Yes, the ones that have been put forward, the principles. Yes.

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Other questions? Mr. Miller?

MR. MILLER: Does the Committee have a position on maintaining the historic 160-foot right-of-way versus a 60-foot right-of-way as suggested in the--

MR. HAWKINS: No. The Committee has not taken a particular position on just how to handle anything there. We begin with an affection for and a knowledge about the L'Enfant Plan, the McMillan Plan, in the sense that it needs to be--the pattern that we end with needs to look as though it belongs among the avenues and streets of Washington and open spaces.

MR. COGBILL: Other questions? Thank you, sir.

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: I will ask Dr. Judy Scott Feldman to come forward representing the National Coalition to Save the Mall.

DR. FELDMAN: Good afternoon Chairman Cogbill and Commissioners. The Coalition has, since its founding in 2000, endeavored to protect and enhance the integrity of the National Mall and

of the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans on which it is based. The positions we have taken supporting or opposing projects are founded on that principle.

With regard to the Eisenhower Memorial site selection and preferred site at Maryland Avenue, we have several points. First, we have no problem with the concept of a memorial to President Eisenhower. Further, we appreciate that Maryland Avenue is long overdue for serious renovation and improvement. A memorial at this site could help speed the process.

If this project proposed undoing decades of neglect by realizing Maryland Avenue as intended by the L'Enfant and the McMillan Plans, and then locating the memorial within the available space of the restored avenue, then it would probably have caused little disagreement or controversy.

However, this proposal would reconfigure the site and actually redesign an historic L'Enfant avenue and it would close a portion of Maryland Avenue to traffic effectively erasing its historic concept as an avenue not simply a vista.

The Coalition believes this approach gives priority to the memorial sponsor at the expense of historic preservation. We, too, oppose the closing

of Maryland Avenue and we believe that the design principles do not represent all the issues that need to be studied. Mr. Brannum makes an important point about keeping the street open for residents.

The Coalition believes any decision on site selection is premature. The Coalition submitted comments on the EA which we believe is grossly inadequate because of the lack of alternatives and we hope you have read them. We believe that a proper EA with equal consideration of reasonable alternatives and the serious evaluation of effects on the site and on the broader historic context could lead to a different conclusion from what you have today.

The closing of Maryland Avenue has already generated controversy as seen in the public comments on the EA. That and the NCPC's designation of Maryland Avenue as a special street warrants, in our view, an EIS, not an EA.

A serious flaw in the EA with potentially grave consequences is its failure to examine impacts on the future of Maryland Avenue. According to architect Arthur Cotton Moore in articles in Washingtonian and in D.C. Architecture, he has been working on CSX to reopen Maryland

Avenue and has already achieved a small portion. 6 million square feet of potential office space will be unlocked by the new redevelopment of Maryland Avenue as a L'Enfant avenue.

Will this redesign and closing of Maryland Avenue kill that potential? We don't know. NCPC's own CSX study described in the Spring of 2006 Bulletin will not be out until 2007. Again, there is a lot we don't yet know.

The Coalition is also concerned that the EA and staff review treat Maryland Avenue in piecemeal fashion. The Coalition believes that there is a need for an EIS on Maryland Avenue, itself, as an historic avenue to evaluate the competing approaches to its restoration.

We believe, as the 106 process finally gets underway, government agencies may find that they are changing their views about their attitudes and conclusion about the appropriateness of this configuration.

I will now complete my testimony with what the Coalition believes is a much bigger preservation issue. The Park Service has issued a finding that reconfiguring the site or redesigning Maryland Avenue would have no significant impact.

That is a highly questionable judgment and, in our opinion, wrong.

The D.C. State Historic Preservation Office letter say that there are divergent views on how to address the L'Enfant Plan sensitivities of the site. Even NCPC's acceptance of the reconfiguration seems to contradict the Legacy Plan and the Capital City Framework Plan both of which show Maryland Avenue reconstructed as a continuous L'Enfant street.

Clearly, this issue needs further discussion before accepting the site or approving any redesign. Also, in my testimony, I have mentioned a need to evaluate the effects on the National Mall. Why? The Coalition has pointed out in recent years the Mall lacks an agreed-upon definition. The Coalition believes that a more historically accurate definition than simply the cross axis is the entire kite-shaped area designed by the McMillan Plan and, in fact, the map that is on your own website shows the entire kite-shaped plan labeled in 1906, "The Mall."

There are three examples, and it didn't get copied in my handout. I'm sorry about that. In other words, the 106 process and the EA need to

evaluate any change to Maryland Avenue and its effects on the Mall.

In last Monday's Washington Post, culture critic Philip Kennicott bemoaned the speed and quality of architectural change happening on Massachusetts Avenue. His comment has relevance for this project here. He ends, "An historically enshrined city plan must inevitably be either a forgotten artifact or something sacred. L'Enfant could lose his relevance to the real life of the city or his early vision could suggest a new imperative--to revere our avenues as more than just frontage on buildable lots."

We believe this discussion needs to be happening before a decision is made.

Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you, Dr. Feldman. Questions from the Commission? All right. I will bring this back to the Commission and open the floor for discussion. Ms. Steingasser?

MS. STEINGASSER: I have one more question for the staff. In the staff report, it mentioned that both the Committee of 100 and the National Coalition to Save Our Mall had asked NPS to be part of a consulting party. Has that determination been

made?

MS. MARCUS: By virtue of their participation in the meeting on August 29th, they are--

MS. STEINGASSER: They are now part of the 106 consulting?

MS. MARCUS: Yes.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay; great.

MR. LEVY: If I could, Mr. Chairman, I believe that an official response from the Park Service is also required in that matter.

MR. MURPHY: I will ask John Parsons to respond.

MR. PARSONS: I'm sorry; I missed the question.

MR. MURPHY: Sorry, John.

MR. PARSONS: Jennifer?

MS. STEINGASSER: Whether the National Coalition to Save Our Mall and the Committee of 100 for the Federal City have been accepted as consulting parties to the 106 process.

MR. PARSONS: Yes. I am not sure that has been done in a formal way, but yes.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the EDR.

MR. COGBILL: Okay. Motion made.

MR. AMES: Second.

MR. COGBILL: Motion made and seconded.

MR. MCGILL: And I would like to make some comments.

MR. COGBILL: All right, Mr. McGill.

MR. MCGILL: I think that the Eisenhower Commission is to be commended for choosing this site. This, first of all, represents a significant move into Southwest which we, as an agency, are trying to achieve to revitalize this area of the city and to extend it as a desirable location for monuments and memorials.

They have also taken a site that has, for years, been abused and ignored with multiple streets, multiple parking, a plaza in front of the Department of Education Headquarters that is little used and found a way to consolidate it and to create something more significant.

Their logic is sound in terms of the relationship between President Eisenhower and his accomplishments as President and the adjacent federal agencies. And the site is fitting as well

because it is in sight of the Capitol.

So I hope that this Commission will support the EDR. I think it is well done, that the design guidelines are good and that the staff has laid out a process that will be followed that will allow for all these views to be heard and resolved as best as possible.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Galvez?

MR. GALVEZ: Just a further comment. I agree. The EDR is very well stated in terms of where this project is at a stage of development and the principles are very appropriate for the stage of development in going forward.

I think they also recognize the fact that just strictly looking at the geometry of the site, it is the really only viable option of how to deal with that site. So thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: I would like to ask Office of Planning to address the closing of this street because I know that the Mayor does not like to close streets until necessary. Some of the comments, two of the comments, that Mr. Brannum made about security and flow of traffic.

MS. STEINGASSER: I would be happy to.

However, I am not the applicant for the application so I am not really prepared.

DR. ELWOOD: Well, whoever could answer. I see the letter from Ken Laden. I am looking at that. But I wonder if I could have some of the history or some answer to that.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Parsons, can you help?

MR. PARSONS: I can lend some help on that. There were two independent traffic studies done and Ken Laden and the Department of Transportation reviewed those. The feeling is that 6th Street where Maryland Avenue would terminate is perfectly adequate to carry the movement that is headed east-west.

Was that the thrust of your question?

DR. ELWOOD: And what would the effect be on, say, security if there were--I see, in the flow of traffic, obviously, that will eliminate some of the flow of traffic because it is a street closure.

But what significance would it have on egress--

MR. COGBILL: Emergency evacuation.

DR. ELWOOD: An emergency evacuation plan, for example, that was brought up by Mr. Brannum.

MR. PARSONS: The emergency egress out of the city is really Independence Avenue. That is

the dominant avenue here from the traffic standpoint. As a matter of fact, the area that we are talking about, if you are familiar with it, is essentially a parking lot now. It does not carry much through-traffic, Maryland Avenue doesn't, as it is configured today. It is mostly taken up with metered parking.

DR. ELWOOD: So there is no flow of traffic that occurs there now?

MR. PARSONS: Oh; there is some but not much, no. And it has to do with the fact that Maryland Avenue terminates at the western end. So does Pennsylvania--don't remind us--the White House. But it physically terminates at the end of Maryland Avenue overlooking the Jefferson Memorial.

DR. ELWOOD: Thank you.

MS. STEINGASSER: Also, not only has DDOT added a letter to our packet, but any street closing would have to go before the City Council for their approval and hearing and this portion would be no exception.

DR. ELWOOD: Well, in that case, can we make a recommendation?

MS. STEINGASSER: The street closure would be redistributed back to NCPC as a referral agency

at that time.

DR. ELWOOD: Okay. I am a little confused now. Could you explain? Procedurally, if the City Council has to approve the closing of the street, how can we act before they do? I guess that is my question.

MR. LEVY: I just wanted to add, if I could, that the EA for the project does address the issue of traffic, of rerouting traffic, and determines that there would be no appreciable effect that, as Mr. Parsons said, 6th Street could carry the traffic that is carried by the spur now.

So it would still connect to Independence Avenue. The site approval, approval of site, doesn't actually close the street. It would be a separate action. That would come later.

DR. ELWOOD: But it seems to me that it is an integral part of this whole plan. I don't know that, when we approved this site for a memorial in the Museums and Memorial Master Plan, we thought about closing the street--what we thought about, actually. I would have to re-read it.

But my question still is what I asked before.

MS. SCHIFFER: I haven't thought about it

at great length but it seems to me that it is somewhat of a chicken and egg; in other words, whether approval of the site comes first. It plainly comes with the understanding that there has to be an evaluation of whether the street should be closed.

If the applicant were to go to D.C. and say, "We want to close the street," and D.C. would say, "Well, we are going to consider closing the street but we don't know yet if it is going to be the site for the memorial is two steps that have to happen. There isn't a particular order of what comes first.

Plainly, if NCPC approves the site and then the condition of having the street closed doesn't come to pass, they will have to come back and say we need a different site.

MS. STEINGASSER: To that end, the city's regulations require that there be a development plan in order to close the street. They wouldn't just close a street with a development--so we almost need to take action on whether this is the right site in order for them file for a street closure.

MR. MCGILL: I believe the Commission did

the same thing with regard to our ATF Headquarters Building where we had requested permission from the Commission and the District for drawing a 100-foot perimeter line that went down the middle of the street that is immediately south of the site and we promised to keep the street open as a right-of-way as a visual street, but we wanted it technically closed for the proper setbacks and security.

We had not yet applied formally to the District that that should be allowed to happen. We asked the NCPC to approve it first. NCPC agreed. And the District agreed.

MR. COGBILL: Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: I think I am a little bit--have formed a different--it is not any reflection on whether I think this should be here or shouldn't be here but, procedurally, it seems to me that if the City Council is looking at a project before it decides whether to close the street or not--it does not have to be an already approved project or an already approved development.

I am just saying procedurally it seems the opposite to me. I just wanted to make sure we are following proper procedures. It seems to me we are putting the cart before the horse in this matter if

we were asking to close the street.

MS. GALLAGHER: Dr. Elwood, I would just reassert that we are approving a sight with many, many conditions and future approvals that are in the process. We haven't even gone through a concept plan yet. So this isn't a finally approved site. This is the very beginning of a multi-faceted process.

DR. ELWOOD: And, Mr. Chairman, to me, it is the very most important part of the process in my experience in dealing with memorials, that it is the part of the process that there is no turning back from once approved. So, I mean, I understand what you are saying and that even makes it more difficult for me to make a judgement because it is an abstract concept.

So, again, not to belabor it and not to delay it but it just seems that procedurally, we might be--I can't envision it, that we should approve this first because it is such an integral part of this whole--if it weren't so integral, I mean, maybe if it weren't an integral part of it, I could understand that, that it was an attribute or something. But it isn't. It is part and parcel, if you will, of the whole thing. So I just put

that forward for consideration of proper procedure.

MR. COGBILL: Other comments from the Commission?

MR. MILLER: I just wanted to put on the record, I wanted to thank Nelson Rimensnyder for his comments. And I thank you for your work over many years in educating District residents, and the country, about our status. I think it is appropriate that President Eisenhower's support for voting rights for District residents be somehow memorialized on this site.

I, too, support this site and think it does provide an opportunity to beautify that area and to reconfigure and to redesign Maryland Avenue in a way that respects the historic right-of-way.

I am a little disappointed--usually not disappointed--in the staff analysis but I am a bit disappointed in the staff evaluation of the historic right-of-way and can't help but notice the lack of analysis and lack of criticism--or lack of concern, maybe, about restoring or maintaining an historic right-of-way for a federal project when you have enormous concern when there is a District project that is being recommended.

But to close much less important

rights-of-way, whether it is L Street or P Street or O Street, these are avenues with the Capitol right at the terminus of the vista which were important in part of the L'Enfant Plan, part of the Legacy Plan. It just doesn't seem to be evaluated.

Maybe that evaluation will come in the 106 process. There are the design principles and I see the Historic Preservation Officer nodding. I know that she will be vigilant in her evaluation during that process. I hope so.

But I do share the concerns that Mr. Brannum raised about the street closing and concerns raised by the Committee of 100 and the National Coalition to Save our Mall.

I am not sure whether I will be voting for it, but, if I am, I would like to see, in the concept and further development of this, a design alternative that at least shows how you could reconfigure, rebuild, Maryland Avenue as the great boulevard that the Legacy Plan called for and still have a wonderful fitting memorial to President Eisenhower.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Ames?

MR. AMES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse this proposal and the Executive Director's

recommendations. I would also like to say that I don't vote on things here city versus federal and federal versus city which I get from some people sometimes. I have never noticed it and staff has evaluated anything with that in mind. I do take a little bit of an opposite view to that. I commend the staff for a job well done, not only on this but it always comes up some way that it is federal versus city. I don't look at this Commission as being that way.

I think if you will look at my voting record, I voted on the merits of each proposal as they come. I don't look at whether the city wants it or the federal wants it or whatever. It is all one big pot and I just felt I needed to say that.

MR. COGBILL: Let me just wade in on my thoughts. I did, initially, as I read this, share the concern about Maryland Avenue. One of the things that persuaded me that we were at least moving forward in the right direction was the careful review of the traffic analysis that was done on this because the impact on the citizens of the District of Columbia was important.

I can see, in an urban area such as--a great urban area such as the District where you can

maintain a level of service C, with only sometimes deterioration to level of service D on the traffic analysis, that that is significant.

So that was the biggest concern that I had when I looked at that. Also, with respect to the alignment here, while it is absolutely important that every action we undertake, that we consider the impact on the L'Enfant Plan, the McMillan Plan, all of the historical contexts in which we look at projects.

We have to note here that the Maryland Avenue right-of-way has been significantly altered by virtue of the connections that were recently--and I say recently, probably in the last 10 or 15 years--installed with respect to the connections onto Independence Avenue. There, we deviate significantly from the existing right-of-way, and we do that for safety reasons.

Now, understand that L'Enfant did this in a time when we didn't deal with automobiles traveling at 25, 34, 45 miles an hour. But we, at some point, had to take into consideration the impact on that plan by virtue of these two modifications.

So I was convinced, after my discussion

with the staff and by my review of the traffic analysis, that this was an appropriate thing to do provided, again, that, as we move forward through this deliberative process, and through the various other approvals that come forward, that continues to be true.

I think that everything we do here is predicated upon--that the fundamental principles we have adopted in the guidelines, the principles, I guess, that we have proposed here, have to be consistently applied and adopted as we go forward because, despite the concerns of Dr. Elwood, which are, in many cases, legitimate, that, if, in fact, this comes back and the plan does not comply with the principles as have been provided, then, certainly, it is within the purview of this Commission to reject it.

I do think that this is an important project. Certainly, I think everyone here would agree that this is a great man that we need to commemorate. So, for that reason, I am going to support the EDR as recommended by the staff and by the Executive Director.

I do have some concern, though, about the idea that communications have not been as good as

they should. Again, I think Mr. Hawkins was very kind in saying that he ascribes no bad motive or ill intent to anyone here. But I do think, as a public body, and all of us involved in this process, we need to be sure that we are involving the public as much as we possibly can.

It is a critical part of this process. It is not only good business to do it that way. It is part of the law. I want to be sure that whatever we do, we comply fully with that.

So I am willing to support the EDR with the understanding that this is a process that requires special attention and, hopefully, as we do this in the future, we won't find ourselves with one alternative and a second alternative which is a no-build.

Mr. Levy?

MR. LEVY; Mr. Chairman, I wanted to state that the staff analysis did carefully consider Maryland Avenue and the L'Enfant Plan, in particular, and that the recommendations that we made are the result of that analysis as well as consultation with various consulting parties including the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer on what would best complement

the L'Enfant Plan.

MR. COGBILL: I believe that is set out in the report. That also was part of my consideration.

Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: I would just like to ask regarding the action by the City Council both Mr. Miller who, I think, in his own way represents the City Council, at least the City Council Chair, and the Eisenhower Memorial proponents A, I guess, what your thinking is on procedurally going before the City Council versus here and to the Eisenhower Memorial people if, in fact, the City Council rejects the closing, if that would be a problem.

Before I vote, I need to have some idea because it is such an abstract concept right now.

MR. COGBILL: Just to sort of comment on the question--

DR. ELWOOD: Maybe you can help me a little bit.

MR. COGBILL: Well, I think the only concern I have of asking the question of Mr. Miller is that he can speak on behalf of Mr. Miller and, perhaps, on behalf of the Chairman. But I certainly don't believe he can speak on behalf of

the Council. And it would be up to him to decide as to whether he would want to opine on what the Council might do.

DR. ELWOOD: Not on what they would do.

MR. COGBILL: Or the procedural--

DR. ELWOOD: It is on the procedure, not on their vote, of course. One can never tell that with anybody. But it is just something that I guess I need to--because it is such a big part--it is a part of the entire memorial plan and it is very important to the memorial site, not even saying it is probably improbable to consider that they might say no. But I just need to have something more substantive to base my opinion on.

MR. COGBILL: I guess, to finish the thought, too, that, with respect to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, I think my concern there would be to ask them to speak to a hypothetical would probably not be something as a counselor I would recommend simply because it is--we don't know. We don't understand the probabilities or significance of that.

But that certainly would be something I think they would have to address at the time should counsel choose not to do that.

But I would certainly defer to either of those to comment if they wish.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Chairman. I think you have responded appropriately.

DR. ELWOOD: Sorry, Rob.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Parsons disagrees.

MR. PARSONS: We agree with Mr. Miller.

DR. ELWOOD: On that basis, I will probably abstain not because I am pro or con or it is right or wrong. I just feel that it could possibly weigh in in some manner. So I will abstain only because of that reason.

MR. COGBILL: If there is no further discussion--

MS. STEINGASSER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry.

MR. COGBILL: Yes, ma'am.

MS. STEINGASSER: I am going to support the motion. I just wanted to add that, or ask the staff if any kind of preliminary design work or design team has started working that we know of on the site or the design or what the next design steps are going to be?

MS. MARCUS: The designer has not been selected yet but the Eisenhower Memorial Commission may want to address that. Is there someone--

MR. REDDEL: My name is Carl Reddel. I am the Executive Director of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Given the pressure of time, what I would like to do is have the individual that is looking after our next step, which is a pre-design programming effort, and just briefly describe that to you. This is Dan Feil, our Executive Architect.

Dan?

MR. FEIL: Good afternoon. We are expecting to embark on a very inclusive pre-concept-design architectural programming effort where we will be talking not only with our Commissioners but also with the consulting parties, with a lot of the Eisenhower Legacy organizations, with the ANC involved, which we have already begun in initial discussions with, with various departments within the District of Columbia and so on.

One of the nice things about working for the Commission, my Commission, is that they really do understand the idea of talking to everybody in D.C. We have tried to be very, very inclusive.

The programming effort is basically a statement of the design problem. That will, then, be given to the design team to solve. So the

program really is simply a definition. It is a nice experience because you get to say what you want. You don't have to come up with any solutions.

But it is also a trial where you try to bring everything together because people will sometimes have different ideas about how to solve something. The program can deal with various alternatives and that gets handed over to the design team.

Similarly, the seven principles get handed over to the design team early on because they need to know up front this is what you have to deal with.

MS. STEINGASSER: I see. Has that design team already been selected?

MR. FEIL: No. We are planning to do--right now, the Commission is still discussing it but we are looking to do a design-excellence competition for it.

MS. STEINGASSER: Oh, great.

MR. FEIL: We believe the design of it is extremely important. The programming methodology that we are proposing to use is both quantitative and qualitative inherent in its process because,

with a memorial, the emotional impact of the memorial is just as important in many ways as physically what it is. So we intend to do both.

MS. STEINGASSER: One of the things that Mr. Rimensnyder brought up about the kiosk and possible bookstore, and I noticed also in the staff report, they talked about that the Department of Education has a basement below grade under this side. I am not sure how they use that, of course, but if there is a way to possibly incorporate some of that basement space for some of these uses that allow them to be below grade which, I know, in light of our discussion would require some new looking at.

MR. FEIL: It is a very small amount of square footage.

MS. STEINGASSER: But it is just an opportunity to utilize as much above and below grade as possible.

MR. FEIL: In the EA, we discussed a maximum of 2500 square feet to support the ranger, public rest rooms and any concession.

MS. STEINGASSER: 2500?

MR. FEIL: Yes. It is really not much space.

MS. STEINGASSER: That is very small.

MR. FEIL: The basement from the Federal Office Building 6, which is Department of Ed, only extends 38 feet beyond the north face of the building.

MS. STEINGASSER: Oh; I see.

MR. FEIL: The sunken garden, which is now fondly called the pit, it basically a light well into their departmental library. They look forward, in part, to the development of this site in figuring out what to do with the pit because, right now, it is closed off to the public. It is about 15, 16 feet below grade and not particularly safe.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. Great. Thank you very much. Appreciate that information.

MR. COGBILL: Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: I would just like to say how nice it is to see Mr. Feil here and I commend the Commission for his being part of the team because I know of his work and I know it is excellent.

MR. MILLER: I would like to echo that. Mr. Feil has reached out to our office and I know others in the District and we appreciate that.

MR. COGBILL: If there is no further

discussion or questions, and I think we are all familiar with the motion, all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

MR. COGBILL: Opposed?

[No response.]

MR. COGBILL: Abstentions?

DR. ELWOOD: I abstain.

[Show of hands.]

MR. COGBILL: Two abstentions. Do you have that down, Ms. Young? Thank you very much. The motion passes.

At this point, I will declare a ten-minute recess. We will reconvene at 3 o'clock.

[Recess.]

MR. COGBILL: I would like to call the meeting back to order, please. Noting the presence of a quorum, we are back in session. We will proceed with Agenda Item 4B which is the Federal Capital Improvement Program for the National Capital Region for Fiscal Years 2007 through 2012.

Mr. Wood.

Federal Capital Improvements Program

for the National Cap Region

Fiscal Years 2007-2012

MR. WOOD: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. Today we request your adoption of the proposed Federal Capital Improvements Program for Fiscal Years 2007 through 2012 for the National Capital Region which the Commission released for review and comment at your June 2006 meeting.

I would like to present a brief overview of the FCIP process during the past year. The FCIP process began in December of 2005 with a request for projects from all federal agencies. The identified list of projects was then presented to the Commission this past June for authorization to circulate for public comment.

Today we present to you the proposed FCIP with updates for adoption and delivery to the Office of Management and Budget.

Let's look at the Fiscal Year 2007 through 2012 program which contains 238 total projects. 200 were submitted by agencies and NCPC has submitted the remaining 38. The estimated total cost of the agency-submitted projects is \$8.2 billion this year which is an approximately 12 percent increase over last year's program.

Projects were submitted by 14 agencies and

they are included in this FCIP. GSA remains the major contributor with 37 projects totalling approximately \$3.2 billion in Capital funding.

In this year's FCIP, we have a total of 40 new agency-submitted projects. We have included a new appendix table requested by OMB that identifies the funding status of previous years' "recommended and strongly endorsed" projects. This year, we have provided more extensive outreach to agencies and we encourage the agencies to provide updated budget information during the public comment period.

The BRAC actions continue to impact previously proposed and new Capital projects for proposals in many defense facilities within the National Capital Region. The proposed FPIC for FY 2007 through 2012 contains a table which identifies the various BRAC actions in the National Capital Region.

Both Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the Fort Belvoir Complex are anticipated to experience substantial changes to their future Capital programs.

NCPC develops recommendations for all FCIP projects and these recommendations are based on

projects in conformity with adopted federal and local plans and policies. They do not represent approval or denial for a proposed project.

NCPC has five recommendation categories. They are "recommended and strongly endorsed", "recommended", "recommended for program purposes," "recommended for deferral" and "not recommended." Of the 200 projects that were submitted with this year's FCIP from agencies, 30 are "recommended and strongly endorsed."

I am going to stop right here at this point to point out to you that the Washington D.C. Flood Control project is included among those 30 "recommended and strongly endorsed."

152 are "recommended." 18 are "recommended for program purposes only." The latter projects are submitted by Fort Belvoir and they require coordination with Fairfax County. The remaining 38 projects are NCPC submissions. Among those, 17 are "recommended and strongly endorsed" and the remaining 21 are "recommended for future programming."

Two new projects were submitted this year in the proposed FCIP that are "recommended and strongly endorsed" and they are the Southeast

Federal Center Remediation Project, a submission by GSA, and the Juarez Circle Streetscape improvements at the Kennedy Center Project, a Department of Transportation submission.

As noted in our last presentation, there are two agency-submitted projects that have been listed in the FCIP for several years that have changed from recommended to "recommended and strongly endorsed" based upon additional information provided by the agency.

These projects are the Food and Drug Administration consolidation at White Oak and Arlington National Cemetery total cemetery management system. In addition, one Commission-submitted project, and it is only new to this category of the FCIP and not to the FCIP, itself. There is also a "recommended and strongly endorsed" and that is the Kennedy Center Plaza Project. The Commission is submitting this project for agency consideration when budgetary and fiscal conditions permit. Last year, it was a project that was proposed and it was placed on hold by the agency since funding was not included in the Transportation Bill which was passed by Congress.

Taking a look at a map of the projects

here, the geographic distribution of the projects submitted shows that there are more overall projects proposed to the FCIP that was issued that are located in Virginia. The distribution of the projects, you can see, has the majority in the District of Columbia again.

The distribution of the cost of the projects in the region increased in Virginia, as well. However, the District still has the majority of the proposed federal capital spending in the region.

Since the release of the program in June, the following changes have been made to the composed FCIP. We have included submissions of nine new projects from the Pentagon at a total of \$198 million in capital funding. We have included the submission of a new project, the United States Institute for Peace Headquarters at a total of \$175 million in capital spending. The Air Force has deleted a project totalling \$1.8 million. Arlington National Cemetery has submitted revised budget estimates for four projects totalling \$21 million.

Presented here are some of the highlights to comments that we received from local

jurisdictions on the FCIP. Fairfax County supports the three projects for transportation within the county and these are new projects. The county remains concerned about the impact of projects proposed at Fort Belvoir and supports NCPC's designation that these projects, as "recommended for further programming purposes only" until the Army addresses Fairfax environmental and transportation concerns as thoroughly as possible either through the Fort Belvoir Master Planning process or through development of the individual projects as appropriate.

Prince George's County Department of Planning supports the investment for the proposed existing and new facilities within the county and the county requests inclusion of funds in the FCIP for completion of the Suitland Federal Center campus.

The City of Takoma Park has strongly supported projects in the current FCIP for programming for boundary markers, in Inner Purple Line and the Regional Visitor Center and Information kiosk, all "recommended for future programming."

We also received the U.S. Army Corps of

Engineers response to the Commission's concern regarding the Washington D.C. vicinity Floodplain Project and that was your presentation earlier today.

Arlington County has reviewed the proposed FCIP for its 2007 through 2012 and the county would like to urge the Commission to ensure that all federal projects comply with the county's Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance and promotes sustainable environmental standards.

The county supports the Pentagon renovation, the Air Force Memorial and the Pentagon Memorial projects and requests federal coordination on the reconfiguration of Hatfield Gate project. Under the Land Expansion Navy Annex Project proposed by Arlington National Cemetery, the county notes that Congress has authorized a land exchange between the Department of Defense and Arlington for a portion of the Navy Annex to be used for a museum.

The county also suggests that the Commission consider recommending a joint project for the development of the North Tract. These comments will be forwarded to the appropriate federal agencies for their information.

I conclude my presentation with the Executive Director's recommendation that the Commission adopt the Federal Capital Improvements Program for the National Capital Region for Fiscal Years 2007 through 2012.

With that, I will be happy to answer any questions.

4B

[The staff recommendation follows:]

MR. COGBILL: Thank you. Questions from the Commission? Dr. Elwood?

DR. ELWOOD: First of all, I would like to thank everyone involved in this. This is a very difficult and certainly huge project for everyone concerned. It is done well this year as it has been in the past. So thank you for that.

I have a few questions. It goes back to--and this is not anything you could not have ever suspected that this would come up. I just don't know how to handle it. We had talked this morning, when we were talking about flood, on Page 48, the submission for the Flood Control Project, and some designation--I know it was "recommended and strongly endorsed."

But we had talked about a separate category even beyond that where it involves public safety. I haven't had time to go through this to see how many projects that might be, but I certainly feel that in this case, and I don't know how many others--hopefully, not too many--have involved public safety. If that could be somehow denoted or if a letter, instead, should be sent.

I don't know how to address that because there is no--we are going to deal with that after

we approve, or probably approve, this. So I don't know what to say about that.

But I just want to remind staff that we had that conversation this morning and, hopefully, some designation can come out of this.

Secondly, on Page 60, there is something about the sea walls at Lincoln Memorial. I meant to ask the speakers this morning if the sea walls crumble, what effect that would have on flood control. I don't know the answer to that but that project was first submitted in 1985 and is "recommended for future programming."

So you might just want to take a look if that is the proper designation that we want if it has been in the FCIP for that long considering, again, what we talked about this morning.

Third, Page 73, on Foreign Missions, we talk about foreign missions a lot in each FCIP. But there is no money allocated for foreign missions so every time we have had an opportunity for a site, we lose it because there is--and this is not our fault. I just feel that, perhaps, we need to inaugurate some conversations with the State Department because we will never have a place unless we have some way to get it when it is

available. These things come and go. That is just an observation.

My last comment is that I believe it was in this report that we used to have a statement in respect to the 60:40 ratio of workers in the District of Columbia and the mandate that that be upheld. I couldn't find that statement in this. Did I miss it? Is it here? I tried to look everywhere but I couldn't find it.

MS. KOSTER: The chart, itself, is on Page 42. We mention it several times in terms of the criteria that we look at and as a policy that we encourage federal agencies to strongly consider.

In this year's FCIP, normally, we get information on these figures in the summer. This year, they are late in reporting so we don't yet have the 2006 numbers, so we didn't bring it up, because what you will see is the same number you saw last year. We are hoping to get that shortly but it may not make it into this document by the time it goes to OMB.

DR. ELWOOD: Could some statement be made to that effect?

MS. KOSTER: Sure.

STAFF: It is on Page 41.

DR. ELWOOD: Thank you, because I tried to find it and couldn't. Thank you very much. That concludes my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you, Dr. Elwood.
Other comments? Questions?

MR. AMES: I make a motion we accept the Executive Director's recommendation.

MR. MCGILL: Second.

MR. COGBILL: Motion made and seconded.
Let me also just add my thanks to the staff for what I think is excellent work. It continues to demonstrate the quality of the work that we expect and, really, just accept as routine when, in fact, this is another extraordinary example of hard work and good information that has been put together for us. I thank you because you work on a very, very limited time schedule, too.

MR. WOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COGBILL: Other questions or comments?

DR. ELWOOD: Just, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, but thank you very much. I was looking at the June 1st draft and not the most recent. That is why I couldn't find it. Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

MR. COGBILL: Opposed?

[No response.]

MR. COGBILL: Abstentions?

[No response.]

MR. COGBILL: The motion carries
unanimously. Thank you.

MR. WOOD: Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: We will move now to Agenda
Item 3B. This is an information presentation on
the Comprehensive Plan for National Capital,
District Elements.

Mr. Mann.

Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital:

District Elements

MR. MANN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
and members of the Commission. I am presenting
today a brief overview of NCPC's roles and
responsibilities regarding the District elements of
the D.C. Comprehensive Plan, a summary of NCPC's
review of the Mayor's Draft Plan and the role NCPC
has in the review and approval process of the plan.

We would also like to acknowledge the
tremendous efforts that the Office of Planning and
other District agencies have put into the

preparation of this document.

The District elements of the Plan, together with the federal elements, constitute the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital and, as required by the National Capital Planning Act, NCPC has a responsibility to certify to the Council of the District of Columbia whether the District elements of the Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Council have a negative impact on the federal interest.

In advance of that process, NCPC staff has reviewed the Mayor's Draft Plan and has submitted comments to the Office of Planning.

First, if we could step back for a moment and talk about NCPC's involvement in the development of the plan to date. Since the inception of the Comprehensive Plan Task Force in November, 2004, NCPC has participated as a technical advisor and attended all the meetings of that group.

Our involvement with the Task Force allowed us to comment and fully participate in the development of the draft elements of the plan as they were written and released to the task force. As necessary, we consulted with the Office of

Planning staff to discuss and resolve planning issues where both offices have an interest in the outcome and we attended several public meetings throughout the process to understand public feedback on the document that might have an impact on the federal interest.

The Office of Planning achieved several milestones over the past two years including producing a vision document to set the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and three subsequent draft documents. The most recent draft plan, the Mayor's draft, was presented to the City Council in July and made available to the public and to us to provide comments for OP's consideration for an addendum to be presented to the Council later this month.

NCPC undertook a thorough review of the document with subject-matter experts providing comments on their area of expertise and other staff members reviewing the elements they are familiar with through their work at NCPC and their involvement in their communities.

Through this process, we developed general-planning comments and federal-interest comments.

The federal-interest comments fell generally into seven subject areas and I will give a brief overview of those in just a moment. I would like you to note, however, that one federal-interest area on which we have no comments was the Foreign Missions Section of the Land Use Element. Comments we provided on previous drafts have appropriately addressed federal interests and that section requires no further revision.

Our first comments request a change to the generalized land-use policy map which currently states that a change of land use or ownership is possible on several parcels of different land over the next 20 years. We have requested that OP delete the reference to the change in ownership as there is no ownership change anticipated on the parcels that they indicated.

We have also requested additional information about the boundary of the central employment area that is shown on the map as there is some inconsistency between the definition adopted by the GSA at the Mayor's request and the boundary depicted on the map.

Our next comments regard the use of federal land to achieve District development

objectives. Several elements contain policies promoting the use of federally owned parcels to achieve long-range housing or employment-development goals.

We feel that the federal government shares these goals and that several current initiatives such as the pending transfer of federal land to District control will support these objectives. In addition, we have a history of working with the city to ensure the best possible planning and development occurs at federal sites like the development occurring at the Southeast Federal Center.

There are, however, several references in the document to the use of other federal property to achieve District housing and employment goals. We have asked OP to delete references to these sites.

The draft plan promotes joint planning between the city, NCPC and the National Park Service to plan and program major open spaces. This partnership has been realized in the CapitalSpace Initiative which is currently underway. The draft plan proposes the transfer of some federal parts to District jurisdiction.

However, we believe the better planning practice is waiting for the completion of CapitalSpace to make any recommendations.

We have identified several places in the plan where the preservation of triangle parks and other L'Enfant Plan features can be strengthened and have noted these for OP's consideration.

The urban-design element of the draft plan recognizes the unique horizontal character of Washington and rightly acknowledges that this happened as a result of the Height of Buildings Act. However, one proposed policy in the plan advocates potential amendments to the Height Act. The staff recommends deleting the reference to amending the Height Act and notes that any changes in the Act would require Congressional action.

The draft plan proposes strengthening environmental screening and assessment procedures.

We support this action and also propose additional policies that would address the environmental exemption in the central employment area. This would provide better information to decision makers reviewing projects downtown.

Our final staff comments concern the review schedule for different approval of the

Comprehensive Plan. As proposed in the draft plan, Congress would review the City Council-enacted plan elements simultaneous with the NCPC review.

However, this would make our mandated review difficult, particularly if the Commission requests changes to the plan.

We propose, instead, that the reviews occur sequentially with the NCPC review occurring before Congressional review.

As I mentioned earlier, NCPC's review role is outlined by the National Capital Planning Act; over the next few months, the City Council conduct public hearings and adopt the plan and, following adoption and prior to implementation, the Council will submit the plan to NCPC to certify whether it has negative impacts on the interests or functions of the federal establishment in the National Capital.

If the plan is deemed to have no negative impact, the city can proceed with implementation. If the Commission finds there is a negative impact, it will certify its findings and recommendations and the Council can modify the plan and resubmit it NCPC. That includes this overview and I would be happy to answer any questions if you have them.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you. Questions from the Commission? Mr. Miller?

MR. MILLER: I wanted to thank Mr. Mann for his presentation. Just a couple of general comments. When the Commission reviews the specific provisions, we can get into that more, the specifics of it, but generally there has been a cooperative relationship between the District and NCPC during the five or six previous enactments of the District elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

In every case where the NCPC has found a negative federal-interest-impact finding, the Council has gone back and modified the plan in accordance with NCPC's recommendation. The reality is that, under the Congressional act, any particular provision which NCPC finds a negative federal-interest impact cannot be implemented by the District anyway.

But in the interest of accommodation and cooperation, the Council has always addressed the concern that the NCPC has raised when they are very limited--you know, there are thousands of pages of documents and it usually comes down to a handful of provisions occasionally where there is a negative federal-interest-impact finding.

But I would just say historically we have disagreed where the District is articulating its position on--it may have to do with a federal piece of property but it may be what the District would like to see happen with that property. These are the District elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

It has generally been the Council's position in the past that it is appropriate for the District government to articulate in its District elements of the Comprehensive Plan what it would like to see happen for land in the District of Columbia recognizing that it can't happen on federal land without a lot of other players being involved including NCPC and the Congress and the President.

But I just wanted to make that general comment and that, for some of the concerns that have been raised generally, we have a concern that we can't even articulate in the District elements of the Comprehensive Plan what the District's vision is for lands within the District of Columbia.

Did you want to comment, Ms. Gallagher, on that?

MS. GALLAGHER: Thank you. I will

comment.

MR. MILLER: On the second point that Mr. Mann raised about the--and I know Ms. Schiffer may have raised this in a voice mail she may have left for me, and I'm sorry if I didn't get back to you on that. The Council, in the past, I think at least the past two Comprehensive Plan amendment cycles, eight years ago and twelve years ago, did send it to Congress and to NCPC simultaneously so that the reviews could begin.

Again, the reality is that no provisions--under the terms of the legislation, itself, it cannot be implemented until all of those reviews, this Congressional review or NCPC review, are completed.

I don't think that there was any difficulty the last couple of times even through the Congressional review was completed and NCPC's review wasn't complete, we went back and modified the plan elements through other legislation in accordance with NCPC's wishes.

So I am not sure what the difficulty is in having the simultaneous review. So I would just like to put that forth on the record. I probably won't be representing the Council Chairman when

this comes back before NCPC, but I just wanted to put those on the record since this might be my only opportunity to do so.

MR. COGBILL: Ms. Gallagher?

MS. GALLAGHER: Thank you. I do appreciate Mr. Miller's comments and I think our disagreements are really very, very limited and I would hope Mr. McGill would provide additional comments here.

But given that we had substantially large significant sites that GSA is very actively and publicly and in a very difficult manner engaging in planning for the Armed Forces Retirement Home, the Water Reed Medical Center, St. Elizabeth's, we felt it was misleading and inappropriate at this time to suggest to the public that these sites were going to be transferred in ownership.

So all we asked for is a change in the legend of the map to not mislead anyone. We cannot pretend that those sites are not of significant federal interest at this time.

Mike, if you want to help out here.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. McGill?

MR. MCGILL: Thank you. First, I would like to congratulate the staff on this continued

slog through the master-planning process. John and Julia have prodded me over and over, week after week, to read the document and I finally did. It is well written. It is informative.

I do think there are some issues related to this question we have been discussing. Sometimes, with the discussion, we get about 60:40 split in federal land being transferred to the District that I feel like the District covets our land and wants us to keep our bodies inside its borders but without any land to put them on.

I think the issue more is not just that the District would like some of this land but that, in some cases, it seems to me the plan either states or implies that the federal land is a means of meeting a goal. It is like we need 30,000 units of housing. Where are we going to put it?

Well, we can put 10,000 over here and here and here and here. The other 20,000 is going to go on federal land we are going to get. Well, that implies something that is wrong; namely, that the District will get the federal land to meet that goal.

It is okay to say, I think, if the land became surplus, then they would like it for X, Y,

Z. But to count it in advance of it becoming surplus for meeting a goal doesn't make sense.

MR. MILLER: We can work with you on that kind of language rather than just striking any reference at all to the land and what different parties would like to see happen there.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. Ames?

MR. AMES: I understand where both of you are coming from. I think an easy resolution of that would be, as a part of the Capital Improvements program, that there be, for lack of a better term, a wish list from the city that would be included in that that is not actually the program, itself, but I think might put it--if the land were available, the city would like to see this.

Without that, there is not, on record, of the city inserting itself in and, yeah, we would like to take this tract of land if GSA or the federal government is not going to use and this is what we would like to do with it because, when it all comes together, there are so many different agencies putting this plan together.

Unless that is inserted somewhere, and I don't think it should be inserted that that is the

gospel of what is going to happen--and I think you have to be very careful, as the Executive Director said, that we don't mislead somebody to think, because it is a part of this report, that that is what is going to happen.

But I do think that everybody concerned that is going to use this as their guiding light for capital improvements through the years needs to have some kind of reference to the city thoughts on that rather than, as he says, a complete pull-out of anything that's there, but for the city and our staff to work out a way that it be put into this report but it doesn't lead anybody to believe anything that is really not the case of the way it is going to be.

MR. COGBILL: Questions? Comments?
Additional questions? Ms. Steingasser?

MS. STEINGASSER: I am curious--I haven't seen exactly what the staff comments are on the Heights of Buildings Act, but it is a Congressional act and the city is aware that it can't change it without going to Congress. So my concern is--number one, I guess, my question is, what are your concerns. No. 2, I hate to see anything taken out from the city again, echoing Mr. Miller's

concern, about this is the city's plan of its elements. These are the federal and these are the city. Anything that would be read as silencing the city from talking to Congress about existing legislation, I hate to see that. So I am curious as to what the comments were on the Height Act and what its purpose was in taking it out.

MR. MANN: We will be providing the specific comments to you by the end of the week, perhaps by the end of the day.

There was only, actually, one particular policy that staff had any opposition to and that was in the very well-written and very thorough urban-design element where it advocated continuing the horizontal city and the historical--keeping the buildings low, as has been historically done.

But there was one particular technical design element and that was actually regarding--there is some indication that retail establishments require floor heights that can't be accommodated that was somehow attributed to the limitations imposed by the Height of Buildings Act.

This latest draft document suggested that perhaps a way to accommodate increased retail floor heights would be to amend the Height of Buildings

Act.

MS. STEINGASSER: How is it in the federal interest to strike that? Why would that be in the federal interest to strike that because, to me, that gets to the issue of trying to silence the city from talking to Congress about existing legislation?

MR. MANN: Of course, that wasn't the intent. The intent was purely to achieve a certain design perspective. We thought that there were alternative ways to achieve that objective rather than amend the Height Act.

MS. STEINGASSER: Again, I guess I am asking is it a design preference of the NCPC staff versus a federal interest of the federal government because I believe that is a very distinct element.

If the city would like to have, in its Comprehensive Plan, a review and discussion with Congress about the Height Act, I am not sure how it is in the federal interest to strike that from our Comprehensive Plan.

It is, I believe, a Constitutional right even for the District residents.

MR. MCGILL: I would like to weigh in on this.

MR. COGBILL: Mr. McGill?

MR. MCGILL: I think there is a very clear federal interest in the Height of Buildings Act which was a point I tried to make with regard to the stadium. Why is there a Height of Buildings Act? Because the federal government wants its major monuments and buildings to be observable.

MS. STEINGASSER: But this is my point. If the element doesn't say, change the Height of Buildings Act--I believe it talks about considering it. By striking it, it is saying that the city should not, in its plan, consider talking to Congress about existing legislation.

It is a more fundamental question to me. We are taking a preemptive design stand versus looking at is it in the federal interest to silence the city and prohibit the city from having, in its Comprehensive Plan, the concept of talking to Congress about an existing act.

MR. MCGILL: See, I think there are two separate issues here. One issue is should the city feel free to talk to Congress about whatever it wants. The answer is, of course.

MS. STEINGASSER: Why can't that be our Comprehensive Plan?

MR. MCGILL: Well, because it is a comprehensive plan and, if the city wants a legislative agenda to go to Congress about, that doesn't need to be in the Comprehensive Plan.

MS. STEINGASSER: How is it in the federal interest to strike it? How is it contrary to the federal interest to strike that section from the Comprehensive Plan?

MR. MCGILL: If NCPC supports the Height of Buildings Act, which I assume NCPC does, and if the Height of Buildings Act was enacted by Congress to preserve the views of major federal buildings such as the Capitol, then, as a planning concept, NCPC stands foursquare behind upholding the Height of Buildings Act.

MS. STEINGASSER: Right. I am not saying that the statement should be read as--see, it is fine line between silencing the city within its plan of what it may talk to Congress about versus taking a pre-assumed position on a design element.

I don't think it is a federal interest to strike from the city's comprehensive elements that they want to look at the Height of Buildings Act.

If we were talking about needle exchange, would we strike that because it is an existing law.

We would say, oh, the city can't talk to the feds about that because it is an existing law. If we wanted to talk about environmental standards of EPA, would we strike that because it is an existing law and the city shouldn't have it in its Comprehensive Plan a discussion with the feds about the EPA standards? No; we wouldn't.

This is a design preference that we have seen over and over from the staff and I just want to be clear, when we get this, I want to know why it is in the federal interest to strike that provision that the City may consider talking to the Congress about the Height of Buildings Act.

I am just putting it out here.

MS. KOSTER: I think, first of all, we appreciate all the comments that have been provided on this particular topic and will certainly go back and look at this particular issue. In this case, we have, in fact--as an agency, we do support the Height of Buildings Act.

The section that Mr. Mann is referencing is really getting more to the issue not of silencing discussion and dialogue which is, in fact, why we are bringing these comments to the District at a very early stage in your process, so

that we can, in fact, by the time it comes back to the Commission, hopefully have fine-tuned any wording changes.

What we were really focusing on is that the implication of how it was written was that, as we read it, if there is a design issue in a building such as the sunken floors, the first response is, we will raise the Height of Buildings Act.

What we were encouraging is look first within the context of the Act to see if there are other ways to address this issue. I don't think it was ever intended to silence a discussion on this.

We will look forward to making sure that we have clarified that with you and with the District.

So I hope that addresses that particular issue but we do come out in support of the Height of Buildings Act in this but certainly not your right to discuss it.

MS. STEINGASSER: That's it. I don't want it to seem that the City doesn't respect the Height of Buildings Act. We may have disagreements over what, exactly, it says at certain points but I think that is a reasonable debate of law.

It is taking it out.

MS. KOSTER: And that is not the intent.

MS. STEINGASSER: It is removing that redress issue that I would like to see--

MS. KOSTER: Certainly.

MR. COGBILL: Other comments?

MR. MILLER: I would say, just for the record, that the staff, I think, is aware of this but, just so that the Commission members are aware, the Council's Committee of the Whole has scheduled a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan legislation that the Mayor has submitted on September 26th. We welcome and look forward to your comments and working with you on the kind of language changes that Mr. McGill and Mr. Ames have suggested.

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: Anything else? Then, thank you, Mr. Mann. It is a very difficult job and I think we have worked cooperatively with the City. A good example is the foreign missions and the fact that we have sorted that out. It has been a long process but I think a very good process in terms of how it has been resolved. That comes from the type of dialogue that we continue to have. Thank you.

MR. MANN: Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: We will move now to Agenda Item 3C. This is an information presentation on the New York Avenue/Florida Avenue Charrette.

Mr. Weil.

New York Avenue/Florida Avenue Charrette

MR. WEIL: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. This is an informational presentation regarding the Charrette that we held back in mid-July.

There is a little background and why the Charrette was originally initiated. DDOT just recently completed a two-year study looking at the New York Avenue corridor from the Maryland/District boundary to the Convention Center.

The study identified relatively heavy traffic volumes along the corridor a significant portion of which was determined to be through traffic travelling between the eastern side of the Beltway and the Southern portion of the Beltway west of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

The mixing of this through traffic along with the local traffic along New York Avenue led to relatively high traffic-accident rates at several key intersections along the corridor.

As a result, one of the key

recommendations from the DDOT Corridor Study, in order to eliminate these high traffic-accident locations and also accommodate this regional through traffic along New York Avenue, was to provide a tunnel, shown here as a red dotted line, between the northern portion of I-395 and a portal location just to the east of North Capitol Street.

This was to allow the heavy traffic volumes moving between I-395 and New York Avenue to be accommodated underground. As a result of this tunnel, New York Avenue would rise and bridge over Florida Avenue and meet at the top of where the current bridge exists today and then slope back down to at grade on the eastern side of the railroad tracks.

This is a rendering that will help you better understand what this preferred bridge alternative would look like at the Florida Avenue/New York Avenue intersection.

Just as a point of reference, the railroad-track bridges would be over here. The elevated New York Avenue facility would travel between the railroad bridge, bridge over Florida Avenue and then proceed down into tunnel just east of North Capitol Street, which is shown right here.

Also, as a point of reference, we have the new ATF Headquarters Building located directly adjacent to the intersection.

The preferred DDOT bridge solution we found to be inconsistent with several federal key interests located at this intersection. Number one, the Legacy Plan advocates for a flexible transportation system that eliminates barriers across the city. An elevated New York Avenue facility would present both a physical and a visual barrier that would bifurcate this portion of the city.

The 2M plan identifies the intersection area as a primary commemoration site and we feel that a viaduct-bridge design solution for the intersection would preclude this commemoration site as envisioned in the 2M plan as an at-grade intersection.

An elevated New York Avenue facility would penetrate the historic L'Enfant city and again, we feel, would diminish the gateway opportunity that would be associated with an at-grade intersection.

Also, as you know, the new ATF Headquarters Building which is close to completion was designed as a signature piece of architecture relating to an

at-grade intersection here and a potential future gateway location.

As a result of these differences in opinions at the intersection location, NPCP, DDOT, GSA and ATF agreed to co-sponsor and host a charrette that would focus specifically on working through these New York Avenue/Florida Avenue intersection design challenges.

The intent of the charrette would be to gather together a group of consultants that would bring different perspectives to the table and that would not only look for a DDOT bridge alternative for this intersection but that would also consider two additional corridor study alternatives.

This is a roster showing the charrette consultants who participated in the charrette. We have Howard Decker and Ray Peloquin here with us today who will be presenting here in a few minutes.

Howard Decker is our project director with EEK. Ray Peloquin is a vice president at RTKL in Baltimore. Unfortunately, Don Stull, Lou Slade, Anita Morrison and Benjamin Tang, who were a part of the charrette panel, were unable to join is here today. Don Stull, President and principal of Stull and Lee in Boston.

Lou Slade brought the traffic and transportation perspective to the Charrette panel.

Anita Morrison brought an economic-development perspective as principal of the Washington Office of Bay Area Economics. Lastly, Benjamin Tang serves as the major bridge specialist leader with the Federal Highway Administration. He brought civil-engineering expertise to the panel.

Let me go through these two additional corridor study alternatives that we decided to include in the charrette. This second alternative is basically an at-grade alternative. Traffic heading towards downtown along New York Avenue would go over the railroad tracks and surface just before Florida Avenue similar to what it does today.

Then, again, it would go underground into a tunnel just east of North Capitol Street and proceed to curve around and come out onto I-395. As a result, both the regional, through and local traffic would flow through this intersection along New York Avenue.

The third alternative is the extended tunnel alternative. Here we have basically extended the tunnel so that it surfaces east of the

railroad tracks. As a result, both the regional through traffic and the local traffic would have separate facilities. The regional through traffic would travel between the northern portion of I-395 and this part of New York Avenue completely underground in a tunnel and the local traffic would be allowed to continue along a surface, New York Avenue.

The charrette consultants were given a mission to assess the three potential intersection design alternatives using their various background and expertise looking at it from an urban-design, city-planning, engineering, traffic and economic-development perspective. Also, they were asked to develop several different urban-design concepts for the intersection area within the context of these three alternatives.

Here we have the format of the charrette.

It was two-and-a-half-day event. Prior to the charrette, we supplied the charrette consultants with briefing binders which contained background studies and plans that were pertinent to this study intersection in the New York Avenue corridor.

The first day was really an information-gathering day for the charrette

consultants. We provided them with a study-area tour. We organized a series of stakeholder interviews to try to get different perspectives so that they could incorporate varying perspectives and any sort of recommendations or individual viewpoints that they formulated.

The second full day was really a work session to formulate these recommendations. The morning of Friday, the consultants presented their viewpoints to NCPC partner agencies and interested stakeholders.

With that, I would like to turn the presentation over to Howard Decker who was one of the panel members. He will run through the context of the study area and corridor for you. Then, after that, both Ray and Howard will run through what they see as being some of their more significant viewpoints.

MR. DECKER: Thank you, Mike. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. First of all, my compliments to you and my congratulations to the staff. They did an extraordinary job in pulling materials together, making sure that we had information and supporting us throughout the two-and-a-half days of our work. It was a real

pleasure for us as panelists to be able to participate with you and the other cooperating agencies in looking at this very difficult problem.

One of the things that characterizes this extraordinary intersection in the life of the city is the kinds of things that are going on around it.

The intersection of New York Avenue and Florida Avenue is in the midst of an extraordinary amount of development happening in that locale.

We have residential neighborhoods of significance, Capitol Hill and Trinidad, the extraordinary projects that are being undertaken on H Street at the Hopscotch Bridge as we call it, the viaduct that goes over the railroad right-of-way here. Trinidad and Capitol Hill are very important neighborhoods and we will come back to this in a little while because we did have the opportunity to speak with residents of Trinidad and of Capitol Hill on both sides of the railroad.

Actually, we had a chance to really get involved in understanding the role that New York Avenue and Florida Avenue play in the life of those communities and we could kind of dial in some of our responses and some of our perspectives and viewpoints as a result.

Of Course, NoMA is a very significant developing aspect of the corridor. It seems as if every time one of us drives down that corridor, it looks very different than it did the week before. It is happening very, very quickly. Northwest 1 is about to see redevelopment. Eckington is seeing a lot of renovation and redevelopment.

There are an enormous amount of things going on in this vicinity which need to be taken into consideration. At closer resolve, you can begin to see the new ATF Headquarters here. Of course, this aerial photograph is wildly out of date already because of all the things that are happening. The new Metro stop. All of these things are very important factors.

Here is 395, the stub coming up out of the ground and joining New York Avenue, the volume of traffic for which was one of the principle motivations for looking into this in the first place.

We discovered that, of the 125,000 average daily trips, ADT, on this corridor on New York Avenue fully a quarter of these are not making stops in the District of Columbia. They are going from Maryland to Virginia and they are just

happening to use the District as a convenient cut-through as they make their way from north to south or south to north.

In the immediate vicinity, as we kind of dive down from 50,000 feet to a lower altitude, the very large facility that is operated by FedEx here on the north side of the viaduct, the new ATF Headquarters which is taking shape here, significant shape here. The Peoples' Building, which now, of course, is home to DDOT and other users. In the midst of all of this, the Wendy's restaurant. We will have more to say about that in a couple of minutes.

Let's take a look at what it feels like on the ground. This is--you are on New York Avenue looking southwest. This is Florida. This is ATF and Peoples.

Now we are looking in the opposite direction looking up New York Avenue as it ascends the viaduct here and looking at Florida, the new Metro stop being here just around the corner from the new ATF Building.

Now we are standing in the middle of the street. Actually, whoever took this photograph was defying death at this very moment because this has

a lot of traffic on it.

Looking up the viaduct to the northeast on New York Avenue, Florida Avenue crossing here.

This is a look down the hill. This feels foreshortened by some trick of photography but, in fact, this viaduct is very steep. It is nearly at a maximum pitch between 7 and 8 percent which is about the maximum you would want to do with a viaduct, all of which is to say that it is coming to grade at Florida Avenue about as quickly as it can. As you come off of New York Avenue over the tracks, this slope is about as steep as it can be.

So we looked at and developed viewpoints for each of these categories; first, the New York Avenue corridor, intersection alternatives and the advantages and disadvantages of each of these alternatives, and then the intersection area, itself, and what its future could be.

I think we came up with a lot of interesting points of view and perspectives. I wish some of your earlier visitors were here this afternoon to hear us say some of these things. But one of the first things, and I think Ray and I looked at one another not long into the workday and say the same thing to one another which is, the

streets of the District of Columbia are here first and foremost to serve the people who live in the District of Columbia.

When we talked to the people during the time we had, when we talked to the neighbors in Capitol Hill and Trinidad, it was quite striking to hear their reports of cut-through traffic. If there is a hiccup of any kind at the end of 395, at the north end, or on New York Avenue, the traffic immediately flows into the neighborhoods.

This is causing very substantial impacts in some cases especially when you are talking about a volume of traffic that is this high. So one of the things that we wanted to say at the very outset was that the D Street--the street network in the District of Columbia is first for residents, second for people who work in the District and, finally, a lower priority to accommodate regional traffic on city streets.

MR. PELOQUIN: I think that while the five panel members felt this to be true, in our interviews with all of the stakeholders from landowners to residents in the surrounding areas, it was very much apparent that they agreed with that view as well.

MR. DECKER: I think another thing we felt about the New York Avenue corridor is that it needed to accommodate a multiple of modes. Right now, it is vehicular mode. There is very little transit. If you ride your bike there, you take your life in your own hands.

It is a very pedestrian-unfriendly environment. So, really, it is a kind of mono-modal kind of environment at the moment. We, I think, felt strongly that--or some of us felt strongly that the corridor should have a mode bias away from the car.

In other work that we have done for DDOT and other places in the city, we have noted that there is a strong mode bias, a generating mode bias, away from the car to enhanced transit, pedestrians, bicycles, other kinds of modes that can take active use of the corridor.

So we felt strongly that you could say about this corridor, let's move it away from a car bias and accommodate other modes.

One of the things that we discovered in the course of our conversations with the stakeholders was that they had looked at enhanced transit but they had never developed it because

there wasn't enough development going on around to support the transit.

The reason that they hadn't developed the development is because there wasn't enough capacity on the roadways--this sounds like a chicken and an egg but it is, in fact--there wasn't enough capacity on the roadways to accommodate new development.

So what we could easily, then, conclude is if you replaced the regional flow-through, cut-through, traffic, got that off of that roadway, you would have enough capacity on the roadway to be able to deal with new and mixed-use development such as is being proposed further out on New York Avenue and it would make a big difference, at least in the near term.

Of course, that would mean that, then, there would be a reason to build enhanced transit on the corridor. You don't build streetcars to nowhere. But if you have a very important development, like the one that has been proposed, for example, up near Bladensburg and New York Avenue, then, potentially, you could, in fact, plan on some sort of enhanced transit opportunity.

MR. PELOQUIN: I think you can tell on

these slides, there isn't really a secret numbering system up there in those numbers that are behind each one of those statements. That is an attempt to try and show the differing views of the panel members on specific recommendations and kind of their priority for those. Different panel members really had different views about which specific issues might be the most important within there, but I think you can see the range of issues through all of these affecting the transportation through that area.

On the corridor, I think that we felt that there were a number of things that we could do to discourage the use of New York Avenue. We could charge a toll. This is called congestion pricing now. I love that, but it is actually a toll. It is some way of assessing a cost for use to try and address questions of equity, transportation equity at least.

Some of us--that would be me--felt disconnecting 395 at Massachusetts Avenue so that maybe you split it so that you can get off at New York and you can get on at Mass or one or the other, I have felt a little bit, as I have looked at this, as if the 395 tunnel and rising up to meet

New York Avenue is a kind of remnant of the notion of building an inner loop which died so many years ago.

The idea of making New York Avenue capable of handling all this traffic feels a little bit like an inner loop sneak attack. So I would propose disconnecting it or, as I say, pairing New York and Mass as on and off as a way of lowering the impacts and splitting the impacts over a larger geographical area.

We believe that, with the creation of the new Wilson Bridge and other improvements that are planned along the 295 corridor, that is an opportunity to discourage regional pass-through on the New York Avenue corridor. So, if you can get into town easily at the new South Cap Bridge or 11th Street Bridges or other opportunities, then you can hopefully lower the volume that is being carried explicitly on New York Avenue.

Of course, you are going to have to have a campaign of some kind including, obviously, signage, but other things, to let people know that there are alternatives to New York Avenue.

We really felt that the next point of enhancing alternative means of entering downtown is

a key issue. All of the burden should not just be put upon New York Avenue to solve all of the problems. It needs to be a system that works together that does not put undue weight onto New York Avenue.

As an aside, on the second day, when I was coming down from Baltimore, it took me two-and-a-half hours to get from the BW Parkway down New York Avenue and in. That doesn't mean I think we ought to have a bridge or a tunnel to be able to run through here quickly, but the problem exists there.

Alternate means--Howard talked about a quarter of the trips coming through New York Avenue not ending in D.C. Today, coming down here, I followed a semi down New York Avenue that made a left turn into the tunnel to go across the river into Virginia. There was no other place for them to have gone from that point. That is a major traffic impact in areas that, in most cases, have communities, residential communities, in them.

MR. DECKER: One of the examples of alternative means and enhancing alternative means being good both for regional users and for local users is what could happen with the 11th Street

Bridge, where the 11th Street Bridge could continue to hook up to 295 and regional traffic but it could be paired with roadways that are explicitly used to connect the street grid on either side of the river so that residents east of the river have an easy urban way of getting across the river and are not tangled up with regional users.

That is certainly one of the schemes that is being looked at. We felt strongly that we needed to create an environment that would support new development and that would preserve and protect the existing residential neighborhoods because they are seeing impacts because of the volume on New York Avenue.

We want to support smart development and improve the jobs and housing balance in the District. If we have mixed-use development, mixed-use development will help us support a move towards an enhanced transit service. Enhanced transit service is one of these phrases that we transit geeks use to talk about, which could be a dedicated bus, it could be street car, but it is some kind of easy means to move high volumes of people.

Discouraging cut-through traffic is very

important and avoiding displacement of existing residents because we are trying to accommodate cars is also something that we felt strongly was not a wise idea.

We also felt that the schemes that were on the table at the moment would have major, or very major, impact on the development that is happening in NoMA. If we build a tunnel at some breathtakingly extraordinary cost, that is going to take half the volume of that traffic and disconnect it from NoMA.

So we want to support the development of NoMA as an active mixed-use place and we also want to see it be a kind of place that can accommodate pedestrians.

Everyone thought that notion of pedestrians, the word "pedestrian," in this context, was a little odd. But it actually is possible to imagine walking there.

The advantages of the bridge scheme are clear. It resolves current safety issues west of North Cap because the heavy regional traffic is gone. It allows an at-grade Capitol/New York Avenue intersection. It will, obviously, reduce the traffic and it will facilitate a flow-through.

But it will encourage additional regional traffic.

We discover it when we build roads that we are inducing higher volumes and that certainly would occur in this case. It would create a very significant north-south barrier. I think, from an urbanistic point of view, you don't want to make barriers in cities. This bridge alternative would make a substantial barrier.

MR. PELOQUIN: And, I think, a substantial portion of the stakeholders from the surrounding areas, when shown the bridge option, reacted very negatively from this standpoint, that it would be a barrier. It would disassociate NoMA from Eckington and it would create two different sides of New York Avenue.

MR. DECKER: People might not feel comfortable walking in this area. In general, people don't like walking under viaducts where there is noise and dirt and so on. So that is an issue. If we are going to build a tunnel, of course, we are going to have ventilation structures like the one we have at Mass and H. That big concrete thing is a vent for that 395 tunnel.

So we would have things like that that would have significant urban-design impacts. Of

course, building this thing would be extremely expensive.

The at-grade advantages; again, it solves a lot of safety issues because it reduces the volume of regional cut-through traffic by moving it away. And it would at-grade the North Cap/New York intersection and reduce traffic. But, again, it encourages regional traffic.

Everything that we are looking at in these is aimed at enhancing regional traffic. I think our view was what you want to do is discourage regional traffic because of the extraordinarily high numbers. The tunnel portal will require the first New York Avenue to actually function in a very limited right-in/right-out way. That is not a really positive benefit.

Of course, it is going to be very difficult to move around as a pedestrian. Again, we will have the construction events. Tunnels have extremely high cost. So this will be very, very expensive.

The long tunnel, which is called the tunnel scheme, which is the very long tunnel scheme, will resolve--it is the same litany of issues where it essentially will enhance and help

regional traffic. It will untangle North Cap and New York and 1st and New York.

But, of all of the schemes we looked at, this is easily the most expensive. It is breathtakingly expensive.

So we believe that you should place a priority on transforming it into a more locally oriented place. We believe, actually, and this may seem oxymoronic having seen these photographs, but we believe that New York Avenue could, in fact, be a great place for Washington, D.C. It could be a gateway, as you come down that hill, or as you begin to look at going up that hill on New York Avenue. It could become a gateway for the city.

We would discourage drive-through, auto-oriented, uses. That means a Wendy's we would discourage or a McDonalds or any kind of auto-oriented use in favor of holding the street wall to create urbanity and an urban place, holding the street edge--Ray is going to talk more about that in a minute.

We believe that you can use buildings and civic elements and memorials and monuments to create a significant place at New York Avenue and Florida Avenue. The development that is happening

there, I think, warrants it.

You can use traffic-calming measures to slow the traffic to a level compatible with an urban neighborhood, again discouraging the regional user and helping to make traffic movement, so intrusive as they are and problematic as they are, for that area now and provide pedestrian access and amenities across New York and Florida so that NoMA is linked.

So pedestrian safety in the New York/Florida Avenue intersection is key. Neighborhood connections is very important and, in fact, making the intersections as attractive as possible.

Some of us have extensive experience in doing this and it is easy to imagine transforming what now looks very unpleasant and is actually very unpleasant to visit into something that really could be a very nice place in the fabric of the city.

MR. PELOQUIN: I think kind of as a guiding principle, these are some sketches we are going to show you here that Don Stull did early on in our process to talk about the ways in which we really ought to look at the urban design of that

area, not as bridges and tunnels which divide areas but as an opportunity to create place that can tie together NoMA and Eckington, can tie together the areas along North Capitol Street and make this a true place like so many other areas in Washington, D.C., the ideas of L'Enfant's original plan, how, when streets come together, when diagonal streets come together, there is a special place that is created through them.

We don't have that right now at the intersection of New York and Florida. But that becomes an important part of place making throughout the entire--some more sketches that Don did. The idea is the typical urban places--if a square is created, that you come into that square on the north, east, west, south sides of it.

In Washington, you have the opportunity for entering those kinds of spaces on the diagonal, creating those kinds of places that are memorable that have a focus to them like the Washington Monument, like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

One of those key issues to creating those kinds of places is street edge, as Howard talked about a little earlier, that there is built form which defines space.

Right now, we will show you a picture in just a second, of the existing situation. There is no definition to that area so there can't be a connection from the south side of New York Avenue to the north side of New York Avenue.

This is the existing situation where you can see the new ATF building being built right there, the Fed Ex building over here, the Peoples building there. But you can see that we have vast areas which are undefined surrounding that.

If we look at other areas within the city that are intersections like this, one of the typical ways that that is handled is through a circle. I think, in the Legacy Plan, NCPD had put forward the opportunity for a circle to be put in this location to address traffic issues.

Through our work on the panel and with Ben Tang who was very helpful in letting us understand the dimensions for tunnels, for viaducts, for roadways and all of that, a circle really won't work at this location because, as Howard pointed out, that steep gradient we have coming down.

You really can't make those transitions in enough space. The amount of land you would need to make that work would just make no sense in the

situation.

We also, then, talked with Rick Rybeck and his folks from DDOT about some alternatives to the way in which traffic flows around the intersection right now. What we tried to do was to bring together all of these thoughts to talk about some diagrams of the way in which space could be created there.

I want to be careful--we are going to show you some diagrams. They are diagrams. They are not solutions for the space. They talk about possibilities and issues to be looked at in the future for these areas.

One of the first things that we talked about was, if we can't do a circle, one of the other ways that the L'Enfant Plan addresses diagonal streets coming together is through the creation of a square.

Now, the square can be space in the middle of it, as we heard about earlier, with the ideas for the Eisenhower Memorial on Maryland Avenue, or it can be the creation of space by edges that surround it with the opportunity to define space on edges where it is not defined right now.

This isn't saying that we should

necessarily--please, Howard.

MR. DECKER: As a scale reference, this is drawn at about the same size as Lincoln Park, just to give you a frame of reference.

MR. PELOQUIN: Again, this is not a solution for it but merely to point out the issues of, in the future, that the possibilities that looking at defining street edge better in the surrounding areas can help us to better define this as a gateway into the city and that, perhaps, we can use DDOT's new solution where cars would have to come and make a right turn and then a left to go down 1st Avenue.

Right now, cars back up as they are trying to make a left onto 1st Avenue which causes all the traffic to back up onto New York on the bridge when people aren't sure about which lane they ought to be in as they come through.

But we also looked at other ways of defining that space that might not be as clearly defined as L'Enfant's other spaces in the plan of Washington but the idea that creating edge around space and allowing the traffic that we know has to move through the area to move, we can create a better place surrounding that.

The idea is that, in the future, if the site is redeveloped, if it is expanded, there might be the opportunity to create edge along that, that, as New York Avenue and those surrounding areas could be developed in the future or changed, that there is the opportunity of defining space in that way as well.

Then, finally, the recognition that we have an existing ATF building which does create edge through the surround and the garden and that, perhaps, through the redevelopment, the proposals that exist on the table right now, for that piece of land, that that may drive the kind of idea that maybe instead of circles or rectangles and squares, that triangles become the kind of space that we can define that can create connection between NoMA and 1st Street up into Eckington and create a focus for the entire area.

MR. WEIL: I have a couple of slides to summarize Lou Slade and Anita Morrison's viewpoints regarding this intersection and New York Avenue corridor.

Basically, Lou's significant points were he felt very strongly about removing the through regional traffic from using New York Avenue by

encouraging it to use alternative routes such as the Beltway and I-295. For example, he felt that it was worth trying to encourage this traffic to use 295 by increasing and improving the east-west connections across the Anacostia River.

This would be good for not only District residents but for the regional commuters as well. He felt that the District should really focus on moving people, not cars, along this intersection and this could be accomplished by fostering a more multi-modal transportation corridor along New York Avenue.

Lastly, he felt that cut-through traffic should be discouraged that is currently cutting through local residential neighborhoods in the vicinity of this intersection and corridor

Anita Morrison, with her economic development perspective, she felt that the District should really try to create an environment that is supportive of new development as well as redevelopment along the corridor while also working to preserve and protect existing neighborhoods, encourage mixed-use development which would, in turn, improve support for enhanced transit service along the corridor and also work to improve the

jobs, the housing, balance

By adding more housing to the District, hopefully, that will help reduce local area traffic congestion by allowing people to live closer to where they work downtown and, lastly, to avoid displacement of existing residents or excluding economic diversity along the corridor.

So, after considering the comments expressed by the panel members, NCPC staff has developed the following preliminary set of recommendations. Number one, to remove the through traffic, discourage that from New York Avenue, remove it from the corridor and encourage it to use alternative routes.

Once this regional through traffic has been removed, New York Avenue may be planned more for District residents and workers rather than for accommodating this through traffic. These points down here get into how to do that more specifically, foster more pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use development along the corridor and encourage better balance among the different transportation modes, preserving and protecting local neighborhoods, improving the District's job-to-housing balance and also making this

intersection, this New York Avenue/Florida Avenue intersection into the next great place for the District.

We feel that it is definitely worthwhile to try to create a new urban space focused on this intersection by using buildings, civic elements, memorials or monuments to really create more of an important place, establish a fitting gateway into the urban core and historic L'Enfant city and also using streetwalls and holding the street edge to form more of an enclosed outdoor room, if you will, which also contributes to the sense of place.

Lastly, transforming the intersection into a more locally oriented place by doing these following things; employing traffic-calming measures to slow the traffic speeds down along New York Avenue, making traffic movements less intrusive, less problematic, for the area and also providing pedestrian access and amenities in linking this intersection area more closely with the adjacent surrounding NoMA neighborhoods.

Also, we felt that it was worthwhile for the District to incorporate this information into the draft NoMA plan and draft New York Avenue Corridor Study reports and also to have the

District explore and evaluate the feasibility, the redistribution of this through traffic through one or more of these following mitigation measures that Howard mentioned earlier on in the presentation.

Finally, our draft report is currently available on our website for review and comment by the general public throughout the month of September. These public comments will be compiled, evaluated and reflected in the report as appropriate and then, once that is finished, the report will be finalized and distributed to our partner agencies, the Commission and also be made available to the general public, hopefully in October.

With that, this concludes this presentation. I would like to open up the floor to any comments or questions by the Commission members.

3C

[The New York Avenue/Florida Avenue
Charrette follows:]

MR. COGBILL: Mr. McGill?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the staff and the charrette team for doing a really extraordinary job. When we contributed money to this effort and I am sure when ATF contributed money to the effort, as well, we sat there thinking, well, this is a really horrible problem. There are no good solutions. It is going to be making the least-worst solution that we can think of and certainly not creating a sense of place at the intersection of New York and Florida Avenues.

What this team has done is taken a DDOT short-term alternative and said, if we take this short-term alternative and we need to study it further and so on and so forth, but if we take this short-term alternative and put it in an urban-design perspective and make this intersection more of a place, then we might achieve the goal of improving traffic flow and, at the same time, create a whole new pleasant park at the gateway to downtown Washington.

When we spoke with DDOT about their alternatives, the alternatives were this Berlin Wall separating NoMA south of New York Avenue from

NoMA north of New York Avenue and putting the ATF building in the shadow of an overpass instead of making it a gateway building or, they said, if you don't like that, how about a 16-lane surface roadway. So the alternatives seemed horrible.

The team has come up with this really creative solution. I think NCPD did a signal service to the city with this. We got more than our money's worth and the staff and the team are to be congratulated.

MR. COGBILL: Thank you, Mike. Mr. Galvez?

MR. GALVEZ: If I could continue to build on the praise here, I think you guys did an excellent job with this because the problem is such a difficult problem to deal with in the first place. You have opened up the Avenue by looking at creating the place but also taking it much further out, looking at the bigger picture and saying, how do we start dealing with the traffic before it gets anywhere near that intersection which is really the key, I think, to solving the problem.

If you think about New York Avenue coming into the city, there are four or five major choke points as you come down before you hit this

intersection. Dealing with the traffic at those points will let you at least have a fighting chance to deal with it right here. So I think it is a great beginning for this.

MR. DECKER: Thank you. It is very true.

When you look at the accident, the slide with the accident statistics on it that Mike showed earlier, you realize that, by the time you get where the real problem is, where the accidents are happening and then we have got really severe problems, by the time traffic gets there, it is way too late and the only thing you can do is back way off to try and figure out how to take that really pretty awful set of statistics, one of the most dangerous places in the city, essentially, and try and get it to calm down.

Thanks.

MR. COGBILL: I think Mr. Galvez has a vested interest in this. I do think it is a very difficult design problem and I think it is really nice to see the creative juices working in, really, some very, I think, good ideas.

The one question I had is if we push the traffic out of the city and off of this road, have we thought about the impact of those additional

cars on the other arteries that do carry the through traffic?

MR. DECKER: We actually talked with Rick and the DDOT folks a little bit about that. There are a series of opportunities that await us to start to address that concern. While the Wilson Bridge is nearly completed, and the capacities for that have been calculated and are known, there are several other projects which are coming along.

I think of two, South Cap and 11th Street as two important ones, where volumes can be taken into consideration for distributing the regional traffic so that people feel like, as they come south on--they have got a number of different alternatives ways of getting into the city as they come down by these revised bridges.

So I think that they are aware of the fact that there are some alternative ways of doing this.

The projects are early enough in their life where they can start to say, yeah, how can we vary this capacity and increase our volume so we can disconnect or slow down, at least, the New York Avenue traffic.

MR. COGBILL: I think that is a very important point because, if we don't move these

things, these different projects, along at the same time, then we don't have the ability to do that. So I think it is important, as we think about this, to think about, as you said, South Capitol Street, 11th Street and making all of these come together because, if we start down one, we may create a problem that this doesn't solve. But I think that is a key point to this.

I guess the other thing, too, just going back to the original DDOT proposal, I am not sure that it would physically work just because of the weaves as you try to integrate that traffic coming in. So I really question that approach to start with and this, again, I think, gives us some very, very good alternatives.

I think the idea of returning these streets to a community-level, to a local-level, status is going to be very helpful because we can still move traffic through there, through the grid, but we don't focus that as one of the arteries to serve Maryland and Virginia.

MR. MCGILL: I would like to make sure that--I am not sure what process we are following here, but I want to make sure that NCPC has the ability to continue advocating this point of view.

As Mr. Dowd, I am sure, will confirm, once the traffic engineer has an idea, it requires a large two-by-four repeatedly applied to stop that idea from being built.

MR. DOWD: I can't confirm that.

MR. MCGILL: So I think the staff recommendations are sound. The study is valid and thought-provoking and encouraging and it is important that we continue to make sure it gets exposure.

MR. DOWD: In fact, from a traffic-engineering perspective, I think the recommendations are sound. What I think is happening here is, as Mike stated, 25 percent or more of the traffic on New York Avenue has no origin or destination in the city. It is finding its most convenient route from Maryland to Virginia.

Right now, for a lot of those people, it happens to be down New York Avenue. So, once the Woodrow Wilson Bridge is replaced and that capacity is there, and some of these other connections from 295 to the 11th Street Bridge, they will find other easier routes which will--is the only way to really them off. You can't put up the sign and say, if

you are going through, go around.

But I think, from a traffic engineering perspective, the recommendations that came out of this effort are valid.

MR. COGBILL: The traffic calming will do a lot to slow the traffic down and cause people to make the informed decision to go another way.

MR. DECKER: Our thought about traffic calming was not only to achieve slower speeds on--because I am a walker. I am a walker and a biker. I often am in that neighborhood because I live nearby. Crossing New York Avenue is blood sport. It is nasty, nasty business.

Calming the traffic would help on New York Avenue but the other thing that traffic calming will help is it will help slow down on the cut-throughs.

MR. COGBILL: Exactly.

MR. DECKER: We have got some real short-cut issues that really need to be addressed here. If we can calm the traffic down, people will be disinclined to make cut-offs through the neighborhoods, I think, and it will help.

MR. COGBILL: That is an historic route, too, historic in the sense that, when I grew up in

Maryland in the 60's, that was the way you came into Washington from Maryland. So that is institutionally where we have been trained to come that way.

MR. GALVEZ: I think, though, just in terms of dealing with the problem, it really is a combination of issues of how you deal with it. You can't just take New York Avenue and say, that is the fix.

MR. COGBILL: Right.

MR. GALVEZ: You have got to deal with 295, the access to the bridges, and then the other gateways to get into the city to pull that traffic away and let it have other ways to get there. What happens now is you get a bottleneck at 295. Everything shuts down because that is the only way to get there.

MR. DECKER: It is a real problem.

MR. COGBILL: This has been very helpful.

I look forward to getting a written report on this and continuing to move this forward. I really do think this is the type of leadership that we need to continue to do and to implement as we go forward because that is really what we are here for. Thank you all for your help in this. It is a very, very

good plan. Thank you.

MR. DECKER: Thank you.

MR. WEIL: Thank you.

MR. COGBILL: I think that completes the agenda for our meeting in September. Thank you all. If there is no further business to come before the National Capital Planning Commission, we stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:34 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.]

- - -